



BANGLADESH

Country Investment Plan

*A road map towards investment in agriculture,
food security and nutrition*

UPDATED VERSION June, 2011

Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh

This document is the result of a joint effort by -

Ministry of Agriculture

Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs

Ministry of Environment and Forests

Ministry of Finance

Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock

Ministry of Food and Disaster Management (Food Division and DMR Division)

Ministry of Health and Family Welfare

Ministry of Industries

Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives

Ministry of Land

Ministry of Social Welfare

Ministry of Water Resources

Ministry of Women and Children Affairs

This effort was carried out in close consultation with private sector representatives, civil society organizations, NGOs, farmer groups and organizations, representatives from research and academia and the Bangladesh Development Partners.

**Coordinated by the
FPMU/Food Division
Ministry of Food and Disaster Management**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 6 |
| 1. NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT | 7 |
| 2. DEFINITION AND PURPOSES OF THE CIP | 8 |
| 3. THE CIP IS ANCHORED IN THE EXISTING NATIONAL FRAMEWORK..... | 9 |
| 4. CONTEXT AND PROCESS OF CIP PREPARATION | 11 |
| 5. THE CONSULTATION PROCESS..... | 13 |
| 6. GUIDING PRINCIPLES..... | 15 |
| 7. RESULTS FRAMEWORK..... | 17 |
| 8. CIP PROGRAMMES | 21 |
| 9. POLICY CONSIDERATIONS..... | 34 |
| 10. COST AND FINANCING | 37 |
| 11. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION..... | 40 |
| 12. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS | 42 |
| 13. THE WAY FORWARD AND IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES..... | 46 |
| ANNEXES | 48 |
| ANNEX 1. UPDATING AND CONSULTATION PROCESS..... | 49 |
| ANNEX 2: RESULTS FRAMEWORK | 72 |
| ANNEX 3: PROGRAMMES DESCRIPTION TABLES | 81 |
| ANNEX 4: COST AND FINANCING | 108 |
| ANNEX 5: GUIDING NOTE ON CIP MONITORING AND EVALUATION..... | 152 |

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-----------|--|
| AFSI | L' Aquila Food Security Initiative |
| ADB | Asian Development Bank |
| ADP | Annual Development Programme |
| AI | Avian Influenza |
| BADC | Bangladesh Agricultural Development Corporation |
| BARC | Bangladesh Agricultural Research Council |
| BIDS | Bangladesh Institute for Development Studies |
| BSTI | Bangladesh Standards and Testing Institute |
| BWDB | Bangladesh Water Development Board |
| CIP | Country Investment Plan |
| CFS | Committee on World Food Security |
| CPF | Country Partnership Framework |
| CSOs | Civil Society Organizations |
| DAE | Department of Agricultural Extension |
| DANIDA | Danish International Development Assistance |
| DfID | Department for International Development |
| DCI | Direct Calorie Intake |
| DLS | Department of Livestock Services |
| DoF | Department of Fisheries |
| DPs | Development Partners |
| DRR | Directorate of Relief and Rehabilitation |
| ERD | Economic Relations Division |
| EU | European Union |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| FFS | Farmers Field School |
| FPMC | Food Planning and Monitoring Committee |
| FPMU | Food Planning and Monitoring Unit |
| FPWG | Food Policy Working Group |
| FYP | Five Year Plan |
| GAFSF | Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme |
| GED | General Economic Division of the Ministry of Planning |
| GoB | Government of Bangladesh |
| HLTF | High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis |
| IFPRI | International Food Policy Research Institute |
| IDB | Islamic Development Bank |
| IFAD | International Fund for Agriculture Development |
| IMED | Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation Division |
| IPM | Integrated Pest Management |
| JCS | Joint Cooperation Strategy |
| LCG-AFSRD | Local Consultative Group on Agriculture, Food Security and Rural Development |
| LGED | Local Government Engineering Division |
| MCCI | Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce and Industry |
| MDGf | Millennium Development Goal Fund |
| MoA | Ministry of Agriculture |
| MoFDM | Ministry of Food and Disaster Management |
| MoFL | Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock |

| | |
|---------|--|
| MoHFW | Ministry of Health and Family Welfare |
| NARS | National Agricultural Research System |
| NFP PoA | National Food Policy Plan of Action |
| NGOs | Non Governmental Organizations |
| NNS | National Nutrition Services |
| PPP | Public Private Partnership |
| REACH | Ending Child Hunger and Under Nutrition |
| SCA | Seed Certification Agency |
| SSN | Social Safety Net |
| SUN | Scaling Up Nutrition |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| WFP | World Food Programme |
| WSFS | World Summit on Food Security |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report represents **the updated version of the Bangladesh Country Investment Plan (CIP)**. The CIP is a country led planning, fund mobilization and alignment tool. It supports increased, effective public investment to increase and diversify food availability in a sustainable manner and improve access to food and nutrition security. Its interventions also aim to mobilize investment by smallholders and other private sector food security actors. It is a 5-year comprehensive plan that aims to ensure sustainable food security.

The CIP is **anchored in the policy, programmatic and financial framework of Bangladesh**: (i) it is the investment arm of the National Food Policy (NFP, 2006) and its Plan of Action (PoA, 2008-2015); (ii) it reflects the food security content of the upcoming 6th Five Year Plan; (iii) it is a strong advocacy and financial tool for increased resource allocation from the budget (through the Government process) and Development Partners (DPs) in the context of the Joint Cooperation Strategy (JCS).

The CIP is a **living document**: its first version was approved by the Government in June 2010; this updated version (June 2011) was developed through a **wide process of consultation** with over 900 stakeholders in Dhaka and the regions (including Government agencies, the private sector, farmers, academics, civil society, NGOs and Development Partners). This process led to refined, more accurately costed and prioritised CIP investment areas, the establishment of a results framework, guiding principles to be applied during implementation and the identification of policy implications to enable optimal effectiveness of interventions.

The CIP provides a **coherent set of 12 priority investment programmes to improve food security and nutrition in an integrated way**. The total cost of the CIP is estimated at US\$ 7.8 billion. Of this, US\$ 2.8 billion are already financed through allocated GOB budget resources and contributions by Development Partners. The financing gap is therefore **US\$ 5.1 billion**, of which **US\$ 3.4 billion** has been identified as first priority requirements.

| Component | Programme (financing gaps are in million US\$) | Funds required | |
|---|--|----------------|--------------|
| | | total | priority |
| Food Availability | 1. Sustainable and diversified agriculture through integrated research and extension | 604 | 441 |
| | 2. Improved water resource management and infrastructure for irrigation purposes | 858 | 583 |
| | 3. Improved quality of inputs and soil fertility | 232 | 170 |
| | 4. Fisheries and aquaculture development | 356 | 212 |
| | 5. Livestock development, with a focus on poultry and dairy production | 775 | 440 |
| Food Access | 6. Improved access to market, value addition in agriculture and non farm incomes | 635 | 368 |
| | 7. Strengthened capacities for implementation and monitoring of NFP and CIP actions | 99 | 69 |
| | 8. Enhanced public food management system | 293 | 212 |
| | 9. Institutional Development and Capacity Development for more effective safety nets | 472 | 340 |
| Food Utilization | 10. Community based nutrition programmes and services | 537 | 480 |
| | 11. Orient food and nutrition actions through data | 22 | 13 |
| | 12. Food safety and quality improvement | 177 | 91 |
| COUNTRY INVESTMENT PLAN FINANCING GAP (million US Dollars) | | 5,061 | 3,420 |

Moving forward, the CIP must be translated into action through active resource mobilization: the Ministry of Finance and many Development Partners have committed to use the CIP to allocate budget contributions, grants and loans. A Country Partnership Framework, to date, endorsed by 8 Development Partners represents a commitment to align financing of food security investments under the CIP. **More financing is required**, however, and a strategic, targeted communications strategy will be key to ensuring this. As a living tool, CIP implementation will sustain open dialogue with all stakeholders—including on policy matters. Furthermore, capacity development of implementing actors will be critical for successful implementation. Additionally, active efforts must be made to ensure promotion of innovative investment interventions, learning and scaling up of successful interventions already in place. Finally, coordination of interventions will be ensured through an inclusive institutional set up which builds upon the existing structure developed by the country in support of the National Food Policy.

1. NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

1.1 The **Government of Bangladesh** (GoB) considers agriculture, food security and nutrition to be major priorities. While the country has made impressive achievements over the last 40 years (notably, it has tripled its rice production), it is increasingly faced with considerable challenges: *population growth* (Bangladesh is already the most densely populated country in the world and its population is still growing by over 2 million people per year); *climate change* (sea intrusion, natural disasters, increasing salinity); *deteriorating access to increasingly scarce natural resources* (water, land); *vulnerability to price shocks*, (as shown in 2008); *persistent poverty* (leading to poor access to food); and one of the highest *malnutrition* rates in the world. The Government considers the fight against food and nutrition insecurity a key strategy for Bangladesh to become a middle-income country. The election manifesto of the present Government, as well as relevant constitutional provisions, provide evidence of this commitment.

1.2 This national commitment matches the **renewed global commitment** that resulted from the 2008 food security crisis, and materialized in the July 2009 L'Aquila Food Security Initiative (AFSI), as well as the November 2009 World Food Security Summit in Rome. During these events, the global community pledged funds and committed to support country-led plans for food security that would reflect countries' investment requirements for increased food and nutrition security. This Country Investment Plan (CIP) represents such a plan for Bangladesh.

1.3 The Bangladesh CIP is a **results based tool** aimed to improve food security in a comprehensive manner. The CIP (i) is **anchored in the existing national policy and planning frameworks**; (ii) builds on past and on-going operations in support of food security, and (iii) reflects the diverse views of its many stakeholders as a result of a unique and inclusive consultation process, involving government agencies, academics, civil society, the private sector, NGOs, UN agencies and Development Partners. The CIP also provides costing and financing gap evaluation as well as priority financing requirements. It explains how it will be used for fund mobilization and monitoring of progress in output delivery and impact. Finally, the institutional set up and way forward for effective implementation are proposed.

1.4 While the first version of the CIP was discussed during the Food Security Investment Forum (Dhaka, 26-27 May, 2010) and approved in June 2010 by the Government, this second updated and more complete version was reviewed during another high-level forum in Dhaka on 20 March 2011, which represented the culminating point of the consultation process.

1.5 This CIP has four annexes: (1) detailed feedback from the consultation process (2) results framework and monitoring system; (3) twelve summary tables spelling out the main programmes forming the CIP; (4) an inventory of existing and proposed projects under the CIP, cost estimates and financing tables.

1.6 The CIP was prepared by the GoB involving a wide range of Ministries, Agencies and Departments, with the Food Planning Monitoring Unit (under the Ministry of Food and Disaster Management) playing a coordination role. The CIP benefits from the strong involvement and leadership at the highest levels of the Government and wide dialogues with stakeholders. FAO provided technical and methodological support, and USAID provided financing. IFPRI prepared an accompanying document on policy dimensions of the CIP which has been incorporated in this version of the CIP in particular in its guiding principles, institutional set up and in a specific Chapter (9) on policy considerations.

2. DEFINITION AND PURPOSES OF THE CIP

2.1 The CIP provides a **strategic and coherent set of 12 priority investment programmes to improve food and nutrition security in an integrated way**. It is a five year plan aligned with the 6th Five Year Plan for 2011-2015 of the Government of Bangladesh, currently under preparation. The CIP builds on the existing solid national food security policy and programmatic framework as described below.

2.2 The CIP is **comprehensive** in that it addresses the three dimensions of food security—availability, access and nutrition—in an integrated way. It aims at linking these three dimensions, in particular by shaping food availability proposals (mostly related to agriculture) so that they **enhance access and improve nutrition** of the most food insecure and malnourished. However, it limits its scope by building on past and on-going investment operations and actions, identifying gaps and needs for scaling up and extension, and incorporates the current national priorities expressed by various stakeholders, including the Government agencies, Civil Society Organizations, NGOs, the private sector and Bangladeshi farmers themselves.

2.3 The CIP is about **food security-related Government investments** included in the Annual Development Programme, which covers investments included in the Government budget. The five “I”s provide a good framework: the CIP would cover **Investment in Infrastructure (including facilities, equipment and materials), Information (including studies, generation and propagation of information through research and advisory services), Institutions (including strengthening physical and human capacities of institutions, streamlining operational modalities, training, staff motivation and awareness) and Innovations**.

2.4 Most economic, policy and social measures and investment have an impact on food and nutrition security. However, the CIP focuses on those investments having a direct impact on food availability, access and utilization, leaving out broader items for which other mechanisms are more adequate. Therefore, the following are not included in the CIP: (i) purely policy and legal measures - the CIP is a means to implement existing policies; (ii) the distribution of food; (iii) subsidies for agricultural inputs, i.e. fertilizers, which are covered by regular budgetary means; (iv) safety net programmes¹ *per se*; (v) direct transfers from DPs to implementers not linked to the Annual Development Programme²; (vi) family planning activities which, though they have an important impact on food security, have more of a public health nature; (vii) reshaping the overall education system in Bangladesh. Additionally, the CIP does not include private investment, which, by nature, cannot be planned. However, public goods financed by the CIP aim to: (i) directly increase production of, access to and balanced utilization of nutritious food; (ii) enable increased investment by smallholder producers; (iii) encourage / leverage private investment through the promotion of Public-Private Partnerships.

2.5 The **CIP** is expected to serve four purposes:

- (i) To **plan and invest resources in a coordinated way**, addressing the three dimensions of food security through an integrated approach;
- (ii) To **increase convergence of domestic and external sources of funding** in support of agriculture, food security and nutrition. This requires a progressive alignment of external sources of funds (from bilateral and multilateral donors) behind a single, inclusive (but evolving) investment plan in order to increase cohesion, coordination and avoid gaps and redundancies;
- (iii) To **mobilize additional resources** from the GoB budget and from external partners, and to monitor commitments, pledges, expenses and remaining gaps;
- (iv) To **monitor and evaluate** investments in food security and prescribe remedial measures to activities that requires strengthening.

¹ Safety net programmes represent an annual amount of USD 2.3 billion

² These transfers add up to USD 390 million

3. THE CIP IS ANCHORED IN THE EXISTING NATIONAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 The CIP relies on the existing Government framework in its three dimensions: (i) policy/institutional; (ii) planning / programmatic; (iii) financial and resource mobilization.

Policy/Institutional Framework

3.2 **The CIP builds on the very solid existing policies, strategies and plans in support of food security in Bangladesh.** In particular, **the CIP aims to support implementation of the National Food Policy (NFP-2006) through a set of investment programmes** that reflect key gaps identified by the Government and other stakeholders, and their priorities to achieve the goals of the NFP. In other words, **the CIP is the investment arm of the NFP PoA.**

3.3 The **National Food Policy (NFP)** represents a unique exercise in defining a comprehensive approach to food and nutrition security, encompassing the three dimensions of food security. It was approved by the cabinet in August 2006 and has three objectives:

- (i) Adequate and stable supply of safe and nutritious food;
- (ii) Increased purchasing power and access to food by the people;
- (iii) Adequate nutrition for all individuals, especially women and children.

3.4 **A Plan of Action (PoA) (2008 - 2015)** of the NFP translates the NFP into 26 strategic areas of intervention and, under each, identifies priority actions, responsible actors and a set of policy targets and indicators. The preparation of the NFP PoA was very **inclusive**, involving 11 ministries, civil society, NGOs, the private sector and Bangladesh Development Partners (DPs). **The 12 CIP programmes directly derive from the 26 areas of action, by aggregating and prioritizing those requiring investment.**

3.5 The NFP and CIP build on key sectoral **policy documents**, such as the National Seed Policy, Flood Action Plan, National Agricultural Extension Policy, National Water Policy (1999), Food and Nutrition Policy (1997), National Plan of Action for Nutrition (1997), the Livestock Sector Road Map (2006), the Fisheries Sector Road Map (2006), and the National Disaster Management Plan (2007-2015). The NFP and CIP are consistent with the Bangladesh Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (2009).

3.6 The **institutional, coordination and monitoring** framework of the CIP (Chapters 7 and 12) will be embedded in the existing framework of the NFP PoA. Monitoring activities will rely on the monitoring system currently in place as part of the national planning process.

3.7 The CIP also draws upon: (i) **the Vision 2021 and the associated Perspective Plan 2010-2021 of the Government**, which provides the long-term vision of the current Government; (ii) the **election manifesto** of the Government and relevant constitutional provisions.

Programmatic / Planning Mechanisms

3.8 The CIP is aligned with the upcoming **6th Five-Year Plan (FYP)** (2011-2015), a key planning document of the Government. The FYP outlines priority development interventions for Bangladesh. It holds that “strong agriculture remains fundamental to poverty reduction as well as food security.” There is also broad support for safety nets that will ensure access to as well as utilization of the enhanced availability resulting from strengthened agriculture. The CIP approach

is in line with the FYP's holistic approach to food security. Throughout the process of the FYP, inputs have been taken from the CIP in order to ensure further coherence.

3.9 The CIP also relies on the planning process set up by the Government to plan annual investment expenses. The **Annual Development Programme (ADP)** was used to identify and cost investment areas and programmes (Chapter 10). Further, the CIP was developed in close link with the **Planning Commission**.

Finance and Resource Mobilization

3.10 In the context of the "Paris declaration on aid effectiveness," the GoB, together with 18 DPs, signed a **Joint Cooperation Strategy (JCS)** on 2nd June 2010. This strategy aims to enhance the effectiveness of development assistance in Bangladesh by creating common platforms for national and sector-based dialogues and facilitating a nationally owned process for improving aid delivery. Its purpose is to align foreign aid with the national vision and to move forward with the aid dialogue and coordination process under the Government's leadership. The CIP can be considered as a contribution to the JCS.

3.11 Further, the CIP draws from the **National Strategy for Accelerated Poverty Reduction II (December 2009)**. Additionally, the aim of the CIP is to be integrated into the **Medium Term Budgetary Framework** which reflects the investment priorities of the Government of Bangladesh.

3.12 The first CIP-2010 was used as a tool to develop the **Country Partnership Framework (CPF)** as a living mechanism for alignment of DPs with the Bangladeshi priority requirements outlined in the CIP. The CPF, can now be used by the Government to mobilize additional resources from the DP community. To date, 8 DPs have signed the CPF.

3.13 Finally, the CIP was developed with the close involvement of the Ministry of Finance, including its Finance Division for budget resource mobilization and the Economic Relations Division (ERD) in view of its central role for resource mobilization with DPs.

4. CONTEXT AND PROCESS OF CIP PREPARATION

Global context

4.1 The CIP is framed in the context of several global initiatives that aim to strengthen food and nutrition security throughout the world:

4.2 In July of 2009, in L'Aquila (Italy), G20 leaders pledged a total of US\$ 22.2 billion under the *L'Aquila Food Security Initiative* (AFSI). As a major contribution to it, US President Obama announced the *Feed the Future Initiative*. Both initiatives represent major commitments on the part of key DPs to support food security through increased investment and the CIP is conceived as a tool to mobilize some of these resources.

4.3 During the November 2009 World Summit on Food Security (WSFS) in Rome, five principles were endorsed by the international community as governing guidelines for food security interventions. The 5 principles, known as the *Rome Principles*, have been fully incorporated during the shaping of the CIP as detailed below:

- (i) **Country-led plans:** The CIP is anchored in the existing national policy framework. It takes priorities from the stakeholders and benefits from the strong political support of the Government.
- (ii) **Comprehensiveness:** The CIP covers the three dimensions of food security (availability, access and utilization) in an integrated way.
- (iii) **Coordination:** Effective coordination is institutionalized through the establishment of a Food Policy Working Group for NFP PoA. This comes under the Cabinet's Food Planning and Monitoring Committee and presents the CIP with a platform of 11 ministries and their departments, as well as civil society and NGOs. Coordination of the DPs is conducted through the Local Consultative Group's thematic sub group on Agriculture, Rural Development and Food Security (LCG-ARDFS).
- (iv) **Role of multilateral system:** In close link with the Government and DPs engaged in the agricultural and food security sectors, the UN system is supporting the CIP. The agencies forming the UN High Level Task Force (HLTF) on the Global Food Security Crisis play an important role.
- (v) **Increased and secured financing:** The CIP aims to and has succeeded (in June 2010) in mobilizing additional funds from AFSI, including from the Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (GAFSP). In March 2011, DANIDA announced a pledge of US\$ 75 million against the CIP.

Process of CIP-2010 Preparation

4.4 CIP-2010 development began in March 2010 and was organized around the extraction from the 26 NFP PoA areas and its first Monitoring Report of key investment requirements to achieve goals in the NFP. Twelve investment programmes were developed. The first draft of the CIP was then reviewed in a broad-based meeting at MoFDM on 4 May 2010 involving stakeholders from the public and private sectors, NGOs, CSOs, and the DPs. Two draft versions were circulated electronically (respectively on 7 May and 23 May) to approximately 160 recipients from among all the stakeholders.

4.5 The high level Bangladesh Investment Forum (27-28 May 2010) chaired by the Prime Minister discussed the CIP and benefited from six policy papers developed by IFPRI and the Bangladesh Institute for Development Studies (BIDS).

4.6 In early June 2010, the MoFDM organized a multi ministry review of the draft CIP to validate the document on behalf of the Government. The consequent joint signature of the document by GoB and DPs took place on 14th June 2010.

CIP Use and Recognition in 2010

4.7 Bangladesh was awarded USD 52 million from the **GAFFSP** for a comprehensive agricultural development programme as envisaged under the CIP. The World Bank is the supervising entity for the investment component (USD 48.3 million) and FAO is the supervising entity for the technical assistance component (USD 3.7 million).

4.8 Additionally, the CIP was showcased in the Regional Investment Forum held in Manila in July 2010 where the CPF and CIP were presented. Further, Bangladesh's strategic instruments for sustainable food security (including the CIP, the NFP PoA and CPF) were showcased again in the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) in Rome in October 2010.

The CIP Revision/Enhancement Process

4.9 Though the first version of the CIP met much success, the Government and DPs agreed upon a revision process leading to this updated version of the CIP (2011). The Plan needed broader participation, especially to facilitate private investment and to consider the priorities of a diversity of stakeholders, particularly at the field-level.

4.10 Through an extensive consultation process (detailed in Chapter 5), updating of the CIP began in December 2010 and aimed at: i) **cost rationalization and identification of financing gap**, ii) further **prioritization of interventions that would reflect stakeholders' views and needs**, iii) **establishment of a results-based M&E mechanism**, and iv) **analysis of key policy issues tied to successful implementation of the CIP**.

4.11 A joint team of GoB and FAO worked with the technical guidance of the FAO Investment Centre, with the Food Planning and Monitoring Unit of MoFDM, supported by the NFPCSP, as the secretariat of the operations.

4.12 A general outline of steps taken in the updating processes is below:

- Prioritization through inclusive consultation with a variety of stakeholders, particularly farmers, as well as public and private sector representatives, and NGOs;
- Costing of the prioritized programmes and identification of funding availability and further requirements;
- Establishment of a results framework, as well as a monitoring and evaluation mechanism for CIP Implementation;
- Policy analysis, organized by IFPRI;
- Consultations with DPs for mapping available and planned support;
- Specific private sector consultation and participation (MCCI Event on 06th March, 2011);
- Alignment with the 6th Five Year Plan (with GED) and GoB Planning Process/Annual Development Programme;
- Iterative reviews of findings of consultations by the GoB heads of departments and planning officials;
- Feed back on findings by the DPs, through LCG-ARDFS and Heads of Agencies Meeting (28th February, 2011);
- Regular technical reviews of the findings by the high-level inter ministerial CIP Technical Committee and strategic review and guidance by the CIP National Committee, chaired by the Minister, MoFDM. The last reviews took place on 14th March 2011.

4.13 The presentation and discussion of the draft revised CIP took place at the **National Forum in Dhaka on the 20th March, 2011**. The draft CIP was also shared with a large number of stakeholders through the website of the FPMU-NFPCSP. Feedback was incorporated into the final version of the updated CIP, completed in April 2011. The final updated draft of CIP was shared with CIP technical committee members on 18th May, 2011 and finalised by taking and incorporating last minute inputs from the technical committee members on 2nd June, 2011.

5. THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

5.1 In order to increase inclusiveness and ensure that the CIP accurately reflects the voices of its many stakeholders, an intensive consultation process was undertaken from December 2010 to March 2011. This **unique consultation process** involved 13 ministries and a large number of their agencies (360 people consulted) academics (from over 20 institutions), private sector (200 people), farmers in various group meetings (310 participants) and with some of their representatives, NGOs and other CSOs (total of 40 organizations). Feedback was gathered through a variety of means, including regional consultations in Mymensingh, Khulna and Bogra, meetings in Dhaka with Civil Society Organizations, the private sector and a wide variety of government stakeholders.

5.2 It is important to note that a variety of consultation methodologies and techniques were employed throughout the process, resulting in different types of feedback. Furthermore, the various groups consulted clearly have varying objectives and perspectives that impact their feedback—this is seen particularly through the different weight placed by different stakeholders on different CIP components (Annex 1). However, much effort has been made to organize and synthesize the information gathered in order to produce a relatively representative sample of feedback from the many key CIP stakeholders across Bangladesh.

5.3 The process of participatory consultation had the additional key benefit of **building ownership of the CIP**. Dialogue with such a variety of stakeholders has led to **three categories of outcomes all incorporated in the CIP: (i) guiding principles, (ii) policy issues, and (iii) programmatic priorities**.

5.4 **First**, strong views were expressed on **guiding principles** that the CIP should follow, as well as important considerations for its design. These are further detailed in Chapter 6:

- (i) The concept (promoted by the Government) of considering the CIP as a *living document* maintained through regular dialogue and communication, was praised by many participants from academia, Government agencies and CSOs and the private sector;
- (ii) The private sector and CSOs/NGOs called for *enhanced partnership* as an improved method for investing in food and agriculture and implementing the CIP;
- (iii) The Government departments (DAE, DRR, Food Department etc.), a number of CSOs, key UN agencies (WFP and UNICEF) and some Development Partners (e.g. EU) emphasized the need to focus on the main required outcome of the CIP (food and nutrition security) by *scaling up the food access and utilization* parts of the CIP, in particular through stronger and better integrated targeted safety nets, and through the *mainstreaming of nutrition* throughout the CIP;
- (iv) The private sector, important Government agencies as well as a number of NGOs and DPs iterated the call for *innovation* in implementing the CIP. This should be done by applying technical or institutional innovations or scaling up successfully innovative pilot interventions, undertaken by various organizations.

5.5 **Second**, a number of **policy issues** arose from the consultations and from the work undertaken by IFPRI. They are either policy measures *per se* or policy concerns directly impacting the effectiveness of CIP. They are further elaborated in Chapter 9 (Policy considerations). However, three striking issues arose:

- (i) *Access to and tenure of land and water resources* arose as a widespread concern amongst the farming community, senior Government officials, NGOs and civil society;
- (ii) *Lack of access to credit and other financial resources* was reflected as a major constraint at the farm level by stakeholders themselves;
- (iii) The need for a policy environment that *enables private sector involvement*. The role of the public vs. private sector was heavily debated and a call for clear roles and responsibilities emerged.

5.6 **Third**, there are several **key broad programmatic issues** that arose throughout the consultation process:

- (i) Ensuring *a stable supply of good quality agricultural inputs* (i.e. seeds, fingerling, day old chicks, AI, feeds and fertilizers). This strong call comes consistently from the farmers themselves, as well as from NGOs and CSOs. This shapes the CIP food availability programmes. There is also a clear need for enhanced quality control through increased accountability of providers and a strong regulatory system;
- (ii) Further, there is a strong call, from stakeholders across the board, for an increase in the development and capacity development of *farmer organizations*. This call is related to many programmatic areas, namely inputs, technology adoption, water usage, credit, fisheries, livestock and market development. Direct investment related to this important priority is foreseen as part of programme 7;
- (iii) *Water resource management and irrigation* also arose as critical issues, requiring investment attention for surface water development, excavation of canals, and reservoirs—with a strong call coming from the Government as well as academia, the private sector and farmers;
- (iv) *Nutrition* also arose as a key priority to be addressed through different programmatic means, including safety nets and an increase in the production and consumption of nutritious food, through homestead vegetable gardens and small-scale poultry, livestock and aquaculture and improving pulse productivity;
- (v) Additionally, stakeholders elaborated a need for strengthened *research and extension services* in particular in response to climate change and adaptation, with a strong call from the Government agencies, academia and CSOs and private sector.

5.7 Throughout the consultation process, many more specific, activity-level priorities arose and are incorporated in the CIP programmes described in Chapter 8.

6. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

6.1 The CIP guiding principles define how the Government of Bangladesh and the stakeholders involved in the Bangladesh food system (including farmer organizations, private sector, consumer groups, NGOs, research, and DPs) will work together to achieve the CIP food and nutrition security outcomes by 2015. The following guiding principles have emerged from the CIP consultation process and have been incorporated during the CIP design process. They shall be systematically applied in the implementation stage.

6.2 **Policy and institutional coherence.** The CIP operates within the development effectiveness framework (Paris Declaration) and encourages policy coherence and effective coordination of interventions. In this respect, CIP delivery mechanisms will be mainstreamed within the country policy and institutional systems, making effective use of them and/or suggesting adjustments to improve their performance. While providing for innovations and new ideas to flourish (see below), new initiatives will need to be carefully assessed and integrated within or linked to the existing institutional and results framework.

6.3 **Comprehensiveness and nutrition agenda.** The CIP is comprehensive and covers food availability, access and utilization in an integrated manner. It also links actions related to food security with actions on climate change and water issues. The key goal of the CIP is **to enhance the nutrition and health of the Bangladeshi population through all CIP components**, including increased availability of nutrient rich food. The focus on the nutrition outcome was re-emphasized during the CIP National Forum (20th March, 2011) by the Ministers of agriculture and finance, UN agencies (in particular WFP), the EU for which mainstreaming of nutrition throughout CIP is key, IFPRI and NGOs (BRAC). The CIP will benefit from revived country commitment in support of nutrition, materialized in the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) movement of which Bangladesh is becoming an early riser, the REACH, MDGf, 1000 days and laser beam initiatives. These should be aligned with and build on the CIP, which represents the comprehensive country framework to guide these initiatives. Accordingly, the CIP nutrition programmes were reviewed, discussed and finalized in close consultation with the Nutrition Working Group and the Scaling up Nutrition (SUN) team in Bangladesh. Four participatory meetings were held during the period May 2010 to February 2011.

6.4 **Inclusiveness and participation.** The CIP is a collaborative framework to guide the actions of stakeholders. Dialogue should be seen as a way to further empower stakeholders to mobilize their own resources, hence broadening the investment resource base. Genuine and inclusive dialogue processes put in place during CIP development should be pursued during implementation so that all stakeholders can effectively participate in the design and implementation of investment programmes. Active participation of stakeholders (in particular smallholder producers and their organizations) should guide the implementation of CIP to enable its effectiveness. As mentioned by the EU during the CIP National Forum (20th March, 2011), this would require to make the CIP accessible to rural communities through simplified and translated communications, an efforts that has been initiated during the consultation process. On-going dialogue during implementation should also allow for regular updating of the CIP, considered “a

living document to be updated on a regular basis through an inclusive process.” Stakeholder dialogue activities will orient the development, monitoring and assessment of CIP performance.

6.5 **Targeting and Gender Considerations.** Investments shall target the poor, marginalized and vulnerable rural people who are the most food and nutrition insecure. This includes women who have the key role in household food production, in particular in relation to diversification of production. Special consideration should also focus on women and young children, the most food and nutrition insecure strata of the population, and their access to nutritious food. This is particularly the case for safety net programmes that would be far more efficient and effective as a result of stronger targeting.

6.6 **Particular attention should be paid to the Southern part of Bangladesh.** Key activities of the CIP should focus on this part of the country in view of its higher poverty and food insecurity levels, as well as the adverse effects of climate change. Despite this vulnerability however, there is great potential to be unlocked following the completion of the upcoming **Padma Bridge**. The CIP will also benefit from the **Master Plan for the South**, currently under development.

6.7 **Innovation and scaling up.** The CIP will encourage investments in innovation to test new approaches and gather learning from experience, whether technical innovations (e.g. rice fortification, alternative wet and dry irrigation techniques, Integrated Pest Management (IPM), adaptation to climate change) or softer and more institutional innovations (e.g. partnerships, contract farming, Farmer Field Schools, women farmer groups). Through a “learning by doing approach”, it shall also focus on replicating and scaling up successful innovations and experiences so that they yield a critical mass of impact.

6.8 **Partnership.** The CIP will work systematically with partners to broaden the resource base (financial, social, knowledge, human), improve performance and deliver results. The key partners are the Government of Bangladesh, farmer and producer organizations, the private sector, consumer groups, NGOs and the Development Partners. Developing these partnerships would aim to delineate the responsibilities and allocate these according to the comparative advantages of each actor, including Government agencies, the private sector and civil society. In order for CIP resources to leverage additional investments, due consideration should be given to partnerships with the private sector, farmer organizations and NGOs (e.g. BRAC, which is very active in agriculture and food security sectors, as well as smaller NGOs).


6.9 **Sustainability, with a particular focus on the environment.** CIP investments should be designed and implemented in ways that ensure quality, impact and sustainability, in coherence with national policies and strategies. To this end, serious attention must be paid to *ensure that all CIP interventions are environmentally sustainable*. This means that not only should interventions not degrade the environment; they should actively work towards mitigation of future environmental threats, including climate change. For example, investments to improve natural resources management strengthen sustainable agriculture practices (including integrated pest management and organic agriculture) and develop climate change resilient production and consumption, should be prioritized.

7. RESULTS FRAMEWORK

7.1 The Results Framework defines **what** the country wants to achieve through the CIP in terms of national food security goals, and **how** the country wants to achieve them in terms of investment. As mentioned by WFP and the WB during the CIP forum on 20 March 2011, the result framework is key tool for alignment and coordination when, as proposed here, it is linked with operational activities and projects. The CIP result framework is made of a **three-level Results Chain**, which defines the CIP Expected Outcomes/Impacts, Outputs and Inputs.

7.2 The identified Results are coherent with relevant key national strategic documents, such as the National MDGs, the National Food Policy (NFP) and the 6th FYP, and further build on the findings of the CIP prioritization and costing exercises. They are coherent and logically linked to each another and include the following three levels¹:

- Outcomes/Impact level: 3 expected outcomes/impacts from the 3 CIP components have been formulated; these correspond to the three objectives of the National Food Policy Plan of Action.
- Output Level: at output level a distinction between aggregate outputs and sub outputs has been made. The aggregate outputs are linked to each of the 12 programs of the CIP; each program of the CIP however has sub-outputs (40) which refer to specific and prioritized areas for investments. The output level of the CIP is comparable to the level of the 26 areas of Interventions of the National Food Policy Plan of Action.
- Input Level: to each of the 12 CIP programs and 40 areas of investment at input level, correspond a number of specific projects. The monitoring of CIP at input level represents the financial execution of the projects and Government and donor commitment, aggregated in the respective area of intervention and CIP program.



¹ In this document, the terms used for the monitoring have not followed the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) terminology. Indeed, emphasis has been given to coherence with existing strategic documents and particularly with the NFP PoA and its first Monitoring Report. Indeed, both the CIP and the NFP PoA (2011) will be monitored together. It is thus essential that same terms refer to the same monitoring level for the sake of clarity.

7.3 CIP expected outcomes/impacts reflect the intended improvements of people's well-being. Expected outputs are the medium-term development results that interventions seek to support. Aggregate outputs of the 12 programmes are drawn from sub-outputs from priority investment areas.

7.4 At the higher level, each of the 3 components is **associated with one expected Outcome/Impact Statement**, and a set **of measurable indicators**. For each of them: (i) a **baseline figure** was extracted from the 2010 PoA monitoring report; (ii) a **target to be achieved within the timeframe of the CIP** was agreed upon through consultations and consistent with the National MDG and the National Food Policy (NFP) Plan of Action (PoA), and means of verification were established. This framework is summarized in the following chart. The provided baseline information represents the key reference against which to measure progress towards the agreed upon targets.

| NFP OVERALL GOAL | | | | | |
|---|----|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| To ensure dependable sustained food security for all people of the country at all times | No | PROXY INDICATORS | BASE LINE** | TARGETS | VERIFICATION SOURCES |
| | a | Prevalence of undernourished people | 27% (FAO 2010, collected 2005-07) | 17.5% by 2015 | FAO SOFI |
| | b | Prevalence of stunting | 43% (2009) | 25% by 2015 (2nd draft 6th FYP) | BDHS |
| | c | Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age | 41% | 33% (2nd draft 6th FYP) | BDHS-NIPOINT |



| CIP EXPECTED OUTCOME/IMPACT | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|-----|--|--|--|----------------------|
| No | COMPONENTS | EXPECTED OUTCOME/IMPACT STATEMENTS | No | PROXY INDICATORS | BASE LINE** | TARGETS (by end of 2015) | VERIFICATION SOURCES |
| 1 | Food availability | Adequate and stable supply of safe and nutritious food is achieved | 1.1 | Rate of growth of food GDP in constant prices | 4.2% | 4.4% | BBS |
| | | | 1.2 | Rice import dependency (import/availability) | 1.4% (average 07/08 – 09/10) | 0% | FPMU |
| | | | 1.3 | Coefficient of variation of rice production over the last 10 years | 0.1 (00/01 to 09/10) | 0 | BBS |
| | | | 1.4 | Share of rice value added in total food value added in current price | 39.4% (07-08) | below 35% | BBS |
| 2 | Food access | Increased purchasing power and access to food by the people | 2.1 | Average growth of wages expressed in kg of rice | 6.4% (07/08- 09/10) | ≥GDP growth+ 0.5 | Bangladesh Bank/DAM |
| | | | 2.2 | Absolute DCI poverty rate (<2122 kcal) | 40% (2005) | 24% (MDG 1, target 1.9) | MDG Report |
| | | | 2.3 | Hard Core DCI poverty rate (<1805 kcal) | 19.5% (2005) | 14% (MDG 1, target 1.10) | BBS |
| | | | 2.4 | Poverty gap ratio (%) | 9% (2005) | 8% by 2015 (draft 6 th FYP) | BBS |
| | | | 2.5 | Inflation differential between general CPI and food CPI (%) | 6.35% (average CPI differential 06-09) | Maximum 0% | Bangladesh Bank/BBS |
| 3 | Food Utilization | Adequate nutrition achieved for all individuals, especially women and children | 3.1 | National Dietary Energy Supply (DES) from Cereals (%) | 69% (2010) | Recommended 60% | HIES |
| | | | 3.2 | Chronic Energy Deficiency (CED) prevalence among women (BMI <18.5%) | 32% (2005) | 20% by 2015 | BBS/HKI |
| | | | 3.3 | Prevalence of iodine deficiency among women (goitre) | 11.7% (2004-05) | < 5% | BBS/UNICEF |
| | | | 3.4 | Proportion of children receiving minimum acceptable diet at 6-23 months of age | 42% (2007) | 56% by 2016 (HPNSDP) | BDHS and HKI/BBS |
| | | | 3.5 | Prevalence of iron deficiency anaemia during pregnancy | 46% (2004) | <20% (WHO/UNICEF threshold) | Various surveys |

7.5 The following table spells out each of the 12 expected programme outcomes/impacts. Most programme indicators and baselines have been extracted from the NFP PoA. Annex 1 provides more details on the results framework and the monitoring system is explained in Chapter 12.

| COMPONENTS | EXPECTED OUTCOME/ IMPACT STATEMENTS | No | PROGRAMME EXPECTED AGGREGATE OUTPUTS |
|--------------------------|--|-----------|--|
| Food Availability | Adequate and stable supply of safe and nutritious food achieved at national level | 1 | Productivity is enhanced, food production is diversified and resilience to climate change is increased through effective generation and propagation of sustainable technical solutions |
| | | 2 | Sustainable and efficient water management is ensured for responding to farmer needs |
| | | 3 | Access to quality is improved and soil fertility is enhanced |
| | | 4 | Sustainable increase of fishery production through improved technology and natural resources management |
| | | 5 | Sustainable increase of livestock production is developed through improved technology, better animal health and resilient management practices |
| Food Access | Increased purchasing power and access to food by the people | 6 | Value chains are developed contributing to better access to food and increased rural incomes. |
| | | 7 | National capacities to design, implement and monitor NFP PoA and CIP investment operations are strengthened |
| | | 8 | Enhanced efficiency and effectiveness of Public Food Management Systems |
| | | 9 | Effectiveness and targeting of social safety net programmes are improved through strengthened institutional capacities to design and implement them |
| Food Utilization | Adequate nutrition achieved for all individuals, especially women and children | 10 | Nutrition and health are improved at community level through integrated short term and long term interventions |
| | | 11 | Planning and implementation of food security policies and interventions are based on improved knowledge |
| | | 12 | National food safety control management and food borne illness surveillance services are strengthened |

8. CIP PROGRAMMES

This Chapter highlights the main features of the 12 CIP programmes: (i) their expected outputs; (ii) the challenges and priorities arising from consultations; (iii) some remaining implementation challenges. Programmes 1 to 5 contribute to the food availability component. Programmes 6 to 9 contribute to the food access component. Programmes 10 to 12 contribute to the food utilization component.

Programme 1: Sustainable and Diversified Agriculture through Integrated Research and Extension

Expected Aggregate Output: *Productivity is enhanced, food production is diversified and resilience to climate change is increased through effective generation and propagation of sustainable technological innovation/solution.*

Priorities from the Consultation Process/ Current Challenges: Many key stakeholders, including those from the National Agricultural Research System institutes, extension agencies and farmers themselves, have named technology generation and adoption for strengthened, diversified agricultural production as key priorities. Key DPs such as DANIDA highlighted the importance of extension services as the main driver of agricultural development. Further, there was a strong consensus throughout the consultation process that effective strategies for climate change adaptation and mitigation are a priority. As such, there is a need to develop more adapted crop varieties that will contribute to strengthened and diversified sustainable agricultural production. Support will be required to strengthen physical and human capacities of the key players in research and extension to ensure effective interventions in this programme area and eventually improve, in a sustainable way, the productivity of the ecosystems.

Proposed Focus and Priority Interventions (Sub-outputs):

- 1. Enhance research & knowledge generation and adoption to increase agricultural productivity and diversity in a sustainable manner:*** Research & technology development in support of increased productivity in varied ecosystems is required in the following areas: (i) for crops, varieties development (short maturing Aus and Aman rice, new HYVs, biotechnology) build on respective experiences of private and public sectors; management practices (fertilizer, cropping patterns, cultural practices for char land, hill and coastal areas); and water and soil conservation; (ii) for livestock, disease control (trans-boundary zoonotic diseases), poultry & dairy development and value added activities; (iii) for fisheries, inland aquaculture development (breeding, feeding, case culture, disease, etc) and coastal aquaculture and marine fishery (shrimp and brackish water species). As mentioned above, there is a need for strengthened human, physical and institutional capacities of key research players, including NARS institutes and universities. The development of human resource capacities through strengthening the quality of the education system at various levels (from secondary schools to university) is a priority. Although strengthening the overall agriculture education system is beyond the CIP, it is required to invest in particular curriculum and capacity development activities with focus on food and nutrition security.
- 2. Improve extension services to propagate knowledge & practices, supported by community-based experimentation & learning and indigenous knowledge:*** Interventions should be based on existing programmes (such as the National Agricultural Technology Project) and aim to put in practice the agricultural extension policy. They are required in the areas of technology adoption & community-based learning (farmers skill training, soil health improvement,

diversification of agriculture, cultivation of quick growing fruits and vegetables, cropping patterns, farm mechanization) and promotion of sustainable agriculture (including implementation of the Southern delta master plan). In order for interventions to be successful, human and infrastructure capacities of relevant extension service delivery organizations, including DAE, DLS and DOF, require strengthening.

3. *Promote the development of responses to adapt agricultural systems to climate change:*

There is a strong demand for strengthened regional research capacities that can generate climate resilient farming practices. High priority was given to research on: development of salt and drought tolerant plant varieties; new insects and diseases due to climate change; the development of new flexible HYVs; adaptation (of crops, fisheries and livestock) to climate change; and adaptation trials in the vulnerable climatic regions. Given the increased scarcity and degradation of natural resources, these responses should pay particular attention to be environmental sound. Further strategies for adaptation include: development of a master plan for accelerating the development and dissemination of climate resilient technology for unfavourable eco-systems; support to agro-climatic and ecological data bases; and the management of dry, wet and char land and biodiversity.

Additional Considerations/ Implementation: Inter-agency collaboration is essential for effective implementation of this programme. In addition to interventions from the public sector agencies, the continued involvement of NGOs, community based organizations and the private sector is critical. The Farmer Field School (FFS) model, a vehicle for knowledge and skill generation that has a proven track record of farmer empowerment in Bangladesh, is an innovative approach to be employed under this programme. This participatory approach is farmer-centred and geared towards problem solving. Further, with an adapted curriculum, addressing specific climate change-related knowledge and skills development, the FFS can be used to help farmers adapt and develop more climate resilient farming.

Programme 2: Improved Water Resource Management and Infrastructure for Irrigation Purposes

Expected Aggregate Output: *Sustainable and efficient water management is ensured for responding to farmer needs*

Priorities from the Consultation Process/ Current Challenges: There are many current challenges to water management in Bangladesh, including declining aquifer levels, arsenic contamination, silting and increased salinity in coastal areas. Stakeholders across the board prioritized the need to: increase surface water irrigation and reduce ground water depletion; enhance on-farm water use efficiency through capacity development of water users; and rehabilitate infrastructure. Considering all these challenges and the urgency to boost food production, augmentation of surface water and improvement of the distribution system is critical.

Proposed Focus and Priority Interventions (Sub-outputs):

1. *Improve water resource management in water distribution systems and at farm level:*

Suggested investment areas are assessment of availability of irrigation water and improvement of the water distribution system. This should include capacity strengthening at both the grass roots and system-wide levels in order to reduce irrigation costs by developing more efficient water saving technologies and promoting a more cost effective distribution system. The promotion of the alternate-wetting and drying technology should also be developed.

2. ***Improve & increase efficiency of surface water irrigation, in particular in the South:*** There is a strong call for nationwide conservation and utilization of surface water by excavation/dredging of canals and river/water bodies with special attention to surface water management in the South. There is also a call for improvement of drainage conditions, capacity development of water users, and improvement of flood control measures.
3. ***Reduce impact of saline water intrusion in the South and enhance river water flow:*** The focused activities that emerged from the consultations are: rehabilitation of polders and their management; dredging of rivers; enhanced surface water irrigation; and improved brackish water resource management practices.

Additional Considerations/ Implementation: Collaboration between the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Water Resources is essential, with DAE, BWDB, LGED and BMDA as the participating institutes. Involvement of farmer organizations and stakeholders from the private sector on farm level water management will also be key. Additionally, updated feasibility studies are required to assess the various technical options related to surface irrigation, river dredging and flood control. This should be accompanied by a solid economic and financial analysis to avoid un-economic investments. Attention must also be given to planning irrigation development in an integrated way at national level.

Programme 3: Improved Quality of Inputs and Soil Fertility

Expected Aggregate Output: *Access to quality inputs is improved and soil fertility is enhanced*

Priorities from the Consultation Process/ Current Challenges: A top priority that arose from the consultations is to ensure a stable supply of good quality, environmentally friendly agricultural inputs. This was a unanimous high priority of all groups of stakeholders consulted. There is a strong need for quality control, certification and accountability of inputs and providers as well as a strengthened regulatory system. Current challenges are inadequate capacity, of DAE, BADC, Seed Certification Agency (SCA), DLS, DOF, BCIC, Bangladesh Standards and Testing Institute, as well as the private sector, to meet the growing demand for quality inputs. Inadequate laboratory facilities for quality testing and monitoring, as well as a weak regulatory system to prevent input adulteration, are also key concerns.

The question of inputs links directly to another issue that arose— soil fertility and land management. These important environmental questions are key to ensuring the sustainability of agricultural production in Bangladesh. Declining soil fertility in Bangladesh is resulting in micro nutrient deficiency in the soil. There is a strong need to promote balanced fertilizer use for different crops and cropping patterns over diversified agro-ecological regions of the country.

Proposed Focus and Priority Interventions (Sub-outputs):

1. ***Enhance availability of agricultural inputs, tested and certified for quality, of diversified crops:*** The proposed priority interventions are: expansion of both seed multiplication and processing farms and preservation facilities of BADC, NARS, DAE, DLS and contract growers; capacity development of public laboratories and SCA for testing quality of inputs; strengthening participation of NGOs and private sector in seed distribution as the role of private sector in the provision of quality seeds and other inputs has increased over past years; capacity development of farmers for autonomous production of quality seeds; and establishment of mechanisms to ensure availability and reasonable prices of all quality and environmentally friendly agricultural inputs (i.e. seeds, planting materials, fertilizers, pest management, feeds, chicks, fingerlings, semen, broods, and veterinary drugs and vaccines).

2. ***Develop public private partnerships through capacity development:*** Public private partnerships are needed in order to strengthen capacities for the production of agricultural inputs (seed/feed processing, poultry and fishery hatcheries), laboratories and the establishment of marketing networks in the country.
3. ***Improve and increase sustainability of soil fertility management:*** Restoring soil fertility is an important issue for the Bangladesh government. The proposed interventions are to promote fertilizer use efficiency and balanced use of fertilizer. The main purpose is to strengthen environmentally sound fertility management practices. This will be done through facilitating application of fertilizers on the basis of soil tests, as well as strengthening of soil testing laboratories and promotion of improved soil health management practices. Additionally, awareness of Upazilla Nirdehika (land and soil use guide) for location specific prescription of fertilizers by the grass root level extension workers should be strengthened.
4. ***Facilitate access to credit and other financial services by smallholders and the rural poor:*** There is a strong call for collateral-free bank loans/credit at low interest rates for crops, livestock and fishery production for smallholders and the rural poor. The need to create specialized financial institutions for these sectors was also iterated.

Additional Considerations/ Implementation: Implementation of this programme should involve a variety of partners. From the Government side, DAE, BADC, Soil Research Development Institute, BCIC, SCA, DLS and DOF should participate. The involvement of farmer organizations and the private sector is also key. Implementation of this programme will be strengthened by a supportive policy environment that would enable public-private partnerships and enhance participation of private sector entrepreneurs in providing quality input services. Finally, it is important that all interventions under this programme keep in mind the relationship between agricultural inputs and our environment. Activities should contribute to **sustainable** agricultural practices through the use of **environmentally friendly inputs**.

Programme 4: Fisheries & Aquaculture Development

Expected Aggregate Output: Sustainable increase of fishery production through improved technology and natural resources management

Priorities from the Consultation Process/ Current Challenges: The development of fisheries and aquaculture provides an opportunity to strengthen production of nutritious, protein-rich food in Bangladesh. The strong call for development of this sector came from government agencies, civil society organizations, the private sector and farmers, due to its important role in employment generation, poverty reduction and food and nutrition security. Current challenges of the sector include constraints related to leasing and management of public water bodies, species degradation, diseases, low quality of brood, fingerlings and feeds, inadequate laboratory facilities of DOF at field level for diseases diagnosis, and lack of storage and processing facilities of fisheries.

Proposed Focus and Priority Interventions (Sub-outputs):

1. ***Develop small-scale aquaculture, through access to quality inputs, advice and skills:*** Proposed prioritized interventions are: promotion of small scale good aquaculture practices with quality feeds, fingerlings and drugs and the enhancement of disease diagnosis facilities in the field offices of Department of Fisheries. Backyard ponds for small-scale aquaculture should be developed by addressing the constraints faced by smallholders.

2. ***Improve management of fisheries resources:*** Priority interventions are: community based management of open water fisheries through training and access to credit; excavation of water bodies for fish breeding; and the establishment of local hatcheries to ensure the supply of quality broodstock/fingerlings.
3. ***Develop public private partnerships in support of infrastructure and services development:*** Development of partnerships is proposed to promote the establishment of hatcheries, feed and fish processing industries with backward and forward linkages; the establishment of cold storage and cold chains; and production of quality fingerling, feed and drugs.
4. ***Promote production in the South through sustainable shrimp and prawn development and community-based co-management of wetlands:*** Proposed interventions are: marine and brackish water fisheries resources management and capacity development; zoning of land for shrimp production; development of fish breeding grounds in the brackish water system; diversification of coastal aquaculture (crab, mussels, sea weeds, shrimp, tilapia etc.) and promotion of technology for integrated use of embankment areas for fish production.

Additional Considerations/ Implementation: Collaboration between the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock and Ministry of Water Resource is essential. DOF, Bangladesh Fisheries Development Corporation, Bangladesh Fisheries Research Institute, Universities and the private sector should also participate in the proposed interventions. It will be important to involve community based organizations of farmers and fishers as well as the private sector. An enabling policy environment will be needed for promotion of public-private partnerships and enhanced participation of private sector entrepreneurs. In particular, the sustainability of lease arrangements has to be improved to enable effective Community based management of open water fisheries.

Programme 5: Livestock Development, with a Focus on Poultry and Dairy Production

Expected Aggregate Output: Sustainable increase of livestock production is developed through improved technology, better animal health and resilient management practices

Priorities from the Consultation Process/ Current Challenges: Livestock development is an emerging priority that arose from various consultations. The strong call for development of this sector came from government agencies, CSOs, private sector and farmers recognizing the contribution of this sector to income generation and food and nutrition security. The current challenges of the sector include: a weak delivery system for veterinary health services; disease control, surveillance and monitoring; low quality of feeds, drugs, vaccines and AI; and poor husbandry practices. It is important to establish laboratory facilities of DLS at field level to diagnose diseases and to train farmers on community based livestock husbandry practices and product marketing.

Proposed Focus and Priority Interventions (Sub-outputs):

1. ***Strengthen animal health services, including better diagnosis and surveillance systems to mitigate disease outbreaks:*** Proposed priority interventions are strengthening animal health services through capacity development of DLS; establishing veterinary disease diagnostic and feed analysis laboratories in DLS field offices; strengthening AI services of DLS, including development of infrastructure; and strengthening of disease surveillance system of DLS.
2. ***Strengthen husbandry capacity at household level through community based improved knowledge and advisory services:*** Priority interventions are training for farmers on rearing of

poultry and farm animals; improvement of indigenous chicken; promotion of fodder production through integrated farming; and promotion of milk production, processing and marketing through cooperatives.

3. ***Improve availability and quality of inputs through public private partnerships:*** There was a strong call from the various consultations to promote public-private partnerships in order to strengthen input services (vaccines, drugs, and health services). Public support should be given through capacity strengthening of private input suppliers in the areas of production, handling and quality assurance.
4. ***Research on livestock development, including genetic improvement:*** Priority was given for research on the genetic improvement of sheep, poultry, goat, cattle and buffalo.

Additional Considerations/ Implementation: Collaboration between the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock is essential. DLS, Bangladesh Livestock Research Institute, Universities and the private sector should also participate in the proposed interventions. It will also be important to involve community-based organizations of farmers. An enabling policy environment will be needed for the promotion of public-private partnerships and enhanced participation of private sector entrepreneurs. Lessons could be drawn upon the experiences of IFAD-financed projects which have developed, amongst others, value chains for back-yard poultry and dairy production.

Programme 6: Improved Access to Markets, Value-Addition in Agriculture, and to Non Farm Incomes

Expected Aggregate Output: *Value chains are developed contributing to better access to food and increased rural incomes*

Priorities from the Consultation Process/ Current Challenges: Government agencies, civil society organizations and farmers iterated a strong call for improved access to markets, value addition activities, and increased non-farm incomes. Current challenges include inadequate market access for smallholder farmers, lack of market information and price signals, inadequate transportation and storage facilities and presence of trade syndicates in the markets. The organization of smallholder farmers into formal community based organizations provides a good opportunity to promote group marketing, improve roads and market infrastructure.

Proposed Focus and Priority Interventions (Sub-outputs):

1. ***Improve physical access to markets, facilities and information:*** Prioritized interventions are: construction of link and feeder roads to improve connection to local markets; strengthening of market information systems; development of market infrastructure for fish landing sites; establishment of modern slaughter houses and live poultry marketing facilities; and monitoring of markets and agricultural product prices. There is a need to update the institutional and governance arrangements for rural markets to provide incentives for market management to invest in market facilities and improve services for market users.
2. ***Mobilize and promote producer & marketing groups for improved market access and knowledge:*** The development and strengthening of farmers' cooperatives is an effective intervention that will allow for group marketing and development of supply chains.
3. ***Develop adequate storage, processing & value addition and reduce waste through public-private partnerships:*** Proposed priority interventions are development of storage facilities at rural level by Government organizations and the private sector; skill development of farmers, especially women

farmers, for value addition, product handling, packaging, preservation and storage; strengthening of cooling chains; provision of credit to farmers for investments in processing and value addition activities.

4. ***Promote and assist the development of off farm activities and rural businesses:*** Proposed interventions are business, technical and managerial advance and planning for non-form activities, specifically through the mentoring of rural entrepreneurs.

Additional Considerations/ Implementation: Collaboration between the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock and the Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives is essential. DAE, DLS, DOF, Directorate of Agricultural Marketing and LGED, NGOs, CSO and private sector should also participate in the proposed interventions. An enabling policy environment will be needed for promotion of public-private partnerships in processing and value addition activities and enhanced participation of private sector entrepreneurs.

Programme 7: Strengthened Capacities for Implementation and Monitoring of National Food Policy and CIP Actions

Expected Aggregate Output: National capacities to design, implement and monitor NFP PoA and CIP investment operations are strengthened.

Priorities from the Consultation Process/ Current Challenges: The ability to design and implement effective policies, and to coordinate their implementation in order to strengthen food and nutrition security is a permanent challenge. The design of investment operations should increasingly be formulated with strong involvement of national stakeholders in order to increase national ownership. Both the Government and its DPs consider that insufficient organizational and human capacities are a major impediment to the design and effective implementation of investment operations in the field of agriculture, food and nutrition security. DPs and many national stakeholders highlight the lack of implementation capacity as a major constraint to effective ground actions and absorptive capacity.

Proposed Focus and Priority Interventions (Sub-outputs):

1. ***Strengthen capacities to implement, monitor and coordinate National Food Policy-Plan of Action and CIP.*** The purpose is to build on the on-going NFP-CSP to further enhance the Government capacity in overall policy development and monitoring in the field of food security, as well as to monitor the overall implementation (resource mobilization and use) of the CIP and its results;
2. ***Strengthen national capacities for design, implementation & monitoring of CIP operations*** This should include the development of national capacities in managing the investment cycle (planning, design, implementation, management and monitoring and evaluation). DPs should agree that some operations that they finance be used for on-the-job capacity development. Capacity strengthening should be through the mobilization of national and external expertise.
3. ***Strengthen capacities of civil society organizations to contribute to CIP development & implementation.*** The purpose would be to both strengthen the institutional capacities for better involvement of the CSOs in the policy dialogue and overall CIP updating process as well as for their more effective participation in the CIP investment operations at community level.

Additional Considerations/ Implementation: Those operations both financed by the budget and DPs should benefit from the increasing national capacities in terms of suitability to local

conditions, stakeholder needs as well as of national ownership. DPs will have to agree to adapt the pace and some of the procedures of the operations that they finance in order to allow strengthened national ownership and capacities.

Programme 8: Enhanced Public Food Management Systems

Expected Aggregate Output: *Enhanced efficiency and effectiveness of Public Food Management Systems*

Priorities from the Consultation Process/ Current Challenges: The Public Food Management System (namely management of public food stocks, food procurement, movement and distribution, and development and technological services) serves a key role in ensuring food security in Bangladesh, especially during times of shocks and crisis. Proper management mechanisms that ensure reduction of cost and leakage, increase capacity to respond, maintain quality and increase the effectiveness of distribution systems are key to taking full advantage of the Public Food Distribution System (PFDS) and reducing the vulnerability of Bangladesh to shocks. These shocks come in many forms—from climate change and natural disasters to food price volatility and the financial crisis.

Proposed Focus and Priority Interventions (Sub-outputs):

1. ***Enhance efficiency and effectiveness of Public Food Management Systems and improve its impact on price stabilization:*** Proposed interventions to strengthen the systems are the digitization of the PFDS including public food stock/storage monitoring system down to field level to improve efficiency and management as well as reduce losses in food stocks; and enhanced quality control, through strengthening inspection and testing services and establishment of labs down to the district level.
2. ***Build capacities of Ministry of Food and Disaster Management and Directorate of Food to better manage the food system:*** Interventions should expand capacity building/strengthening to handle public food distribution systems. This includes staff training in all spheres of public food management and effective responses to emergencies and improving supervisory and monitoring activities through logistics support. Sustained capacity development is also prioritized through the establishment of a Centre for Food Management Training and Operational research.
3. ***Increase and modernize public storage and handling facilities, including in disaster prone areas:*** Priority interventions are building of modern storage facilities that are better equipped to adapt to the climate change impacts and resist disaster shocks, repair and rehabilitation of existing warehouses and improving ambient environment of stocks to maintain quality and increase shelf life. These interventions are aimed towards speeding up strategic response capacity, reducing cost and storage loss, maintaining food quality and safety and adapting to the climatic impacts.

Additional Considerations/ Implementation: Interventions should also be taken to articulate or streamline the food movement and procurement policies/guidelines; to devise efficient mechanism/computerized tools for optimizing procurement and movement planning; to develop tools for tracking stocks in transit; to develop/update storage guidelines/manual; to develop inspection, testing and laboratory guidelines/manual; and to articulate operational and maintenance guidelines/manual for technical installations. These actions will help improve the management/governance and service delivery under PFDS. In addition, there is scope for

exploring **public-private partnerships** under this programme. Careful attention must be paid to take full advantage of the potential for synergies and collaboration. An enabling policy environment will be needed here.

Programme 9: Institutional Development and Capacity Development for More Effective Safety Nets

Expected Aggregate Output: *Effectiveness and targeting of social safety net programmes are improved through strengthened institutional capacities to design and implement them*

Priorities from the Consultation Process/ Current Challenges: Bangladesh spends the equivalent of about US\$ 2.3 billion per year on social safety nets (SSN). This represents 2.4% of its GDP and is almost entirely financed from budget sources, accounting for 15% of its total annual revenue budget. SSNs are operated by 13 different ministries and some NGOs covering various target groups. An important priority is to reduce mistargeting. Also, the multiplicity and lack of coordination of programmes leads to inefficiencies and less than optimal use of resources and needs to be addressed. Finally, the weak capacities, in particular at decentralized levels, should be strengthened to improve the delivery of these programmes.

Proposed focus and priority interventions (Sub-outputs):

- 1. Strengthen institutional capacities to effectively operate social safety net programmes and formulate a new integrated strategy for social safety net programmes to: (i) coordinate and streamline them; (ii) enhance impact and targeting; (iii) improve governance. This would require to review:*** (a) the size and nature of the actual transfer; (b) the appropriateness and efficiency of the transfer modality - whether cash or food based transfers are more appropriate; (c) how or if transfers can be adjusted to capture the effects of inflation; (d) the skills and support (capacity) of the various ministries responsible for implementing the programmes; (e) the capacity of NGO partners retained to assist with the implementation of the programmes, (f) how the programmes are monitored, evaluated and reported. Capacities should be strengthened to develop a multi-year strategy to improve the targeting performance of SSNs, streamline and coordinate these safety net programmes. Attempts should also be undertaken to improve synergies between safety net programmes (food or cash for work) with productive infrastructure such as irrigation, rural transport and markets. This review and strategic work could be undertaken in collaboration with international partners such as WFP, DFID or others. Targeting effectiveness needs to be improved to ensure that the benefits of the programmes reach the poorest and the food insecure, especially pregnant women and children under 2 years of age.
- 2. Investment in employment and income generation of social safety nets (including in ADP).*** Interventions should build on existing innovative SSNs in order to develop their scopes.

Additional Considerations/ Implementation: Interventions should involve partnerships with NGOs who are heavily involved in safety nets. They also require strong collaboration between various stakeholders involved. Interventions would also focus on other pertinent issues related to SSNs, like scaling up of effective programmes, sustainability of programme benefits, and monitoring and evaluation of programmes to ensure effective targeting. Cost effectiveness of means-tested versus geographic targeting for different population segments or geographical locations will be defined through research and simulation

Programme 10: Community Based Nutrition Programmes and Services

Expected Aggregate Output: *Community nutrition improvement is supported by strengthened National Nutrition Services (NNS)*

Priorities from the Consultation Process/ Current Challenges: Key stakeholders, particularly those with the deepest knowledge of field-level concerns affecting the food security of Bangladeshi families—women farmers, iterated a clear call for support in the fight against malnutrition. A variety of programmatic means were suggested, but the deep need for support in this area is clear and constant. Current nutrition programmes focus predominantly on service delivery rather than on more sustainable interventions, which would use a community mobilization approach. There is also poor multi-sector collaboration when it comes to nutrition programmes, and thus a clear need to strengthen coordination between partners.

Proposed Focus and Priority Interventions (Sub-outputs):

- 1. Community based nutrition programmes, linking to the National Nutrition Services (NNS):*** The National Nutrition Services deliver a package of basic health and nutrition activities including micronutrient supplementation, counselling and behavioural change and ante-natal care. Under this programme, these activities should be strengthened, and delivery should be linked to community-based mechanisms. This link will mobilize households and women to take responsibility for the health and nutrition improvement of their families and communities. A livelihood approach will be applied, through which the various dimensions of nutrition insecurity and means of livelihood of communities and households will be addressed in a comprehensive way.
- 2. Support community based efforts of homestead gardening, rearing small livestock, aquaculture and awareness building for improved nutrition:*** This activity complements the national nutrition programme of Bangladesh. Home gardening, poultry raising and other community level nutrition-based agricultural activities should be revived under this activity and complemented by integrated horticultural development, fish ponds, behaviour change communications (BCC) or any other activities on demand.
- 3. Link long term with immediate treatment of acute malnutrition, in particular through therapeutic and supplementary feeding:*** This activity aims to strengthen coordination of long and short-term approaches to nutrition. Agricultural and food based activities should be linked with health-based nutrition capacity building interventions. There should be a focus on BCC strategies for maternal, infant and young child nutrition, as well as micronutrient supplementation and fortification. Long-term actions should be complemented by immediate treatment of acute malnutrition through therapeutic and supplementary feeding to ensure rapid nutrition rehabilitation.

Additional Considerations/ Implementation: Collaboration between the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, the Ministry of Agriculture (in particular the DAE), the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock and the Ministry of Food and Disaster Management is essential. Further, it is key to ensure continued involvement of NGOs, moving from short term contracting relationships to longer-term partnerships. The programme should seek synergies with other mechanisms such as REACH, MDG-F and project Laser Beam, for which Bangladesh has been selected as a pilot country. Concerted efforts should also be made to ensure alignment of priority actions with the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) framework linked to the first 1,000 days of life.

Programme 11: Orient Food and Nutrition Program Through Data

Expected Aggregate Output: *Effective information supports planning, monitoring and evaluation of food security policies and interventions*

Priorities from the Consultation Process/ Current Challenges: As mentioned in Programme 10, throughout the consultation process nutrition has emerged as a key priority for Bangladesh, especially with reference to maternal and young children's nutrition improvement. In order to strengthen nutrition interventions and orient nutrition policies, key food and nutrition information is required. There is currently a lack of available, up-to-date nutrition-related data. The national nutrition survey was conducted every 10 years since the early 1960s, but the last available data is from 1995/1996.

Proposed Focus and Priority Interventions (Sub-outputs):

- 1. Undertake comprehensive national nutrition and food consumption survey & update food composition tables:*** An updated and comprehensive food consumption survey is essential to inform programme implementers on actual food and nutrient intakes, track dietary changes, identify nutritional gaps and set food production and consumption targets based on nutrition improvement goals and indicators. There is need to create demand for healthier food supply. This will help guide food policies towards supplies of diverse and healthier foods, including food imports. It will also inform a number of the CIP programmes on food availability, access and utilization. Similarly, in the context of the recent introduction of high yielding crop and non crop varieties (HYVs), an update of food composition tables (FCT) will be key to orient research, extension and production of improved seeds. An updated FCT is required for setting food and nutrition standards specific to Bangladesh, as well as recommended dietary allowances for all nutrients and bioactive compounds essential for good health.
- 2. Undertake study of dietary diversification and supplementation needs and develop advocacy, awareness and educational materials to facilitate behavioral change in eating habits and practices:*** This activity will be key in establishing associations between dietary diversity and nutrient adequacy and between dietary diversity and household food security and strengthening the evidence base of nutrition interventions especially for the vulnerable groups in Bangladesh.
- 3. Strengthen national capacities in surveying and analysis to facilitate evidence based decisions:*** Key organizations involved in strengthening nutrition in Bangladesh – the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and the Institute of Nutrition and Food Science (INFS), Dhaka University– have qualified personnel and good laboratories, however, human and physical capacities still require strengthening. In addition, support in order to undertake field surveys is needed.

Additional Considerations/ Implementation. Within the Government system, the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare is in charge of nutrition interventions, but collaborating with other ministries, namely the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Food and Disaster Management and the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock, is critical for coordinated work under this programme.

Programme 12: Food Safety and Quality Improvement

Expected Aggregate Output: *National food safety control management and food borne illness surveillance services are strengthened*

Priorities from the consultation process/ Current challenges. Food safety represents an important cornerstone of both nutrition and public health. There are several challenges in the sector, including a lack of strong policy support. For example, the Bangladesh Pure Food (Amendment) Act, Rules and Regulations are mostly outdated and do not focus on the key food safety issues and risks. Additionally, the absence of well-equipped and well-resourced sanitary inspectors and a National Food Analysis Laboratory are critical deficiencies. Further, the absence of effective information, education and communication materials on food safety and food hygiene is a major shortcoming.

Proposed Focus and Priority Interventions (Sub-outputs):

1. ***Improve surveillance system of food borne illnesses:*** The establishment and expansion of sentinel/pilot sites for surveillance of food borne illnesses is a key intervention. It will deepen understanding of the extent of the disease burden, its health and nutritional implications, and the development of evidence-based interventions.
2. ***Develop and enhance capacities of laboratories and systems for food quality assurance and safety and control of food:*** As mentioned above, there is a need to provide technical and administrative support to the establishment of a well-equipped and resourced National Food Analysis Laboratory. Further, there is a need to support Sanitary Inspectors with analytical data to ensure the enforcement of laws and improvements in food control.
3. ***Support the development of a modern food control management system:*** Interventions here should include the development of modern food laws and regulations, and the creation of an effective food inspectorate with properly trained, supervised and supported Sanitary Inspectors.

Additional Considerations/ Implementation: There are many opportunities and a great need for collaboration among partners to ensure successful implementation of this programme. Firstly, collaboration between the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and the Food Division of the Ministry of Food and Disaster Management is key. Additionally, the Bangladesh Shrimp and Fish Foundation provides an example of effective collaboration between public and private partners to ensure food safety. It could be looked to for best practices and further collaboration. Further, FAO is currently implementing a project – Improving Food Safety, Quality and Food Control in Bangladesh, which strengthens regulatory and diagnostic capacities on food safety and quality assurance. There is a potential for collaboration here as well. Finally, the National Food Safety Advisory Council was recently reconvened to oversee food safety, however its mandate and authority need to be further developed and enhanced.

The following Table summarize the main features and responsible Government agencies of the 12 CIP programmes.

| No | Component | Programme Title | Proposed Focus and Priority Interventions | Main Institutions Involved |
|----|-------------------|---|---|--|
| 1 | Food Availability | Sustainable and diversified agriculture through integrated research and extension | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance research & knowledge generation and adoption to increase agricultural productivity and diversity in a sustainable manner Improve extension services to propagate knowledge & practices, supported by community-based experimentation & learning and indigenous knowledge Promote the development of responses to adapt agricultural systems to climate change | NARS institutes, Universities, Privates, DAE, DLS, DOF, FD, LGED, AIS, Mass Media, DMB, DRR, DOE, BADC, ECGIS, IWM, BMDA |
| 2 | | Improved Water Management and Infrastructure for Irrigation Purposes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Improve water management in water distribution systems and at farm level Improve & increase efficiency of surface water irrigation, in particular in the south Reduce impact of saline water intrusion in the South Enhance river water flow to the South | BADC, DAE, BWDB, LGED, BMDA |
| 3 | | Improved quality of input and soil fertility | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance availability of agricultural inputs, tested and certified for quality of diversified crops Develop public private partnerships through capacity development Improve and increase sustainability of soil fertility management Facilitate access to credit and other financial services by smallholders and the rural poor | BADC, BCIC, SCA, DAE, DLS, DOF and Private sector |
| 4 | | Fisheries & Aquaculture Development | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Develop small scale aquaculture, through access to quality inputs, advice and skills Improve management of fisheries resources Develop public private partnerships in support of infrastructure and services development Promote production in the South through sustainable shrimp and prawn devt and community based co management of wetlands. | DOF, BFDC, BFRI, Universities and private sector MoLGRD&C/LGED |
| 5 | | Livestock Development, with a focus on poultry and dairy production | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen animal health services, including better diagnosis and surveillance systems to mitigate disease outbreaks Strengthen husbandry capacity at household level through community based improved knowledge and advisory services Improve availability and quality of inputs through public private partnerships Research on livestock development, including genetic improvement | DLS, BLRI, Universities and private sector |
| 6 | Food Access | Improved access to markets, value-addition in agriculture, and to non farm incomes | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Improve physical access to markets, facilities and information Mobilize and promote producer & marketing groups for improved market access and knowledge Develop adequate storage, processing & value addition and reduce waste through public-private partnerships Promote and assist the development of off farm activities and rural businesses | DAM, DAE, DLS, DOF, AIS, BFDC, BSTI and private sector |
| 7 | | Strengthened capacities for implementation and monitoring of NFP and CIP actions | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen capacities to implement, monitor and coordinate National Food Policy-Plan of Action and CIP; Strengthen national capacities for design, implementation & monitoring of CIP operations Strengthen capacities of civil society organizations to contribute to CIP development & implementation | FPMU, Food Division NARS institutes, and Universities |
| 8 | | Enhanced Public Food Management Systems | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance efficiency and effectiveness of Public Food Management Systems and improve its impact on price stabilization Build capacities of Ministry of Food and Disaster Management and Directorate of Food to better manage the food system Increase and modernize public storage and handling facilities, including in disaster prone areas. | Food Directorate, BARC |
| 9 | | Institutional Development and Capacity Development for more effective safety nets. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen institutional capacities to effectively operate social safety net programmes and formulate a new integrated strategy for social safety net programmes to: (i) coordinate and streamline them; (ii) enhance impact and targeting; (iii) improve governance Investment in employment and income generation of social safety nets (including in ADP). | Disaster Management and Relief Division, Dept. of Women Affairs, DMB, MSW |
| 10 | Food Utilization | Community based nutrition programmes and services | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Community based nutrition programmes, building on and linking to the National Nutrition Services (NNS) Support community based efforts of homestead gardening, rearing small livestock, aquaculture and awareness building for improved nutrition Link long term strategies with immediate treatment of acute malnutrition, in particular through therapeutic & supplementary feeding | DGHS, DAE, DOF, DLS, BARI, BINA, Universities, BANHRDB, BNNC |
| 11 | | Orient food and nutrition program through data | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake updated & comprehensive national survey of food consumption & food composition Undertake study of dietary diversification and supplementation needs and develop advocacy, awareness and educational materials to facilitate behavioural change in eating habits and practices Strengthen national capacities in surveying and analysis to facilitate evidence based decisions | Food Division, BBS, DAE, DLS, DOF, DGHS, BANHRDB, BARC, BARI, BRRI, BNNC, INFS, BAU |
| 12 | | Food Safety and Quality Improvement | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Improve surveillance system of food borne illnesses Develop and enhance capacities of laboratories and systems for food quality assurance and safety and control of food | Food Division, BSTI, DGHS, private sector, BCSIR, AEC |

9. POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

9.1. The policy framework in which the CIP is grounded is the **National Food Policy (NFP)**. It is based on a comprehensive approach to food security encompassing its three key dimensions: availability, access and utilization of food for balanced nutrition. The NFP integrates all relevant policies and strategies developed by the Government as outlined in paragraph 3.4 and as such represents the platform through which policy considerations relevant to the CIP should be considered.

9.2. The **Plan of Action** of the NFP (2008-2015) translates the provisions of the NFP into 26 areas of interventions and priority actions, providing a comprehensive framework for identifying investment and priorities for policy actions required to achieve food security. As such it provides a policy agenda, enabling the Government to undertake the right decisions, monitor progress toward the NFP objectives and highlight further policy changes to be undertaken. In this regard, the 2010 NFP PoA monitoring report provides a good analysis by the Government of the progress towards the implementation of policy actions in all areas of intervention, analyzes recent developments in these areas and formulates needs for further actions.

9.3 The combined provisions of the NFP and its PoA show that Bangladesh was an early adopter of the comprehensive approach to food security, a key principle for defining an effective programmatic framework for policy and investment decisions. This cohesion has to be preserved by **preventing fragmentation of the policy framework and dialogue for food and nutrition security**, while keeping it updated to the feedback provided by the results oriented monitoring of progress toward the policy and investment targets. A major requirement to fully implement the NFP is to further improve the institutional set up and to strengthen implementation capacities (which are both covered by the CIP), rather than multiplying policy and strategic documents with the high risk of duplication.

9.4 The consultation process with various stakeholders and a policy analysis exercise undertaken by IFPRI,¹ in the context of the CIP improvement, complement this on-going work by putting focus on some of these particularly important remaining **policy concerns that impact the effectiveness of the CIP**. These policy considerations are of three types: (i) those affecting the overall effectiveness of the CIP; (ii) those relevant to the private sector and its investment in food security; (iii) those in relation to more specific CIP interventions.

Overall policy considerations

9.5 Three general policy considerations were extensively discussed throughout the consultation process with various stakeholders:

¹ The many policy recommendations in the note of IFPRI on policy considerations in relation to the 12 CIP programmes have been incorporated in the following ways: (i) in developing guiding principles of the CIP (Chapter 6); (ii) in designing the CIP activities themselves (Chapter 8); in the institutional set up of CIP (Chapter 11) and this chapter on overall policy issues relevant to CIP achievements.

- **Access to and tenure of land and water resources.** Land tenure is perceived as a major constraint particularly for the food insecure who, for a large part, do not own the land that they work. They have insecure, prohibitive and unstable access to land through crop sharing arrangements, which reduce both the impact of potential CIP interventions on household food security (if production has to be shared) and the incentive for these smallholders to invest as a result of uncertain access to land. Further, surface water is leased to potential users with insufficient clarity and regulation, leading to a lack of incentive for sustainable use and investment in better practices. This is a widespread concern among the farming community, Government senior officials, NGOs and civil society;
- **Lack of access to credit and other financial resources** was often mentioned by the farming community, entrepreneurs and civil society as a major constraint for them to take advantage of CIP public investment to invest in productive assets. In their difficulties to access the banking system, they point out governance issues, complex procedures, insufficient regulatory and policy mechanisms for agro-processing; as well as excessive collateral requirements and interest rates. In addition, smallholders mention the inadequacy of most of the current microfinance activities to support their investment activities;
- The direct **subsidized distribution of fertilizers** is having some negative impacts which should be addressed, such as: (i) diversion of budget resources away from potential investments towards subsidies; (ii) distortion in the use of fertilizers (towards more subsidized ones) in contradiction with CIP programme 3 which aims to optimize the use of fertilizers; (iii) distraction of extension agents who spend large amounts of time monitoring the distribution process, at the expense of technical work. The possibility to convert into cash subsidies should be explored.

Private Sector Investment in agriculture

9.6 Private sector representatives took part in the consultation process and confirmed the immense scope for private investment in the food security sector, provided an enabling policy environment exists. Private sector is committed to partly fill some resource gap when investing in food security. Opportunities exist in agro-processing, in the milk and dairy industry, and in strengthening the quality of the input supply business, the production and maintenance of farm equipment. Deregulation has led to the expansion of the small irrigation pump industry, which enables more affordable investment by water users, who now benefit from more accessible equipment. The CIP should build on existing initiatives by innovative entrepreneurs who have invested in contract farming, or new marketing relationships with producers (e.g. milk collection systems). These initiatives are accompanied often by services to the farmers, such as provision of credit, price information and extension services. The private sector should be further consulted, e.g. through the MCCI and other representative bodies.

9.7 However, in order to expand the scope for private sector involvement, some policy elements must be more conducive. These include fiscal incentives or reduced interest rates to enable the development of infant and risky industries in the agricultural sector; a much stronger regulatory framework to allow the development of secured contractual arrangements between

actors along the food value chain; revision of the tariff system which is unfavourable for local production; the reduction of artificial support to state entities involved in business activities, which currently results in unfair competition and limits private investment.

9.8 The **role of the private vs. public sector** was indeed extensively debated throughout the consultation process. In addition to the detrimental and unfair competition by public agencies in some private sector activities, the roles of private vs. public were questioned in relation to governance and efficiency concerns. Some development partners question the direct involvement of Government agencies or institutions in productive, marketing or other activities that are perceived as more effectively handled by the private sector (e.g. seed multiplication, marketing of fertilizers, irrigation infrastructure). In contrast, a number of smallholders and NGOs highlight issues related to uncontrolled and dishonest behaviours of some private sector players that take advantage of farmers' weaknesses. Normative frameworks and, control and enforcement mechanisms should be strengthened, not as a constraint to private sector development, but as a way to reinforce the confidence of private agents in the predictability and reliability of market transactions.

More specific policy issues have been incorporated in the design of the CIP:

9.9 An enabling policy for **fostering education** both at a higher level (for research purposes) and a professional level (for extension workers) is required. The issue of "brain drain" should be addressed. In addition, new education curricula should be developed to ensure convergence of education programmes in health, nutrition and food. During the CIP forum of 20 March 2011, BAU, IFPRI and the MoFDM emphasized the need to improve the quality of the broad education system in Bangladesh.

9.10 Policies should enable **fair access to markets** by farmers and consumers, particularly for some commodities key to food and nutrition security (e.g. milk). These could include a **more favourable tariff system** for imported items that could be produced locally; interventions to avoid quasi monopolistic attitudes of some market players; the promotion of marketing groups or associations to empower smallholders' access to markets;

9.11 The need for a more effective and better governed **regulation and quality control of inputs**, so as to protect smallholders and enable them to invest in improved techniques and inputs;

9.12 A need to further clarify **trade-offs between various uses of food stocks** (safety net to food insecure people; price stabilisation and emergency stocks) so as to improve management of the PFDS, and better evaluate needs for additional and enhanced storage facilities;

9.13 The partial **enforcement** of some existing regulations and rules should be addressed through empowering and disseminating information to communities and grass-root actors;

10. COST AND FINANCING

10.1 Cost and financing requirements were estimated through three steps: (i) an estimate of available financing of CIP activities from on-going investment activities financed by the Government and development partners; (ii) additional investments required (total financing gap) based on needs to achieve the CIP results and outcomes described in Chapter 7. These needs were estimated through extensive joint work with all agencies involved; who worked out proposals for investment (usually called “projects”) based on their analysis of needs; (iii) a priority ranking exercise on the basis of the careful analysis of feedback from stakeholders that resulted in the identification of a priority financing gap. Detailed background data and calculations tables are provided in Annex 4.

10.2 Before beginning the exercise, a **clear definition** of investment included in the CIP was required. The CIP includes **public investment**, i.e. investments channelled through the Annual Development Programme (ADP¹), which is the Government process used to allocate resources (from existing budget sources and DP contributions) to invest during the next 5 years. The operating expenditures, salaries, price support, subsidies and other interventions covered by the revenue budget were not considered. In particular, most of the safety net programmes (relevant to food security) are not included in the CIP, as they are related to regular expenditures. They however correspond to an estimated US\$ 2.3 billion annually (about 12.7% of the national budget), i.e. over US\$ 11 billion over five years, more than the CIP itself. Only those safety nets considered as investments (and therefore appearing in the ADP) were included in the CIP, including employment and income generating safety nets.

10.3 All investments undertaken by the Government are channelled through the ADP. In contrast, only part of the DP contribution is channelled through the ADP (the part complementing GoB budget contributions to projects); while part is channelled outside of the ADP, (e.g. when DPs finance NGOs to undertake certain activities). The latter part has not been included in the CIP.

10.4 The updated cost exercise therefore provides an estimate of (i) the ongoing investments reclassified according to the 12 Programmes (and sub-programmes), (ii) the existing available resources already committed through the ADP, including those financed by the budget and by the DPs; (iii) the financial gap to be filled.

The exchange rate used for calculation is US\$ 1 = Taka 69.5

10.5 The sources of estimates and calculations are:

- a. **Mapping of both on-going and planned interventions of GoB Agencies and DPs.** These are called “projects” and the entire database is attached in Annex 4, Table 4.5 and Table 4.6. The term “**project**” is used to describe on-going and planned investment interventions whether or not they represent actual projects (e.g. financed by some DPs) or development activities streamlined in the Government system. A template was circulated to all relevant GoB departments/ministries to gather information on their ongoing and future projects, as a way to calculate financing requirements. Meetings were held to explain the methodology, purpose of the exercise, the need to rationalize and prioritize proposals in view of the goals and expected results of the CIP. Individual visits were also made to focal

¹ The ADP represents the budgetary tool used by the Government to allocate resources on an annual basis in support of investment (i.e. excluding current expenditures).

points in those departments/ministries that were designated to undertake the exercise. A joint meeting with different ministries/departments was held thereafter to validate the list and to prioritize the projects in the pipeline;

- b. **ADP:** The above costing was cross-checked by a systematic screening of the ongoing projects of the relevant departments included in the ADP.
- c. **Sixth FYP:** Information was also collected for the interventions relevant to the CIP suggested by the GoB agencies for the draft **Sixth Five Year Plan** (July 2010 – June 2015). These were used to evaluate further needs (financing gap) so that the CIP and FYP are consistent;
- d. **DP mobilization:** a total of 24 **DPs** were asked to provide detailed information on their on-going and planned interventions. 13 **DP**'s have responded to the request.

Estimates of available financing

10.6 Summary figures are shown in the table on the next page, while all the detailed calculation tables are in Annex 4. Existing financing was estimated at **US\$ 2.8 billion** already allocated through the ADP process, including US\$ 1.2 billion from Government budget resources and US\$ 1.6 billion from **DPs**. This amount does not include contributions from **DPs** that are not channelled through the ADP (e.g. important US, EU, DfID and other bilaterals who channel larger percentages of their funds through NGOs). This was estimated at US\$ 0.56 billion. It also does not include the interventions of multiple local NGOs involved in food security.

Estimate of additional requirements and priority ranking.

10.7 The **total financing gap** (net of the above available funds) is estimated at **US\$ 5.1 billion**¹. However, while this full amount is considered essential for attaining the goals of the CIP, availability of funds might not match these requirements. This necessitated a prioritization of some projects for the CIP period during an extensive consultation process on investment priorities. Each area of intervention of the CIP was rated through participatory methods and the following rates were applied for each of the CIP sub-programmes depending on priority ranking:

- a. TOP: 90% of the financial requirement prioritized
- b. HIGH: 70% of the financial requirement prioritized
- c. MEDIUM: 50% of the financial requirement prioritized
- d. LOWER: 40% of the financial requirement prioritized

10.8 Through this process, prioritized investment was estimated at **US\$ 3.4 billion**. Funds to be further mobilized from GoB and **DPs** are expected to be allocated along these priorities through the resource mobilization strategy described in the next chapter. When consulted, **DPs** provided information on possible future commitments that could be mobilized to finance CIP activities. This amounted to an estimated US\$ 0.88 billion, as shown in Table 4.4 in Annex 4. These tentative allocations should be confirmed as direct contributions to CIP for alignment purposes. Moreover, a pool of funding is being established, comprising GOB funds and contributions from various **DPs** (AusAid, CIDA, DFID, EC, KfW, GTZ, JICA, SIDA, UNFPA, WB, UNAIDS, UNICEF, WHO, and USAID) for the 32 OPs of HPNSDP, expected to be approved in June 2011. So far, a total amount of around US\$ 1.3 billion has been committed from **DPs** (of which an estimated 15% are contributions for direct interventions on nutrition).

¹ Around US\$ 321 M are about to be allocated by GOB and **DPs** for the implementation of direct nutrition interventions.

| CIP | | | Total CIP (m US\$) | Existing Resources (m US\$) | | | Financing gap (m US\$) | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| ID | Component | Programme | | GOB | DPs | Total | Total | Priority |
| | | | A = D + E | B | C | D | E | F |
| 1 | Food Availability | Sustainable and diversified agriculture through integrated research and extension | 781.2 | 33.9 | 143.3 | 177.2 | 604.1 | 441.3 |
| 2 | | Improved water management and infrastructure for irrigation purposes | 1,630.4 | 410.8 | 361.2 | 772.0 | 858.3 | 583.6 |
| 3 | | Improved quality of input and soil fertility | 343.0 | 28.1 | 83.1 | 111.2 | 231.8 | 170.3 |
| 4 | | Fisheries and aquaculture development | 392.9 | 19.7 | 17.0 | 36.6 | 356.3 | 211.6 |
| 5 | | Livestock development, with a focus on poultry and dairy production | 835.1 | 22.1 | 38.0 | 60.1 | 775.1 | 439.7 |
| Subtotal - Availability | | | 3,982.7 | 514.5 | 642.5 | 1,157.1 | 2,825.6 | 1,846.4 |
| 6 | Food Access | Improved access to market, value addition in agriculture and non farm incomes | 1,258.3 | 417.0 | 206.4 | 623.4 | 634.9 | 368.3 |
| 7 | | Strengthened capacities for implementation and monitoring of NFP and CIP actions | 113.2 | 0.2 | 14.4 | 14.6 | 98.6 | 69.0 |
| 8 | | Enhanced public food management system | 637.3 | 142.2 | 202.0 | 344.2 | 293.2 | 212.1 |
| 9 | | Institutional Development and Capacity Development for more effective safety nets | 1,064.6 | 116.6 | 476.2 | 592.7 | 471.8 | 340.5 |
| Subtotal - Access | | | 3,073.4 | 675.9 | 899.0 | 1,574.9 | 1,498.5 | 990.0 |
| 10 | Food Utilization | Community based nutrition programmes and services | 558.0 | 5.2 | 15.5 | 20.6 | 537.4 | 480.0 |
| 11 | | Orient food and nutrition actions through data | 33.2 | 1.2 | 10.1 | 11.3 | 21.9 | 13.0 |
| 12 | | Food safety and quality improvement | 186.5 | 1.3 | 7.6 | 8.9 | 177.5 | 90.8 |
| Subtotal - Utilization | | | 777.7 | 7.7 | 33.1 | 40.8 | 736.8 | 583.9 |
| TOTAL | | | 7,833.7 | 1,198.2 | 1,574.7 | 2,772.8 | 5,060.9 | 3,420.3 |

11. RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

11.1 The CIP is a strategic tool for integrating all food and nutrition security related investments into a comprehensive results framework, and to mobilize additional financial resources. To achieve its outcomes, the CIP needs to be implemented through coherent planning, budgeting and financing processes that harness all resources, while building on synergies and avoiding duplication. In this respect, the design of the CIP along the Paris Declaration principles (ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results and mutual accountability) provides a strong basis for its effective implementation. In Bangladesh, the CIP resource mobilization strategy should be anchored in the Joint Cooperation Strategy (JCS). More specifically, efforts will be made to rationalize the mobilization of financial resources, including:

- Regular consultations on the mobilization and use of financial resources with FPMU, MoF Finance Division, ERD, Aid Effectiveness Unit, Planning Commission, Line Ministries and DPs;
- Improved monitoring of financial resources (Government and donor pledges, commitments and actual disbursement);
- Regular fora to promote private investment in food and nutrition security involving the private sector, farmer organizations, CSOs, line ministries, Chambers of Commerce;
- Communication efforts to promote investment in food and nutrition security by showing results.

11.2 In view of the high fragmentation in the country's delivery and financial systems,¹ a pragmatic approach is proposed that would build momentum towards increasing the absorptive capacity of investments and improving the effectiveness of development interventions, along the following lines:

- Pursue strong engagement with the Planning Commission so that the final 6th FYP fully integrates the CIP, to be considered its food and nutrition security arm;
- Further involve the Ministry of Finance (Finance division, ERD, AEU) in order to increase financial resources in support of priority programmes and activities of the CIP;
- Put in place a strong monitoring process of CIP results, outputs and resources as part of the Food Policy Monitoring exercise under the FPMU, as described in this document;
- Continue the productive dialogue and negotiation with development partners who eventually should become an important source of financing for the CIP.
- Further prioritize interventions aimed at improving the absorptive capacity of both public and private investments.
- Further prioritize interventions with a high potential for leveraging investments and other resources (natural resources, knowledge, human resources, etc.) from the private sector, farmer organizations and CSOs.

11.3 **Government and Development Partner Roles.** Strong engagement of the Government should be matched by an equal commitment from DPs. This engagement should support investment efforts in line with the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness, the JCS, signed

¹ Evaluation of the implementation of the Paris Declaration, Phase II – Country Evaluation Bangladesh, Final Report, December 2010.

in 2010 in Bangladesh and the global l'Aquila Food Security Initiative, signed in July 2009 by over 20 countries who pledged US\$ 22 billion to finance country-led plans, such as the CIP. As the CIP has been designed and will be implemented along the principles of Development Aid Effectiveness and the 5 Rome principles, DPs should step up their financial resources, and align their strategies and development programmes in food and nutrition security with the CIP guiding principles, programmes and institutional arrangements.

11.4 Both Government and DPs will use the **financing gap identification and prioritization exercise of the CIP to allocate additional resources for investment**. On this basis, both parties should jointly identify specific programmes/projects to be financed, and further designed, negotiated and approved by Government and the concerned financing institutions (or global financial mechanisms such as GAFSP). This negotiation process with DPs should use the Country Partnership Framework (CPF), which has so far, been signed by 8 DPs, as a practical tool to raise additional support. 24 DPs were invited to contribute to CIP preparation and to date, 13 have contributed. Fund mobilization should build on this commitment. The dialogue and negotiations should be strengthened on a multilateral basis (through the LCG AFSRD) and through bilateral discussions with key multilateral technical agencies, with the support of ERD, FPMU and technical ministries, if necessary. Particularly active DPs (DANIDA, DfID, USAID, ADB, IDB, IFAD, World Bank, WFP, FAO, etc.) should continue to play a facilitation role to strengthen support from the DP community. Immediately following the CIP forum on 20 March 2011, DANIDA announced a pledge of US\$ 75 million in support of CIP.

11.5 Where specific projects and programmes have been jointly identified by the Government and DP(s), a **more detailed design phase should be undertaken**, involving: (i) a more complete review and lesson taking from past and on-going operations in the concerned sector, in order to possibly upscale existing innovations or fill gaps in these operations; (ii) a careful technical design and assessment of the proposals; (iii) social and environmental assessment, if required; (iv) a careful costing and a financing plan, including the identification of financing gaps; (v) financial and economic cost-benefit analyses; (vi) the establishment of a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system; (vii) proposals for capacity strengthening activities based on assessments of institutional capacities; and (viii) the development of a clear implementation plan and procedures.

11.6 An important part of the fund mobilization strategy is to **enhance investment absorption capacity**, i.e. capacity to effectively design and implement investment operations in the field of food security. This is the purpose of CIP programme 7. This requires capacity development support of all stakeholders, including key government agencies, farmer organizations and the private sector. Efforts should address the development of technical and management skills to design and implement investment programmes, run businesses, together with enhancing stakeholders' leadership. In this respect, GAFSP funds were mobilized for this purpose with provision of Technical Assistance by FAO, but more efforts are required to improve implementation effectiveness and performance.

11.7 **Leveraging private investments**. The CIP is about making investments in "public goods" that are critical to leverage more investments and resources (natural resources, knowledge, human resources) from the private sector, farmer organizations and CSOs. In this respect, efforts should be made to prioritize investments that have the highest potential for harnessing resources from other partners. Efforts should also be made to foster innovation and scaling up of good practices related to partnership contractual arrangements (e.g. contract farming, outgrower schemes, supply chains), Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in various sectors, risk management tools, etc.

12. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

12.1 CIP institutional arrangements aim to ensure: (i) **high political engagement** from government decision-makers, country partners, including the private sector, farmer organizations and CSOs, and DPs; (ii) **strong coordination and monitoring** of actions foreseen in the CIP in order to improve effectiveness of actions. During the CIP forum on 20 March 2011, participants re-affirmed the importance of strong coordination, as the CIP is a multi-sector tool. Existing mechanisms exist with the NFP, which should be strengthened; and (iii) **efficient mobilization of resources** from government, private sector, farmers and DPs, including funding, knowledge, etc. To reinforce country ownership and ensure sustainability, the proposed arrangements will use and strengthen existing country institutional and delivery systems. In this respect, CIP implementation builds strongly on the mechanisms in place for monitoring (1) the National Food Policy Plan of Action and progress toward MDG 1 and (2) the projects financed through the ADP as part of the national planning process.

Institutional settings for CIP formulation

12.2 The institutional arrangements for the formulation of the updated CIP have been established in line with the decisions of the 10th of November 2010 inter-ministerial meeting. The consequent Government directives formed two committees: the **CIP National Committee**, with the overall mandate to provide strategic guidance in the CIP review process (ref. MoFDM/FD/FPMU/(FSCN)-01 (66)/2008/(part-2)/184), and the **CIP Technical Committee**, responsible for conducting technical review, prioritization and follow up of the CIP (ref. MoFDM/FD/FPMU/(FSCN)-01(66)/2008/(part-2)/185). Both Committees are composed of representatives of relevant Government agencies, and receive technical support from the FPMU. The Technical Committee also includes non-governmental actors and DPs¹. At CIP implementation stage, these provisions will be unified with the existing arrangements for monitoring the NFP PoA and MDGs.

Towards a unified framework for coordination and monitoring NFP PoA, MDG1 and CIP


12.3 The following institutional arrangements will be used:

- The **Food Planning and Monitoring Committee (FPMC)** is a cabinet-level committee, representing the Ministers and Secretaries of the ministries/divisions concerned with food security using FPMU as its secretariat. The FPMC is responsible for providing political guidance and orientation through the National Food Policy (NFP) and its Plan of Action. It will also ensure political coordination of the CIP at the highest level.
- The **National Committee (NC)** is chaired by the Minister for Food and Disaster Management and is composed of the Secretaries of the various concerned divisions, Heads of Universities/Research Institutions, DPs, Private Sector and other Non-Governmental Organisations. It will be tasked with (a) enhancing coherence and alignment of current

¹ Specifically, the CIP National Committee is tasked with the responsibility to: a) enhance coherence in the alignment of current and planned investment within CIP Programmes; b) identify investment priorities and gaps; c) promote an enabling environment (policies) and partnerships for the effective implementation of the CIP d) oversee the CIP implementation and monitoring processes. The Technical Committee supports the National Committee by: a) guiding the identification and prioritization of CIP related investment projects; b) providing guidance on the implementation of CIP Programmes; c) coordinating the CIP implementation and monitoring processes.

and planned investment within the CIP Programmes; (b) identifying investment priorities and gaps; (c) promoting an enabling environment (policies) and partnerships for the effective implementation of the CIP; and (d) overseeing CIP implementation and monitoring processes.

- **The Technical Committee (TC)**, responsible for conducting technical reviews, prioritization and follow up on CIP implementation, supports the National Committee.
- The **Food Policy Working Group (FPWG)** is chaired by the Secretary of the Food Division, MoFDM, with the participation of all concerned ministries. The FPWG and its supporting four Thematic Teams (TTs) – see below – are responsible for monitoring progress towards MDG 1 and the National Food Policy Plan of Action objectives. The Government Notification of the 23rd of December 2010 added the responsibility to Monitor CIP Outcomes/Impacts and Outputs achievement to the duties of the FPWG and TTs. The FPWG supports the NC by (a) guiding the identification and prioritization of CIP related investment projects; b) providing guidance on the implementation of CIP Programmes; and c) coordinating the CIP implementation and monitoring processes.
- The **Thematic Teams (TTs)** play a critical role in monitoring CIP programmes and components (along the lines spelled out in the Government Notification dated 23rd December 2010).




12.4 **Role of FPMU.** The FPMU provides support to the unified framework. It will act as the secretariat of the various Committees and provide technical and operational support to the FPWG and TTs.

12.5 The **Local Consultative Group on Agriculture, Rural Development and Food Security (LCG ARDFS)** is the venue for dialogue between GoB and its Development Partners in line with the JCS. The Ministry of Finance (ERD), Ministry of Planning, and Line-Ministries concerned could be further involved in the meetings of the LCG ARDFS. This group contributes to improving development initiatives' effectiveness and monitoring international aid resources and DP financed programmes. Members of the LCG ARDFS participate in the CIP Annual Review Meetings.

Monitoring arrangements

12.6 At the level of CIP overall Goal, Outcomes/Impacts and Outputs (levels 1 and 2 of the CIP Results Chain), the institutional settings for CIP revision and the ones in place for monitoring the NFP PoA, MDG and CIP are integrated in a unified framework that includes: a) focal points from each relevant Government sector (incorporated in the Thematic Teams and FPWG); b) the National Committee; c) the Food Planning and Monitoring Committee.

12.7 Monitoring at CIP outputs and input level is conducted according to the existing national system for monitoring ADP investments, summarized in the figure below:



12.8 It is important to emphasize the presence of the Ministry of Finance and the IMED in the composition of these bodies. In particular, the IMED can play a critical role in providing monitoring information of ADP investment projects contributing to CIP Programme Outputs and Outcomes/Impacts.

12.9 Similarly, the membership of the ERD in the FPWG is critical for linking the Development Partners and monitoring their technical and financial contributions to the CIP, while membership of the Finance Division will facilitate consistency with the Medium Term Budgetary Framework process. The detailed composition and responsibilities of the bodies in the unified structure is provided in Annex 2.

12.10 The CIP Results Based Monitoring¹ System consists of regular reviews of progress made in implementing CIP actions and activities, combined with monitoring of progress against achieving CIP Outputs and Outcomes/Impacts. In other words, CIP monitoring is not only concerned with asking “Are we taking the actions we said we would take?” but also “Are we making progress on achieving the results that we said we wanted to achieve?” Through this approach, monitoring involves tracking strategies and actions being taken by partners and other stakeholders, and identifying the new strategies and actions that may be taken to ensure progress towards the most important results.

12.11 CIP key monitoring dimensions are:

- i. Progress towards CIP Outcome/Impact. This is carried out under the institutional setting for integrated monitoring at outcome/impact of the CIP, NFP PoA and MDG (consisting of the Thematic Teams, the expanded FPWG and the National Committee, under the authority of the National Food Committee - Food Planning and Monitoring Committee).

¹ Monitoring can be defined as the ongoing process by which stakeholders obtain regular feedback on the progress being made towards achieving CIP goals and objectives. Monitoring, together with Planning and Evaluation, is one of the interconnected processes of Results Based Management (RBM). RBM can be considered as a broad management strategy aimed at achieving improved performance and demonstrable results. Monitoring is an ongoing process which ensures constant feedback, learning and improving: plans are regularly assessed and discussed based on the key Monitoring (and Evaluation) findings and lessons learned.

- ii. Progress towards CIP Outputs. This is also carried out under the institutional setting for integrated monitoring at output of the CIP, NFP PoA and MDG (see above).
- iii. Input level achievements:
 - a. Progress towards CIP Investment Projects substantial results and execution performance of allocated budgets. This is carried out as part of the ADP monitoring according to the existing national planning process.
 - b. Donor commitments in contributing to the CIP Programmes financing. This dimension is combined with the CIP monitoring at outcome and impact level and stands under the responsibility of the ERD, with inputs from the LCG ARDFS, as available.

12.12 The CIP Results Framework is the key reference for monitoring the first and second dimension. Progress against CIP expected Outcomes/Impacts and Outputs (aggregate and sub-outputs) is assessed through the criteria established by the indicators identified in the CIP Results Matrix.

12.13 The key reference for the third monitoring dimension is the CIP project database, which is regularly updated through the national ADP monitoring process. Findings from monitoring ADP investment projects related to the CIP are aggregated at CIP Programme level. This information will be cross-checked with the findings from the first monitoring dimension and will represent a proxy indicator of the relevance of the investment projects associated with CIP expected Outputs and Outcomes/Impacts. In particular, the alignment between Output and Outcome/Impact progress, on the one side, and Input progress, on the other, would show that the identified investments are relevant for CIP goals.

12.14 The CIP Results Based Monitoring System is operated through the following tools which are produced as part of a single report on an annual basis:

- i. Progress towards CIP Outcomes/Impacts and Outputs prepared by the Thematic Teams under the supervision of the extended FPWG jointly with reporting on sections of the NFP PoA not included under the CIP.
- ii. Report on financial allocations and execution and progress towards results of ADP-CIP investment projects, consolidated at CIP Programme level. The IMED provides aggregated information on the financial progress of investment projects relevant for the CIP while the Planning Commission and line Ministries provide information about new project approvals.
- iii. Reports on GoB allocations and donor commitments based on information from the ADP book (from the Planning Commission) for the former, and from ERD for the latter.

12.15 Key findings from the aforementioned monitoring reports are analyzed and discussed within the TTs and the FPWG for further submission to the CIP National Committee and the Food Planning Monitoring Committee. CIP monitoring findings are disseminated and lessons learned are incorporated into the following phases of CIP Programme implementation, through the coordination and guidance provided by the National Committee.

12.16 The detailed CIP Monitoring Methodology and CIP Monitoring System functioning are provided in Annexes 2 and 5.

13. THE WAY FORWARD AND IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES

13.1 The CIP is a strategic tool in the hand of the Government to increase and improve investment in food security, i.e. agriculture, fisheries and livestock, food access and safety nets and nutrition activities. It also provides a framework for dialogue and for collaborative action between partners (Government, private sector, farmer organizations, CSOs, DPs) under the leadership of the Government.

13.2 The major risks associated with the CIP, their mitigation measures and the ratings associated with them are shown in the table below.

Table: Risk analysis

| Critical risks | Risk mitigation measures | Rating |
|--|--|---|
| a. Insufficient leadership and political commitment from Government and partners | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep a high political profile and the strategic focus - Strengthen the dialogue with partners - Ensure GoB presence within the LCG ARDFS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low for Government, as food security is on the top of its agenda - Moderate for DPs, who recognize the need to invest in food and nutrition security |
| b. Weak coordination and increased fragmentation may result in weak effectiveness and delivery, and further deterioration of the food security situation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Put in place RB-M&E and focus on results - Implementation arrangements are mainstreamed into country systems: planning, budgeting, financial management and reporting are gradually aligned - MoF (Finance Division and ERD) to be strongly involved in implementation arrangements - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very High: Implementation arrangements need to be further developed, and additional resources mobilized to develop the country capacities to coordinate effectively investments and achieve results |
| c. Resources mobilized (from GoB and/or donors) are not enough to finance CIP activities, resulting in under-investment and thus limited results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CIP Results framework and M&E to include monitoring of resource mobilization - CIP will be mainstreamed into GoB's planning and financial systems (SFYP, MTBF, ADP) - Develop a resource mobilization approach - LCG ARDFS to be strengthened to improve planning and use of DPs' financial commitments - CIP Promotion through effective communication - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High: More work needs to be done to develop an effective approach to resource mobilization, together with a communication/promotion strategy |
| d. CIP investments are more "business as usual" with limited innovative solutions leading to limited learning, scaling up and eventually lack of competitiveness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research and Development activities are key investment areas - Innovation and scaling up are key guiding principles | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High: More needs to be done to promote innovation, and identify successful innovations for scaling up. Specific instruments need to be designed for fostering innovation |
| e. CIP public investments have limited leverage on other partners' investments including funding and other resources from the private sector, farmer organizations and CSOs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guiding principles to prioritize investments with high leverage effect - Policy agenda includes work on roles of public vs. private sector - Sustained dialogue with private sector, farmer organizations and CSOs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High: More work to be done to (i) further improve the business environment, (ii) develop approaches for leveraging more investment (e.g. supply chain arrangements, PPPs), (iv) dialogue and fora (investment fairs, food agro-industry fairs); and (iii) promote innovation |

13.3 Given the ambition and the complexity of the CIP, most of the risks identified are rated as high, despite the risk mitigation measures taken at the design stage of the CIP. Further work needs therefore to be done on a number of fronts to manage these risks while putting the CIP to work. This includes the development of **an implementation approach and plan** based on the institutional and monitoring arrangements spelled out in Chapter 12 to ensure effective coordination and delivery of results. Based on the results framework, the plan will define the coordination mechanisms between partners by investment programme, clarify responsibilities, and

further delineate the planning and budgeting arrangements. The implementation plan should also provide for a **resource mobilization approach** involving government agencies, DPs and other partners, with stronger engagement of ERD and the Finance Division (from Ministry of Finance) and DPs through the LCG ARDFS, along the lines described in Chapter 11. In the mean time, the Government and DPs should demonstrate their commitment by stepping up their funding. A specific **approach to communication**, including the development of an IT platform, should also be part of the implementation plan. The implementation plan should also identify the needs and the required resources and financing for **capacity development**.

13.4 **Promote innovation, learning and scaling up.** Beyond the support to agricultural research and extension systems, there is a need to develop a more systemic approach to promoting innovation and learning while identifying successful experiences for scaling up. Specific instruments need to be put in place for fostering and financing innovation, knowledge sharing and scaling up ventures.

13.5 To develop a strong collaborative framework with the contribution of all partners, Government and its partners should sustain a **strong dialogue** on investment in food and nutrition security. Using the CIP as a strategic instrument focused on results is a way to sustain the commitment of all actors, including consumer groups, farmer and producer organizations, the private sector, NGOs, Government and development partners. The dialogue should aim at aligning Government and DPs' strategies and programmes along CIP orientations and principles. A broader, evidence-based **policy dialogue** should be continued to create a more conducive environment for public and private (business) investments in food and nutrition security within the scope of the National Food Policy and the partnerships with key development partners and think tanks (FAO, IFPRI, etc.). Regular fora involving all stakeholders should be organized to discuss monitoring results and related research results, and inform food security related policy and investments. Such fora should be organized annually.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1. UPDATING AND CONSULTATION PROCESS

1. This annex presents the process of updating and enhancing the CIP as well as a brief description of stakeholder consultation activities. The outcomes of the consultation process contributed to improve proposed investment programmes, as well as CIP guiding principles, institutional set-up and implementation arrangements.

Process for updating CIP Design

2. The first version of the CIP of June 2010 was prepared through wide consultations with key ministries, private sector representatives, NGOs and Development Partners. The consultation process was further broadened to include a larger number of stakeholders, especially farmers and their organizations. It was also deepened to include consultations at regional and national levels with a greater number of stakeholders. Updating the CIP consisted of further i) rationalizing the costs, ii) prioritizing, iii) refining the results-based M&E arrangements, and iv) identifying key policy issues tied to successful implementation of the CIP. This was performed along the following steps:

1. Prioritization through inclusive consultation (see stakeholder consultation) including broad consultations with farmers and their organizations, private sector actors, CSOs, etc.;
2. Costing of prioritized programmes;
3. Establishment of a results framework, M&E and implementation arrangements;
4. Policy Mapping, organized by IFPRI;
5. Consultations with DPs for mapping available aid;
6. Alignment with the 6th Five Year Plan and GoB Planning Process/Annual Development Programme;
7. Review of findings of consultations by the GoB heads of departments and planning officials;
8. Review of findings by the DPs, through the Local Consultative Group on Agriculture, Rural Development and Food Security (LCG-ARDFS) and Head of Agencies Meeting;
9. Technical Review of the findings by the high-level Technical Committee;
10. Review by the National Committee, chaired by the Minister, MoFDM;
11. National Forum on the draft documents and findings;
12. Finalization of the updated document.

Stakeholder consultation process

3. The consultation process aimed at better prioritizing and improving the quality and relevance of the proposed investment areas in terms of expected results, targeting and delivery mechanisms and implementation arrangements. This also contributed to building stronger focus and ownership among all partners while further mobilizing their commitments and resources (finance, knowledge, social and political capital, etc.). Information and knowledge sharing through genuine interaction between partners contributed to building a stronger unity of purpose with regard to the key investment areas and to critical policy and implementation issues.

4. A joint team of GoB and FAO worked under the technical guidance of the FAO Investment Centre in Rome, with the CIP Secretariat i.e. Food Planning and Monitoring Unit (FPMU) of MoFDM, supported by FAO's National Food Policy Capacity Strengthening Project (NFPCSP) as the secretariat of the operations. The consultation exercise was coordinated and facilitated by the FPMU, with the support of FAO through the Local Support Team (LST) made of FPMU, FAO

and local consultants. A professional facilitator assisted in planning and organizing the consultation process. The consultation was undertaken from December 2010 to March 2011 (see Appendix 1, list of consultation activities). It involved 13 Ministerial Departments and a large number of public agencies (360 officials consulted), researchers and academics (20), private sector representatives (200), farmers (310) and some of their representatives, NGOs and other CSOs (40), and Development Partners (24). Feedback from the various meetings is presented in Appendices 2, 3 and 4).

5. Three **Regional Stakeholder Fora** took place in Mymensingh, Khulna and Bogra (for the Rajshahi region), with the participation of a large number of stakeholders:

- Regional forum in Mymensingh at the Bangladesh Agricultural University covering public and private sectors and academia; followed by a meeting with farmers at the NGO ASPADA (3 December 2010);
- Regional forum in Khulna divisional town (29th January 2011) in Circuit House with the participation of public agencies, traders, chamber representatives, media, academia; followed by a meeting in the DAE Auditorium with farmers, NGOs, traders and women farmers' groups; and
- Regional forum held at the Rural Development Academy in Bogra district on 5th February 2011 covering all stakeholders including farmers and women.

6. The stakeholders discussed major investment opportunities under each component/programme and provided feedback on priority investments, including support to capacity development and some innovations and/or existing projects/ventures with potential for scaling up. Priorities were translated into a ranking of proposed investments. With the support of IFPRI, critical policy issues have been identified for creating a more conducive investment and business environment. (see summary of regional fora in Appendices 2.1 to 2.3, and synthesis of stakeholders' feedback in Appendices 2.4 and 2.5).

7. **Focus Group Meetings** took place in Dhaka with Civil Society Organizations, farmers and their organizations, the private sector, and research and academia:

- Consultations with a large number of **NGOs and other CSOs** took place on 24th February 2011 at FAO Dhaka Office. Many other bilateral meetings were held with NGOs and think tanks.
- Consultations with the **private sector** included three key meetings. An open discussion was held on 25th January 2011 at the office of the Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce and Industry (MCCI) with the participation of a number of private sector leaders and think-tanks (like the Chairman of Grameen Bank, representatives from the think-tank Policy Research Initiative) together with FAO, USAID and IFPRI. A second meeting was arranged on 27th February 2011 by the Secretary, Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock. A broad consultation with the private sector took place on 6th March 2011. This brought together private sector associations, lead investors in the agro-business and other relevant industries with the leaders of financing systems/banking sector. The Minister for MoFDM was the Chief Guest and had a press conference with a large group of media representatives at the end together with the FAO Representative, USAID Mission Director and IFPRI Representative.
- Debates on the "access" dimension of CIP were taken on 3rd March at FPMU, with GoB agencies, ministries and the relevant DPs; and
- Discussions of R&D activities were held with Agriculture Information Service (AIS), Seed Certification Agency (SCA) and the Bangladesh Agricultural Development Corporation (Sech Bhaban, BADC) on 18th January.

8. **Technical Meetings (TM)** with a large number of government agencies to further identify priority investment programmes, deepen their technical content and discuss related planning and budgeting issues. These meetings also resulted in identifying critical policy issues by programme, as well as innovations and programmes with potential for scaling up. These include meetings with the following agencies (see summary of these meetings, Appendices 3.1 to 3.6):

- Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE, 06 January 2011);
- Department of Fisheries (DoF, 09 January);
- Department of Livestock Services (DLS, 10 January);
- Director General of Health Services (DGHS) focusing on the nutrition dimension (DGHS, 17th January);
- Directorate General of Food, Directorate of Relief and Rehabilitation with FPMU focusing on the access dimension (DGoF, 18th January);
- The Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock and its agencies (MoFL, 19th January);

9. **Consultations with Development Partners (DPs).** Interactions between GoB and DPs fall within the Joint Cooperation Strategy, which was signed on 2 June 2010, as a means to put into practice the Paris Agenda on aid effectiveness, and the Local Consultative Group on Agriculture, Rural Development and Food Security (LCG ARDFS). The CIP design team interacted intensively with a large number of DPs through the LCG ARDFS and through bilateral meetings. DPs include AsDB, AusAid, DANIDA, DfID, EKN (the Netherlands), EU, IsDB, IFAD, SDC (Switzerland), UNDP, UNICEF, USAID, the World Bank and the World Food Programme (WFP). This process started with the LCG ARDFS Core Group meetings in December 2010 and January 2011. A 3rd meeting was held on 10th March 2011 at the FAO Representation. USAID organized a consultation with the DP Heads of Agencies on 08 March. This helped to fill the gaps and prepare for the joint GoB-DP “National-Forum” on the updated CIP on 20th March 2011.

10. Twenty three DPs, mostly members of the LCF/ARDFS, were consulted to complement the costing figures and to provide information (projects, current and pipeline financing) to enable the mapping of current resources and identify the financing gaps. Updated figures on ongoing and future investments were received from 13 DPs: ADB, AusAid, DANIDA, DFID, EKN (Netherlands), EU, FAO, IDB, SDC, UNICEF, USAID, WB and WFP. For three other DPs (IFAD, JICA and UNDP), complementary data were taken from the updated Country Partnership Framework. Cross referenced information was provided by GoB agencies/departments for other agencies. A large number of DPs also participated in the national forum held in May 2010 to discuss the CIP.

11. Two **National Stakeholder Fora** took place with the participation of all major stakeholders, including development partners, to discuss and endorse CIP proposals. The first Forum – the Bangladesh Food Security Investment Forum - took place in Dhaka on 26-27 May 2010 with high level participation from Government Ministers, DPs and other key stakeholders. The forum discussed the CIP and its six background papers. The second Forum was held on 20 March 2011 with the participations of the following Ministers (Finance, Planning, Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries and Food and Disaster Management). Approximately 200 representatives of government, research and academia, private sector, CSOs and DPs participated in the review of the final CIP document (see feedback from the National Forum in Appendix 4).

12. **Meetings of the Technical Committee and the National Committee.** The Technical Committee representing the government, DPs, private sector, academia and NGOs, met several times (6th December 2010, 13th January 2011, and 14th March 2011) to review the updates and

provide orientation and guidance. Regular briefing/team meetings with FPMU have been taken regularly. The National Committee reviewed the draft of the updated CIP on 14th March.

13. The consultations at design stage have led to bringing the perspectives of the various stakeholders together and building some strong consensus around priority investment programmes and key policy issues to be considered. Moreover, stakeholders have strongly contributed to identifying the key principles to guide implementation, contributing to improving substantially CIP's collaborative framework and enhancing its strategic dimension.

14. **Process for prioritization of investments.** Stakeholder priorities were reflected in the narrative and description of each investment Programme (see Annex 3) along the following criteria (used by the Planning Commission of GoB):

- **Top Priority:** Most important to the goals of CIP, has potential to provide immediate benefits to large sections of people and already has substantial GOB commitments;
- **High Priority:** Important areas where efforts would benefit the public and has regional and area-based importance and needs to be implemented immediately.
- **Medium Priority:** Important programs where implementation may be needed in future.
- **Low Priority:** Programs where implementation depends on the availability of resources.

15. **Policy Mapping.** IFPRI undertook a policy mapping exercise as part of the updating and consultation process, in close cooperation with GoB and FAO. In this respect, initial meetings among IFPRI, USAID and FAO were held on 13th January 2011, followed by the preparation of a synthesis on priority policy issues, prepared by IFPRI¹, which was presented at the National Forum on 20 March.

16. **Consultation on costing, financing and resource mapping.** Information on ongoing and projected investments in food and nutrition security - including costing and financing - was collected through standard templates which were sent to nearly 40 relevant agencies. Similar templates were also sent to the relevant DPs. Findings of the prioritization and costing processes were shared with the GoB agencies on 28th February in a day-long seminar. This exercise also led to the mapping of existing investment operations and available resources.

¹ IFPRI, Bangladesh Policy and Research and Strategy Support Program, Policy Analysis for the Country Investment Plan for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition in Bangladesh, March 2011.

List of key consultation activities

The list of consultation activities (by chronological order) includes the following:

1. Regional consultation in Mymensingh: at the Bangladesh Agricultural University covering public and private sectors, academia etc, and with farmers at the NGO ASPADA (3rd December 2010)
2. Department of Agricultural Extension DAE, 6th January 2011)
3. Department of Fisheries (DoF, 9th January)
4. Department of Livestock Services (DLS, 10th January)
5. R&D Agencies like BARI, BRRI, BJRI, etc under National Agricultural Research System (NARS) led by Bangladesh Agricultural Research Council (BARC, 13th January)
6. The Director General of Health Services focusing on the nutrition dimension (DGHS, 17th January)
7. Other agencies like Agriculture Information Service (AIS), Seed Certification Agency (SCA), Bangladesh Agricultural Development Corporation (Sech Bhaban, BADC, 18th January)
8. The Directorate General of Food, Directorate of Relief and Rehabilitation with FPMU focusing on the access dimension (DGoF, 18th January), and
9. The Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock and its agencies (MoFL, 19th January)
10. Discussion with the private sector on 25th January 2011 at the Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce and Industry (MCCI), with private sector leaders and think-tanks (like the Chairman of Grameen Bank, representations from the think-tank Policy Research Initiative), FAO, USAID and IFPRI;
11. The 2nd regional consultation took place in Khulna divisional town (29th January) on two separate locations: the Circuit House for the agencies, traders, chamber representatives, media, academia; and at the DAE Auditorium for the farmers, NGO, traders, women farmers' groups
12. The 3rd regional consultation was held at the Rural Development Academy in Bogra district on 5th February covering all the stakeholders and farmers
13. A separate consultation with the CSOs and NGO forums was also taken on 24th February at FAO Dhaka office.
14. A consultation between the private sector and the public sector was organized on 27th February and chaired by the Secretary, Ministry of Fish and Livestock (MoFL);
15. A broader consultation on the “access” dimension was taken on 3rd March at FPMU, where both GoB agencies, ministries and the relevant DPs joined in a brain-storming session.
16. Broad consultation with the private sector, Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce and Industry (MCCI), 6th March. This consultation brought together private sector associations, lead investors in the agro-business and other relevant industries together with the leaders of financing systems/banking sector. The Minister for MoFDM was the Chief Guest and had a press conference with a large group of media representatives at the end together with the FAO Representative, USAID Mission Director and IFPRI Representative.

Record of Issues that Arose in the Regional Consultation on 3/12/2010 at BAU, Mymensingh

A number of experts, extension officials and farmers actively participated in the discussion on investment priority of CIP. Following priority issues were put forward for consideration:

1. Utility services in the rural areas: support to preparation of spare parts of power tiller, pumps, etc.
2. Investment on development of climate resilient technology
3. Food and nutrition: there is vast scope for food processing, refinement of food processing technology
4. Support production of high value vegetables and fruits
5. Genetic improvement of poultry, goat, cattle and buffalo. Poultry should not be ignored in the genetic improvement programme of livestock.
6. Training is important for capacity development of scientists and farmers for technology generation and adaptation in crops, livestock and fishery.
7. Support production of quality seeds, feeds, fingerlings, drugs and vaccines.
8. Promote contract farming with public-private partnership, capacity development of farmers' organization
9. Encourage community based extension services by updating farmers' knowledge and skill, and institutionalizing community based extension services
10. Support fisheries development through:
 - Management of inland marine fisheries- assessment of sustainability of emerging species like Tuna.
 - Small scale inland aquaculture- promote good aquaculture practices
 - Diversification in coastal aquaculture- Crab, mussels, sea weeds, etc.
 - Diversification of fish processing- e.g., processing and export of pangus fish
 - Support disease diagnosis facility in the regions
 - Quality control of feed
11. Support livestock development through the following actions:
 - Promote livestock development for food and nutrition security
 - Promote small scale dairy for milk and beef production
 - Promote public-private partnership for livestock services- production of vaccines, drugs, animal health services and control of diseases
 - Vertical and horizontal integration is needed in livestock sector
 - Support establishment of modern slaughter house for safe food
 - Quality control of feed and veterinary drug
 - Milk processing and marketing
12. Improved water management through the following actions:
 - Improve water distribution system of minor irrigation- improve with buried pipe
 - Improve cost effectiveness of irrigation
 - Improve irrigation efficiency
 - Improve surface water irrigation in the South
 - Rehabilitation of polders and their management
 - Construction of barrage in the downstream of Gorai river to increase water in the South
13. Enhance the quality control of fertilizers and soil fertility management through the following actions:
 - Growing concern of management of soil salinity
 - Strengthening of soil testing laboratory

Record of Issues that Arose in the 2nd Regional Consultation on January 29, 2011 at Circuit House, Khulna

A regional consultation on the CIP was held at the Circuit House conference room, Khulna in the morning of 29th January 2011. About 80 representatives of local public institutions and other stakeholders actively participated in the consultation. Mr. Ad Spijkers, FAOR, and Additional Divisional Commissioner, Khulna, Mr Rafiqul Islam were guests. The additional director, DAE of Khulna region chaired the session. Dr. Z. Karim moderated the process of discussion. A Farmers' Consultation was also held in parallel at ATI, Khulna, chaired by Tariq Hassan, EX-DG, DAE. In this session Mr. Ad Spijkers was Chief Guest. About 100 farmers (60% were women) attended the session.

The CIP document was presented and discussed in both sessions. A number of experts, academia, extension officials, Chambers of Commerce, traders, private sector actors, public representatives, NGOs and farmers actively participated in the open and group discussions on investment priority of CIP. Findings of both consultations were presented and validated in the afternoon Plenary Session held at Circuit house. The group discussions focused on the following four issues: Food Availability; Food Access; Food Utilization; Regional Food Security Issues.

The following points/issues were raised in open, group discussions and plenary session in the light of the programmes and priority interventions of CIP:

| I) Food availability | |
|---|---|
| Officials & other stakeholders | Farmers |
| 1. Improved Water management and infrastructure for irrigation | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Dredging of river, Introduce Water harvest technology with preparation of reservoir <input type="checkbox"/> Construction of polders and their management <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement of Drainage condition in the arable lands | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Creation of surface water irrigation opportunity through water reserve, dredging and/or excavation of rivers, canals <input type="checkbox"/> Protection of vast area of Rupsha-Terokhada Beel, Dakatia- Dumuria Beel against saline water intrusion <input type="checkbox"/> Establish effective drainage to enable bringing vast area to fit for timely planting of rice (Boro) <input type="checkbox"/> Low lift pump for surface water irrigation should be made available at cheap price |
| 2. Soil fertility management | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Promote improved soil health management practices, introduce crop rotation with legumes where possible | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Provide soil testing facilities free of cost all over the area <input type="checkbox"/> Fertilizer Quality testing facilities be made locally available |
| 3. Technology development & transfer | |
| <p>Salt tolerant variety development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Collection of local germ plasm for salt tolerant variety development <input type="checkbox"/> Support technology transfer <input type="checkbox"/> Capacity development of extension personnel | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Support Agri. research to provide salt tolerant varieties of crops including rice <input type="checkbox"/> Develop and promote technology for integrated use of Embankment areas for vegetable and rice production <input type="checkbox"/> Strengthen IPM including arranging increased supply of botanicals and biopesticides <input type="checkbox"/> Provide farmers' skill training on different aspects of crop production, poultry raising and fish production |

| | |
|---|--|
| 4. Supply & sustainable use of Inputs, land, etc | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure availability of inputs- seeds and fertilizers <input type="checkbox"/> Protection of agricultural land and protection of tenant right <input type="checkbox"/> Provide easy loan to the farmers <input type="checkbox"/> Promote community based agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> Support insurance system for crop, livestock and fishery <input type="checkbox"/> Increase women's access to land, water and other resources <input type="checkbox"/> Increase poor peoples' access to land, water, technology and inputs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Seed Quality testing facilities be made locally available <input type="checkbox"/> Skill training for seedbed management for good seedling raising <input type="checkbox"/> Increase supply of quality seeds through BADC reducing reliance on private sector <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure supply of quality seed through private seed dealers <input type="checkbox"/> Quality seed of hybrid rice and other hybrid crops should be made available locally through BADC or honest traders <input type="checkbox"/> Law to protect agricultural land from selling for other purposes <input type="checkbox"/> Land use planning to protect agricultural land loss <input type="checkbox"/> Local coordination among different departments- BWDB, AG, Food <input type="checkbox"/> Law to stop leasing Govt. Khash land for enabling brood continuation/survival <input type="checkbox"/> Enhance farmers' cooperative/united efforts/ICM club in farming under local DAE supervision <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural loan including those for crops, Livestock and fishery should be made available through Krishi Bank at low interest/interest free |
| 5. Livestock development | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Provide feed subsidy <input type="checkbox"/> Dissemination of mature technology of BLRI <input type="checkbox"/> Reduce high price of Day old chicks <input type="checkbox"/> Support for fair price of livestock products (resolve marketing problem of livestock product) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Arranging electricity supply for poultry raising <input type="checkbox"/> Good brood/chicks for poultry and disease free fish brood/seed <input type="checkbox"/> Making available of quality poultry feeds <input type="checkbox"/> Skill training of poultry farmers on feed, nutrition, and disease management <input type="checkbox"/> Veterinary services including de-worming should be made available through Government. |
| 6. Fishery development | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Shrimp policy is needed <input type="checkbox"/> Zoning for bagda shrimp <input type="checkbox"/> Excavation and conservation of Jalmahal and baor for fisheries <input type="checkbox"/> Community based fisheries development <input type="checkbox"/> Subsidy of fish feed needed <input type="checkbox"/> Diversification in coastal aquaculture- Crab, mussels, sea weeds, etc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Making available of quality fish feeds <input type="checkbox"/> Develop and promote technology for integrated use of Embankment areas for fish <input type="checkbox"/> Improved hatchery should be established locally |
| 7. Marginal farmers | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Support for credit facilities and institutional capacity building, inputs and technology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Provide capital to enable them buying pure seed, fertilizer in time <input type="checkbox"/> Tenant farmers should be given interest free loan and crop insurance should be introduced <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural loan including those for crops, Livestock and fishery should be made available through Krishi Bank at low interest/interest free without Security to marginal farmers |

| II) Food Access | |
|--|--|
| Officials & other stakeholders | Farmers |
| <p><i>Intervention on storage</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Establish cold storages <input type="checkbox"/> Establish seed storage for farmers <input type="checkbox"/> Strengthen training and demonstration for proper packaging <input type="checkbox"/> Provide credit and insurance facilities Increase storage facilities in the rural areas <p><i>Marketing and trade</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Construction of link road and feeder road <input type="checkbox"/> Development of cooperatives for group marketing <input type="checkbox"/> Strengthening market information system <input type="checkbox"/> Increase research on post harvest loss <p><i>Value addition</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Skill development of poor farmers and women <input type="checkbox"/> Strengthen IPM and ICM <input type="checkbox"/> Research for development of processed food products <input type="checkbox"/> Establish mini processing industries at farmers' level <input type="checkbox"/> Provide credit for processing industries <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure participation of women in value addition activities <input type="checkbox"/> Explore edible fruits of <i>Sundarbans</i> for nutrition and income <input type="checkbox"/> Generation of income of income of landless and distressed women through value addition activities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Establish cold storage and improvement of local markets particularly for perishable vegetables and fish <input type="checkbox"/> Protect from the Syndicate of traders through good market management <input type="checkbox"/> Loan/credit for perishable crops/vegetable, which is not available now should be introduced through Krishi Bank <input type="checkbox"/> should improve Local roads, transportation connecting local improved market <input type="checkbox"/> Should introduce Safety net card/program |

| III) Food utilization (Nutrition) | |
|--|----------------|
| Officials & other stakeholders | Farmers |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Planned intervention on farming of crop, livestock and fishery <input type="checkbox"/> Support homestead gardening <input type="checkbox"/> Strengthen one home and one farm project activities for production of vegetables, fruits and livestock <input type="checkbox"/> Conduct nutrition survey <input type="checkbox"/> Support training for developing awareness in nutrition <input type="checkbox"/> Encourage production and utilization of safe food | |

| IV) Regional issues |
|--|
| Officials & other stakeholders |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excavation of canals for irrigation and drainage • Distribution of khas land to the landless through cooperatives • Marketing problem of agriculture products • Shortage of quality seeds • Population problem • Establish rail road to port • Support research for livestock • Shortage of electricity • Preserve white fish in the cold storage • Develop regional laboratories • Farmers' training for production and marketing • Provide subsidy for machinery • Need to enhance security for the fishermen working in the sea • Establish tourism centre for Sundarban |

Record of Issues that Arose in the 3rd Regional Consultation on February 05, 2011 at Rural Development Academy (RDA), Bogra

A day long regional consultation on the CIP was held at the RDA conference room, Bogra on February 05, 2011. In the session Ad Spijkers, FAOR and Younus Ali, Additional Director, DAE were guests. The Director General, RDA, Mohammad Nazrul Islam ndc, chaired the session. Dr. Z. Karim moderated the process of discussion. A Farmers' Consultation was also held in parallel at RDA, chaired by DG, RDA, Mohammad Nazrul Islam ndc. In this session Mr. Ad Spijkers was Chief Guest. The CIP document was presented and discussed. A number of experts, academia, extension officials, Chamber, traders, private sector, public representative, NGOs and farmers actively participated in the open and group discussions on investment priority of CIP. Findings of both consultations were presented and discussed in the afternoon Plenary Session.

The following points/issues were raised in open, group discussions and plenary session in the light of the programmes and priority interventions of CIP:


| I) Food availability | |
|--|---|
| Officials & other stakeholders | Farmers |
| 1. Improved Water management and infrastructure for irrigation | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Increase supply of electricity for irrigation <input type="checkbox"/> Support channel digging (deeply) by groups- for fish and irrigation <input type="checkbox"/> Capacity development of water users, providing river training and support protection of river bank erosion <input type="checkbox"/> Efficient use of irrigation water through surface water utilization and pre-cast canals. <input type="checkbox"/> Development of water conservation technology <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation and reclamation of water bodies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Irrigation canal should be made concrete <input type="checkbox"/> River/water reservoirs should be dredged/excavated <input type="checkbox"/> Losses from flood should be controlled <input type="checkbox"/> Support uninterrupted electricity for irrigation |
| 2. Soil fertility management | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Promote improved soil health management practices, introduce crop rotation with legumes <input type="checkbox"/> Expansion of arsenic mitigation technology <input type="checkbox"/> Support farmers for application of fertilizers on the basis of soil test <input type="checkbox"/> Development of soil conservation technology <input type="checkbox"/> Need research on low pH problem of soils of Barind Tract | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Soil testing kit should be made available <input type="checkbox"/> Quality testing facilities of fertilizer, irrigation and water be made locally available by the government free of cost |
| 3. Technology development & transfer (integrated Research and extension for climate change)) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Support development of short-duration draught tolerant variety of Aus and Aman rice crops <input type="checkbox"/> Development of cultural practices- mainly fertilizer, seedling age and short duration rice varieties <input type="checkbox"/> Promote sustainable agricultural method for USG, LCC, Drum seeder, OM, soil test, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvement of food security and livelihood through transfer of appropriate technology by | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Supervision/Assistance of Sub-assistant agriculture officers (SAAOs) in DAE should be made available through accountability <input type="checkbox"/> Similar supervision positions should be made in Fisheries/Livestock department <input type="checkbox"/> Skill training for all (seed, crop cultivation, fish production, livestock rearing) should be provided in wide scale <input type="checkbox"/> Support farm mechanization to face labour crisis |

| | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> group formation <input type="checkbox"/> Support homestead vegetable production programme <input type="checkbox"/> Cultivation of quick growing fruits- mango, jackfruit, papaya, banana, litchi and guava, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Support inclusion of RDA in NARS system <input type="checkbox"/> Develop cropping zone for high value crops with support of agro-technology <input type="checkbox"/> Food production and associate departments should be coordinated for field level extension services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Tree plantation program should include fruit trees |
| 4. Supply & sustainable use of Inputs, land, etc | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Subsidies should be given to the producers for inputs such as power (diesel, electricity), fertilizers, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Support production of quality seeds by the farmer themselves. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Good quality seed/fertilizer should be ensured <input type="checkbox"/> Seed production through WISE be expanded <input type="checkbox"/> Price of all inputs including feeds should be reduced <input type="checkbox"/> Private seed production must be certified and bag should be accompanied with certificate by appropriate authority |
| 5. Livestock development | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Establish disease diagnostic and feed analysis laboratory at Upazilla level <input type="checkbox"/> Support artificial insemination center, livestock center with manpower at Union level with transportation facilities <input type="checkbox"/> Review livestock policy in relation to private sector development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Quality medicine/vaccination should be made available by Government <input type="checkbox"/> Prices of feeds should be reduced; balance between cost of inputs & produces be ensured <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure availability of good chicks at reasonable price <input type="checkbox"/> Import of milk be stopped or higher vat/tax be imposed <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure availability of quality Siemens of good breed (preferably imported) <input type="checkbox"/> Introduce Insurance scheme |
| 6. Fisheries development | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Excavation and sanctuaries of water bodies for fish breeding and community based management of open water fisheries | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Government managed brood bank should be established in each locality <input type="checkbox"/> Local marketing be improved and Export market of fish should be explored <input type="checkbox"/> Security free Bank loan/credit at low interest should be made available <input type="checkbox"/> Quality feed at reasonable price should be made available <input type="checkbox"/> Price of raw materials of feed may be reduced |
| 7. Cooperatives and credit | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Establish producers' organizations <input type="checkbox"/> Organize fish farmers and fishers through community based cooperative organizations and provide need based training and credits <input type="checkbox"/> Support Cooperative marketing system <input type="checkbox"/> Build new institutes for distribution of credits for fisheries and livestock <input type="checkbox"/> Credit should be given at minimum interest (service charge only) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Cooperative farming and marketing should be encouraged <input type="checkbox"/> Security free loan/credit from bank be made available |


| II) Food Access (Market information & value addition) | |
|--|--|
| Officials & other stakeholders | Farmers |
| <p><i>Intervention on storage</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Increase storage facilities of agricultural products at rural level by GOs and Private Sectors with establishment of special types of cold storage for specific products <input type="checkbox"/> Provide credit facility for establishment of cold storage and agribusiness, <input type="checkbox"/> Provide training on technical knowhow of product preservation and storage <input type="checkbox"/> Provide supports for cooling chain for carrying products to distance markets and linking farmer with business chain <p><i>Marketing and trade</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Enhance present marketing facilities (fish landing, and market infrastructures) in the region. Establish sufficient road network for easy movement and marketing of products <input type="checkbox"/> Support Cooperative marketing system for developing supply chains of farmers and middlemen <input type="checkbox"/> Need formulation of act on Farmers' right like consumer act <input type="checkbox"/> Establish Modern slaughter house and live poultry marketing facilities with manpower at the local market, The implementing agencies will be municipality, city corporation, Upazilla, Union Parishad <input type="checkbox"/> Support monitoring of farm level markets and agricultural products prices <input type="checkbox"/> Resolve problem of marketing of milk <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure involvement of some research and training institutions (like RDA, Bogra) in respect of conducting research and piloting some experiments <p><i>Value addition</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support training on processing, value addition, preservation of agro-based products, and marketing • System development is needed in creating cropping zone for efficient production and marketing of product • Establishment of cropping zone specific processing plant and marketing network <input type="checkbox"/> Provide training and credit for establishing processing farms to the potential entrepreneurs <input type="checkbox"/> Establish milk and meat processing plant <input type="checkbox"/> Piloting of food processing plant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Support Government procurement of food grain directly from farmers <input type="checkbox"/> Export market for potato and other produces <input type="checkbox"/> Tol/local tax should be reasonably fixed and displayed at market/announced by Government authority |

| III) Food utilization (Nutrition) | |
|---|----------------|
| Officials & other stakeholders | Farmers |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Developing awareness on nutrition through media and training <input type="checkbox"/> Increase storage facilities of all types of foods <input type="checkbox"/> Food quality should be improved as per international standards <input type="checkbox"/> Food processing facilities should be developed (such as icing, chilling, etc) <input type="checkbox"/> Food monitoring facilities should be increased in field level <input type="checkbox"/> Campaign on diversification of food habits which leads to creating demand in the market. <input type="checkbox"/> Livestock can play important role for nutrition. Need to support processing and marketing of livestock products. <input type="checkbox"/> Expand VGD facilities for the fishers of different char lands and conserve water bodies and biodiversity | |
| IV) Regional issues | |
| Officials & other stakeholders only | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Strengthening regional research activities to cope with climate change situation <input type="checkbox"/> Development submergence and drought- tolerant short duration rice varieties <input type="checkbox"/> Support dissemination of submergence tolerant rice varieties (BRRI Dhan 51 and 52) at farmers level <input type="checkbox"/> Develop marketing facilities in the region <input type="checkbox"/> Introduce leguminous crops into the cropping pattern <input type="checkbox"/> Strengthen research on new insects and diseases due to climate change <input type="checkbox"/> Promote application of lime in low PH soil areas for upland crops <input type="checkbox"/> Provide training to the sugarcane farmers and gur makers <input type="checkbox"/> Support management of control of fruit pests (bar fruit borer, mango hopper, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Support establishment of biogas plant in new areas <input type="checkbox"/> Develop retting facilities for jute crops <input type="checkbox"/> Support farmers' training on balanced fertilizers <input type="checkbox"/> Develop public-private partnership on tissue culture facilities <input type="checkbox"/> Support production of quality seeds by the farmer themselves <input type="checkbox"/> Develop new flexible HYVs to meet climatic hazards <input type="checkbox"/> Development of resource(water and soil etc) conserving technologies <input type="checkbox"/> Support fodder production by integrated farming <input type="checkbox"/> Support farmers for application of fertilizers on the basis of soil test <input type="checkbox"/> Develop appropriate cropping pattern for high Barind with short duration HYV Aus varieties <input type="checkbox"/> Promote conservation of rain water for cultivation of non-rice crops <input type="checkbox"/> Encourage crop diversification with greater thrust with ecological balance through integrated resource management practices <input type="checkbox"/> Adaptive trials for direct seeded rice cultivars. | |

Synthesis of Consultations with farmers, micro-entrepreneurs and their organizations



Synthesis of Consultations with Civil Society Organizations



Record of Issues that Arose in the Discussion Meeting on January 06, 2011 at Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE), Khamar Bari on CIP consultation

Consultation was held at the DAE conference room on the morning of 6th January, 2011. The Director General of DAE chaired the consultation. Ms. Lalita Bhattacharjee, FAO, made a welcome remark on behalf of FAO. Dr. Z. Karim moderated the discussion. Systematic presentation and discussion were held on the various programme area and priority interventions.

The relevant issues emerged from the discussion are recorded:

- i. Explore a new programme area on climate change adaptation on sustainable production of crops, fishery and livestock, while the first programme area should be renamed as Integrated research and extension development.
- ii. Suggested Inclusion of the following under Programme # 1, (in addition to earlier Proposed focus and priority interventions):
 - Strengthening agricultural technology transfer system
 - Faster promotion of already mature technology for increasing productivity
 - Promote agriculture diversification (crops, fishery and livestock)
 - Establish soil health care management
 - Promote vegetable and fruit production
- iii. Under programme # 3: Strengthening Community-based seed production system needs to be included as an additional focus area. It is also suggested to include the Seed Certification Agency as an implementation agency.
- iv. Under programme # 6 (access to market): include capacity development initiatives to strengthen DAE.
- v. Under Programme # 2, 3, 6, and 10: include DAE as one of the agencies to be considered.
- vi. Deleting the name of projects from the list of implementing institutions, for example ASPS and NATP.

Regarding budget and priorities, DAE has been invited to recast the allocation and to provide information in the supplied template. Dr. Lalita emphasized that nutrition education should be strengthened in the agriculture extension programme. Dr Karim summed up the discussion. The chair also highlighted above points and concluded 3 hour consultation offering thanks to all.

Record of Issues that Arose in the Discussion Meeting on January 09, 2011 at Department of Fisheries, Mayatsha Bhaban on CIP consultation

A Consultation on the CIP was held at the Department of Fisheries conference room in the morning of 9th January 2011. The Director General of DoF Mr. Mahbubur Rahman chaired the consultation and Dr. Z. Karim moderated the process of discussion. The CIP document was discussed and the following points/issues were raised in the light of the programmes and priority interventions by the senior officials of DOF participating in meeting:

- i. Rename the Fishery Development Programme of the CIP document as Fisheries and Aquaculture Development.
- ii. Include following activities under Programme # 4, in addition to earlier focus interventions:
 - Marine and brackish water fisheries resources management and capacity development
 - Fisheries habitat restoration in the mangroves
 - Establishing disease diagnostic centre in DOF field offices
 - Fish Breeding ground development in brackish water system
 - Improved Sanctuary management in open water culture
- iii. Under programme # 6 (access to market): include capacity development for DoF and infrastructure development on storage, transportation, handling and marketing facilities.

There is an overall suggestion to include DoF in Programme # 1, 2, 6, 10 and 12 in addition to other institutions already included.

Regarding activities, DoF was invited to further provide priority investment areas and budget under the required template within one week. It was decided that DoF officials meet again with the CIP team after finalization of their recommendations in line with CIP document. Dr Karim summed up the discussion. The chair also highlighted two more areas of interventions: i) planning fisheries development considering the positive/and negative impacts of climate change; and ii) Capital dredging that would be required for water resource management and restoration of habitat for fisheries development (specially for Hilsa). He then concluded the consultation with thanks to all.

Record of Issues that Arose in the Discussion Meeting on January 10, 2011 at DLS, Farmgate on CIP consultation

A Consultation on the CIP was held at the Department of Livestock Services (DLS) conference room in the morning of 10th January 2011. The Director General of DLS Mr. Asraf Ali chaired the consultation and Dr. Z. Karim moderated the process of discussion. The CIP document was discussed and the following points/issues were raised in the light of the programmes and priority interventions by the senior officials of DLS participating in the meeting:

- i. The participants suggested inclusion of the following specific activities under Programme # 5, apart from the earlier Proposed focus and priority interventions:
 - Strengthen DLS with respect to a) increasing the professional strength b) developing modern infrastructure facility and c) imparting higher training abroad.
 - Strengthen disease research and vaccine production of DLS
 - Establishing veterinary disease diagnostic centre in DLS field offices
 - Strengthen AI services of DLS with development of infrastructure (storage, transportation) and manpower
 - Strengthen disease surveillance system of DLS
 - Improvement of indigenous chicken
 - Promote public private partnership for livestock development
 - Support research on feeds and fodder
 - Support establishing reliable livestock data base
 - Promote farmer's training for livestock development
- ii. In programme # 6 on access to market, the participants highlighted the inclusion of DLS for Promotion of community based supply chain development for livestock products (e. g, Community based contract growers, Rural Chilling Centre, storage, value addition, etc)

There is an overall suggestion to include DLS in Programme # 1, 6, 8, and 10 in addition to other institutions already included.

Regarding activities, DLS was invited to provide revised investment priorities and related budget under the required template within one week. Dr Karim summed up the discussion. The chair also highlighted above points. He then concluded the consultation with thanks to all.

Record of Issues that Arose in the Discussion Meetings on January 13, 2011 and March 16 at Bangladesh Agricultural Research Council (BARC), Farmgate on CIP consultation

A Consultation on the CIP was held at the BARC conference room in the morning of 13th January, 2011. The Chairman of BARC Dr Wais Kabir chaired the consultation, Mr. Ad Spijkers, FAOR made introductory speech highlighting importance of CIP and role of NARS. Dr. Z. Karim moderated the process of discussion. The CIP document was discussed and the following points/issues were raised in the light of the programmes and priority interventions by the heads of the NARS institutes participating in the meeting:

- Livestock and Fishery research is missing in the programmes - P1 and P5 of CIP
- Include arsenic problem and micro nutrients issues for soil health management.
- Participation of NGOs and private sector in seed distribution was highlighted.
- Suggested inclusion of CGIAR, IRRI, ILRI, CYMMYT and World Fish in # 7. (Institutions involved) under Programme P5 of CIP.
- Enhance capacity of NARS in terms of infrastructure and HRD.
- Specific attention need to be given on HRD development for project implementation, management, monitoring and evaluation.
- Need to support technology development for summer season hybrid vegetables.
- Develop technology for unfavourable eco-system including southern delta, charland and Monga affected areas.
- Support technology generation on post- harvest and pre-harvest loss minimization

The chair mentioned that BARC has worked on identification of research priorities for 2020. It is still a draft and he assured to provide the draft within a week in order to work on the areas of NARS priorities. He then concluded the consultation with thanks to all.

Another meeting took place between BARC and the CIP formulation team on March 16 to further discuss Investment Programme 1 on “Sustainable and diversified agriculture through integrated research and extension”. The meeting agreed that investments should address the following: (i) capacities of research agencies and partners to respond to the current and emerging challenges including climate change, (ii) research activities to develop and propagate effective solutions to enhance productivity, diversify food production and increase resilience to climate change. Moreover, it was agreed that the CIP provisions would be taken into account in the upcoming agricultural strategy under preparation.

Record of Issues that Arose in the Discussion Meeting on January 17, 2011 at Directorate-General of Health Services (DGHS), Mohakhali, on CIP consultation

A Consultation on the CIP was held at the conference room of DGHS of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MOHFW) in the afternoon of 17th January, 2011. The Director Planning and Research, DGHS, chaired the consultation and gave the welcome address. Dr. Z. Karim moderated the process of discussion.

The CIP document was discussed and the following points/issues were raised in the light of the programmes and priority interventions by the officials of DGHS participating in the meeting:

- Support for scaling up of nutrition interventions in the country.
- Expand and empower community clinics
- Support complementary feeding programmes for children
- Strengthen national nutritional services under DGHS

The chair also highlighted importance of reducing malnutrition problem of the children and women. He mentioned that written feedback will be provided within a week and Dr Mustafizur Rahman, Team member, PPC will coordinate this. He then concluded the consultation with thanks to all.

Record of Issues that Arose in the Discussion Meeting on January 18, 2011 at Department of Food, Khaddya Bhavan, on CIP consultation

A Consultation on the CIP with the Department of Food (DoF) of the Ministry of Food and Disaster Management (MoFDM) in the DoF's conference room in the afternoon of 18th January 2011. The Director General chaired the consultation and gave the welcome address. Dr. Z. Karim moderated the process of discussion.

The CIP document was discussed and the following points/issues were raised in the light of the programmes and priority interventions by the officials of Department of Food and Disaster Management & Relief Division participating in the meeting:

- Support for automation of public food distribution system with introduction of ICT
- Support establishment of modern storage facilities
- Support institutional capacity building in terms of HRD and infrastructure
- Develop institution for research, planning and policy issues
- Strengthening capacity for implementation of redesigned safety net programmes

The chair also highlighted above issues. He mentioned that written feedback will be provided within a week and concluded the consultation with thanks to all.

National Forum on Improving the Country Investment Plan for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition

Dhaka, 20th March, 2011

Forum Summary

A wide variety of stakeholders came together on the 20th of March, 2011 to review the draft updated Country Investment Plan for Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition (CIP). The Forum resulted in a fruitful debate about key priorities and interventions that should be a part of the CIP, as well as how to move forward in implementing the plan.

GOVERNMENT

The presence of 5 different ministers (Agriculture, Finance, Food and Disaster Management, Livestock and Fisheries and Planning) was a clear demonstration of the political commitment of the Government of Bangladesh to the CIP. The inter-ministerial process behind the updating of the CIP was praised and *further collaboration between the ministries was called for*. Additionally, several Government representatives called upon the donor community to help address the funding gap of the CIP.

DP SUPPORT

Development partners, mobilized through the CIP updating process, also showed their support at the forum. The U.S. voiced its full support for the plan as well as its eagerness to move forward with implementation. Additionally, the U.S. spoke of accelerating funding levels for agriculture and nutrition and called for robust private sector involvement in implementation of the plan. WFP also iterated their commitment to the plan, and that they are looking forward to implementation. Technical issues raised by WFP relate to the need to aim at improving household food security through production, but also targeting for safety nets needs strengthening, as well as a focus on the first 1,000 days. The E.U. also spoke on the comprehensiveness of the plan, and the need to harmonize the nutrition interventions. A representative from the World Bank stated that the Bank saw an opportunity for strengthened coordination through the CIP, and was looking to consolidate their projects and align with the CIP through its results framework. BRAC committed to being a partner in the CIP implementation process and iterated the importance of bringing the private sector on board. Further alignment was seen from CGIAR, whose research programmes line up with the CIP.

PRIVATE SECTOR

Throughout the forum many participants called for collaboration with the private sector, recognizing its role as an emerging actor in the agriculture and food security sector. Several ideas emerged, including mobilizing private sector resources to help fill the US \$ 3 billion funding gap as well as interventions such as crop insurance, input supply and the provision of credit. They vocalized the importance of meeting frequently to evaluate and review implementation plans and arrangements, and also to establish mechanisms that ensure accountability of private sectors actors. Representatives from the sector were present at the forum and demonstrated their commitment to food security, but voiced the *need for strengthened collaboration between the public and private sectors*.

PRIORITIES

Forum participants were asked to express their priorities for the CIP. Issues that arose were in line with the priorities that arose during the consultation process.

Nutrition was a key issue that emerged throughout as a priority the Forum. From production to access to utilization, it was made clear that nutrition must be addressed by interventions across the board. This comprehensive vision of nutrition must be a multi-sector responsibility. Further, a strong call was iterated for capacity building and knowledge improvements that would strengthen absorptive capacity for investments in the agriculture, food and nutrition security sector. Access to credit was raised as another priority for stakeholders, along with a call for innovation, research and investment in education. Other priorities included seed sector quality control, the need for improvements in water usage, more open and transparent market information (including price mapping). Forestry and family planning were also brought up during the discussion, as well as the debate between cash versus input subsidies. Finally, it was recommended that the CIP be translated into Bangla and spread to farmers themselves.

MONITORING

During the forum, the M&E and institutional arrangements envisioned for the CIP were shared. CIP implementation and monitoring will converge with systems already in place. It was recommended that development partners are incorporated into the system, particularly at the level of monitoring—as the CIP is a reference tool not just for the Government, but also in the planning of DPs’ interventions. The Food Planning and Monitoring Unit of the Ministry of Food and Disaster Management was nominated as the focal point for monitoring activities, with CIP implementation taking place in collaboration with the IMED as well as other ministries.

POLICY ISSUES

IFPRI presented their work on policy issues linked to CIP implementation. One of the most important issues, of critical policy concern for the CIP, is that of land tenure. Producers will not be likely to make investments if they don’t have tenure on their land. Lack of tenure makes them risk averse and thus likely to miss out on opportunities for improved production. Credit and education also arose as key policy issues.

THE WAY FORWARD

The Forum outlined several important steps to ensure effective implementation. The CIP should be incorporated into the 6th Five Year Plan and additional strategic partnerships should be established. It was also recommended to find lead agencies/supporting units for each programme. The Local Consultative Group on Agriculture, Rural Development and Food Security was elaborated as a good donor coordination mechanism to link up with the CIP.

Another key that was mentioned for successful implementation is strong capacities of producer organizations – both female and male. Though the CIP consultation aimed to tap the knowledge of the farming community and civil society, their presence at the Forum was not particularly strong—demonstrating *a clear need for strengthening of community based and farmer organizations*. These organizations are a viable way to address many of the issues that arose during the Forum, including credit, inputs and market access. Capacity strengthening is also needed for institutions at the community level and for other implementing partners in Bangladesh.

Support of the development partners, particularly through the delivery of committed funds, is another key for moving the CIP forward. Further, implementers must ensure that public investments leverage private investments – particularly those of producers, which should be aggregated through producer organizations, in order to lower transaction costs.

Forum participants expressed the need for a CIP implementation plan, which has been elaborated in the main text of this document.

ANNEX 2: RESULTS FRAMEWORK

The Results Framework defines the CIP strategic vision, in terms of goals and expected results to be achieved for improving food security in Bangladesh. The Results Framework represents also the key reference for guiding CIP implementation and for monitoring progress towards the expected results.

CIP Results are reflected into a three-level results chain which defines a coherent architecture of logically linked expected Outcomes/Impacts (CIP Components), Outputs (aggregate outputs of CIP Programmes and sub-outputs of investment areas under each Programme) and Inputs (CIP Investment projects). The CIP results chain planning is based on the logical framework methodology and on the key assumption that the effective implementation of the identified investment interventions will contribute to the achievement of the related expected Outputs and Outcomes/Impacts.

The CIP Results planning process is a top-down exercise which answers to the following flow of questions:

- 1) *“In which areas do we have to work to improve food security in the country? What are the expected impacts of our efforts?”*


The answer to these questions led to the formulation of three Impact statements associated to each of the CIP components addressing Food Availability, Food Access and Food Utilization.

- 2) *“What are the programmes to be implemented for contributing to the achievement of the CIP Expected Outcomes/Impacts? What are the aggregate Outputs we want to achieve through the implementation of the CIP programmes?”*

This question led to the identification of the twelve CIP Programmes, each of them associated to an Expected Aggregate Output statement (five on Food Availability; four on Food Access; three on Food Utilization).

- 3) *“What are the key investment interventions which are required to contribute to the achievement of the CIP expected aggregate Outputs?”*

The answer provided brought to the identification of forty priority investment areas.



CIP expected Outcomes/Impacts describe the intended changes in the development context as measured by people’s well-being, while expected Outputs reflect the medium-term development results that investment interventions are seeking to achieve. Findings from the CIP Monitoring and Evaluation processes will support the assessment of the relevance of the identified investment interventions and the extent to which they contribute to the achievement of CIP Outputs and Outcomes/Impacts.

The identified CIP Results are coherent with relevant key national strategic documents, such as the National MDGs and the National Food Policy (NFP), and reflect the findings of the CIP Prioritization and Costing exercises.

SMART Results (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound) are defined in the Results Framework Matrix at Impact and Outcome levels, providing a set of measurable targets, baselines and performance proxy indicators. In particular, Component level results (Targets, Baseline and Indicators) have been extracted from the National MDG and the National Food Policy (NFP) Plan of Action (PoA). Each of the 12 CIP Programmes is associated with one Expected Aggregate Output Statement, a set of proxy performance indicators and baseline information. Most of the Programme Indicators and Baselines have been extracted from the NFP PoA.

| NFP OVERALL GOAL | | | | | |
|---|----|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| To ensure dependable sustained food security for all people of the country at all times | No | PROXY INDICATORS | BASE LINE** | TARGETS | VERIFICATION SOURCES |
| | a | Prevalence of undernourished people | 27% (FAO 2010, collected 2005-07) | 17.5% by 2015 | FAO SOFI |
| | b | Prevalence of stunting | 43% (2009) | 25% by 2015 (2nd draft 6th FYP) | BDHS |
| | c | Prevalence of underweight children under five years of age (%) | 41% | 33% (2nd draft 6th FYP) | BDHS-NIPORT |



| CIP EXPECTED OUTCOME/IMPACT | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|-----|--|--|--|--|
| No | COMPONENTS | EXPECTED OUTCOME/IMPACT STATEMENTS | No | PROXY INDICATORS | BASE LINE** | TARGETS (by end of 2015) | VERIFICATION SOURCES |
| 1 | Food availability | Adequate and stable supply of safe and nutritious food is achieved | 1.1 | Rate of growth of food GDP in constant prices | 4.2% | 4.4% | BBS |
| | | | 1.2 | Rice import dependency (import/availability) | 1.4% (average 07/08 – 09-10) | 0% | FPMU |
| | | | 1.3 | Coefficient of variation of rice production over the last 10 years | 0.1 (00/01 to 09/10) | 0 | BBS |
| | | | 1.4 | Share of rice value added in total food value added in current price | 39.4% (07-08) | To be defined by GoB | BBS |
| 2 | Food access | Increased purchasing power and access to food by the people | 2.1 | Average growth of wages expressed in kg of rice | 6.4% (07/08-09/10) | ≥GDP growth+ 0.5 | Bangladesh Bank/ Dpt of Agric. Marketing |
| | | | 2.2 | Absolute DCI poverty rate (<2122 kcal) | 40% (2005) | 24% (MDG 1, target 1.9) | MDG Report |
| | | | 2.3 | Hard Core DCI poverty rate (<1805 kcal) | 19.5% (2005) | 14% (MDG 1, target 1.10) | BBS |
| | | | 2.4 | Poverty gap ratio (%) | 9% (2005) | 8% by 2015 (draft 6 th FYP) | BBS |
| | | | 2.5 | Inflation differential between general CPI and food CPI (%) | 6.35% (average CPI differential 06-09) | Maximum 0% | Bangladesh Bank/BBS |
| 3 | Food Utilization | Adequate nutrition achieved for all individuals, especially women and children | 3.1 | National Dietary Energy Supply (DES) from Cereals (%) | 69% (2010) | Recommended 60% | HIES |
| | | | 3.2 | Chronic Energy Deficiency (CED) prevalence among women (BMI <18.5%) | 32% (2005) | 20% by 2015 | BBS/HKI |
| | | | 3.3 | Prevalence of iodine deficiency among women (goitre) | 11.7% (2004-05) | < 5% | BBS/UNICEF |
| | | | 3.4 | Proportion of children receiving minimum acceptable diet at 6-23 months of age | 42% (2007) | 56% by 2016 (HPNSDP) | BDHS and HKI/BBS |
| | | | 3.5 | Prevalence of iron deficiency anaemia during pregnancy | 46% (2004) | <20% (WHO/UNICEF threshold) | Various surveys |

Expected Aggregate Outputs and Indicators

| CIP COMPONENTS/ OUTCOMES/ IMPACTS | | | CIP PROGRAMMES / OUTPUTS | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|---|---|------------|--|-----------------|----------------------|
| No | COMPONENTS | EXPECTED OUTCOME/ IMPACT STATEMENTS | No | Programme Titles | PROGRAMME EXPECTED AGGREGATE OUTPUT | No | OUTPUT PROXY INDICATORS | BASE LINES | VERIFICATION SOURCES |
| 1 | Food Availability | Adequate and stable supply of safe and nutritious food achieved at national level | 1.1 | (1) Sustainable and diversified agriculture through integrated research and extension | Productivity is enhanced, food production is diversified and resilience to climate change is increased through effective generation and propagation of sustainable technical solutions. | 1.1.1 | No. of improved new rice varieties developed (1.1.1 PoA Monitoring Report) | 5 | BRRI |
| | | | | | | 1.1.2 | No. of new non-rice varieties developed | 2010 | BARI/BINA/BAU |
| | | | | | | | Wheat | 2 | |
| | | | | | | | Maize | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | Potato | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | Pulses | 0 | |
| | | | | | | | Vegetables | 2 | |
| | | | | | | | Oil Seeds | 0 | |
| | | | | | | Fruits | 5 | | |
| | | | | | | 1.1.3 | No. of farmers trained on sustainable agriculture practices | 404,679 (09-10) | MoA (DAE) |
| | | | 1.1.4 | Share of rice on total cropped land | 76.22% (07-08) | MoA | | | |
| | | | 1.1.5 | Increase in major crops production in thousand MT | 2005-07 average | BBS | | | |
| | | | | Rice | 2.635 | | | | |
| | | | | Wheat | 816 | | | | |
| | | | | Maize | 593 | | | | |
| | | | | Potato | 4.728 | | | | |
| | | | | Pulses | 284 | | | | |
| | | | | Vegetables | 2.261 | | | | |
| | | | | Oil Seeds | 316 | | | | |
| | | | Fruits | 5.695 | | | | | |
| 1.2 | (2) Improved Water Management and Infrastructure for Irrigation Purposes | Sustainable and efficient water management is ensured for responding to farmer needs | 1.2.1 | % of cropped area under irrigation (1.2.1 PoA Monitoring Report) | 44.38% (07-08) | BBS | | | |
| | | | 1.2.2 | Average trend of water table in Northern regions (in meters per year) | -0.078 (07-08) | BBS | | | |
| | | | 1.2.3 | Irrigation cost as % of total Boro production cost (1.2.3 PoA Monitoring Report) | 16.21% (08-09) | FPMU / MoA | | | |
| | | | 1.2.4 | Ground water table depth variation in the northern regions | -0.078 (88-07) | WARPO | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|-------|--|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| 1.3 | (3) Improved quality of input and soil fertility | Access to quality inputs is improved and soil fertility is enhanced. | 1.3.1 | Improved seeds supply (BADC, DAE and private companies) as % agronomic requirements | 2009-10 | MoA |
| | | | | <i>Rice</i> | 44.62% | |
| | | | | <i>Wheat</i> | 48.24% | |
| | | | | <i>Maize</i> | 80.80% | |
| | | | | <i>Potato</i> | 10.00% | |
| | | | | <i>Pulses</i> | 3.13% | |
| | | | | <i>Vegetables</i> | 32.15% | |
| | | | | <i>Oil Seeds</i> | 5.01% | |
| | | | 1.3.2 | % increase in improved seeds production | 20.88% (09-10) | MoA |
| | | | 1.3.3 | Supply of urea as % of estimated requirements (1.3.2 PoA Monitoring Report) | 98.01% | MoA |
| | | | 1.3.4 | Supply of TSP as % of estimated requirements (1.3.3 PoA Monitoring Report) | 53.68% | MoA/BBS |
| | | | 1.3.5 | Supply of MoP as % of estimated requirements (1.3.4 PoA Monitoring Report) | 56.25% | MoA/BBS |
| | | | 1.3.6 | Increase in major crops yields (MT/Ha) | 2004-07 average | MoA |
| | | | | | <i>Rice</i> | |
| <i>Wheat</i> | 1.7% | | | | | |
| <i>Maize</i> | 2.3% | | | | | |
| <i>Potato</i> | 15.0% | | | | | |
| <i>Pulses</i> | 0.3% | | | | | |
| <i>Vegetables</i> | 3.0% | | | | | |
| <i>Oil Seeds</i> | 0.4% | | | | | |
| <i>Fruits</i> | 11.3% (05-07 av. | | | | | |
| 1.4 | (4) Fisheries & Aquaculture Development | Sustainable increase of fishery production through improved technology and natural resources management | 1.4.1 | GDP from fishery sector as % of agriculture GDP (excluding forest), at constant price 1995-1996 (1.4.4 PoA Monitoring Report) | 24.27% (08-09) | BBS |
| | | | 1.4.2 | % increase in national aquaculture production | 5.69% (08-09) | FAO/DOF |
| 1.5 | (5) Livestock Development, with a focus on poultry and dairy production | Sustainable increase of livestock production is developed through improved technology, better animal health and resilient management practices. | 1.5.1 | GDP from livestock sector as % of agricultural GDP (excluding forest, at constant price 1995-96) (1.4.3 PoA Monitoring Report) | 14.48% (08-09) | BBS |
| | | | 1.5.2 | Total production (quantity) of | 2008-09 | Bangladesh Economic Review/ DLS |
| | | | | <i>Eggs (million)</i> | 4,692 | |
| | | | | <i>Milk (million MT)</i> | 2,286 | |
| <i>Meat (million MT)</i> | 1,084 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---|-------|--|---|----------|---|---------------------|--|--------|
| 2 | Food Access | Increased purchasing power and access to food by the people | 2.1 | (6) Improved access to markets, value-addition in agriculture, and to non farm incomes | Value chains are developed contributing to better access to food and increased rural incomes. | 1.5.3 | % increase of artificial insemination to previous year | 13.6% (08/09-09/10) | Department of Livestock Services | |
| | | | | | | 1.5.4 | Difference in number of poultry deaths due to avian flu from previous year | +389% | FAO | |
| | | | | | | 2.1.1 | Difference between farm gate and retail price of selected goods | 2010 | Agricultural Marketing Department | |
| | | | | | | | | <i>Coarse rice</i> | | 11.11% |
| | | | | | | | | <i>Lentil</i> | | 26.87% |
| | | | | | | | | <i>Onion</i> | | 23.81% |
| | | | | | | | | <i>Brinjal</i> | | 20.00% |
| | | | | | | 2.1.2 | Difference between dealers' and farmers' prices of fertilizers | 2009/10 | MoA | |
| | | | | | | | | <i>Urea</i> | | 11.40% |
| | | | | | | | | <i>TSP</i> | | 7.23% |
| | | | | <i>MoP</i> | 7.25% | | | | | |
| | | | 2.1.4 | Variation of per capita rural incomes in real terms | Tk. 1246 | HIES BBS | | | | |
| | | | 2.1.5 | Rural women self-employed, as % of total rural women employed (2.5.4 PoA Monitoring Report) | 11.6% (05-06) | BBS LFS | | | | |
| | | | 2.1.6 | Rural women engaged in unpaid family work, % of total rural women employed (2.5.5 PoA Monitoring Report) | 71.8% (05-06) | BBS LFS | | | | |
| | | | 2.2 | (7) Strengthened capacities for implementation and monitoring of NFP and CIP actions | National capacities to design, implement and monitor NFP PoA and investment operations are strengthened | 2.2.1 | No. and value of new investment projects under CIP approved | 0 | CIP Monitoring Reports | |
| | | | | | | 2.2.2 | CIP available budget execution performance (%) | 0% | CIP Monitoring Reports | |
| | | | | | | 2.2.3 | CIP Monitoring Reports are regularly produced | 0 | CIP Monitoring Reports | |
| | | | 2.3 | (8) Enhanced Public Food Management Systems | Enhanced efficiency and effectiveness of Public Food Management Systems | 2.3.1 | Effective grain storage capacity at close of fiscal year in mt (1.11.1 PoA Monitoring Report) | 1,473,217 (08-09) | Weekly Foodgrain Situation Report, MIS DG Food | |
| 2.3.2 | Ratio of food grain quantity distributed by MoFDM through GR and VGF (in kg) and number of individuals affected by natural disasters in that particular year (2.2.2 PoA Monitoring Report) | 88 (2009) | | | | NFPCSP | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|--|----------|--|---------------------|-------|--|--|------------------------|--|---|-------------|--|------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | | | | 2.3.3 | Public food grain procurement as a % of target | 69% | DG Food | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 2.3.4 | PFDS operating margin | 2008-09 44% | MoF, FPMU | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 2.4 | (9) Institutional Development and Capacity Development for more effective safety nets. | Effectiveness and targeting of social safety net programmes are improved through strengthened institutional capacities to design and implement them. | 2.4.1 | Budget coverage of VGF and VGD, million cards (2.4.1. PoA Monitoring report) | 2009-10 7.86 0.60 | DMRD | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | VGF VGD | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | 2.4.2 | Safety net programmes expenditure as % of GDP | 2010-11 2.5% | MoF | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | 2.4.3 | Budgeted coverage of EGPP beneficiary | 2009-10 2 million | DMRD, MoFDM | | | |
| | | | | | | 3 | Food Utilization | Adequate nutrition achieved for all individuals, especially women and children | 3.1 | (10) Community based nutrition programmes and services | Nutrition and health are improved at community level through integrated short and long term interventions. | 3.1.1 | Proportion of infants under six months exclusively breast fed (%) | 43% | BDHS/ NIPORT |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.1.2 | % of poor households raising home gardening and backyard poultry (3.3.1 PoA Monitoring Report) | 47% (2007) | HKI/ CMN/BBS |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.1.3 | Share of total dietary energy consumption from 8 major food groups (cereals, milk, meat, sugar, oil, fruit, vegetables, starchy roots) | 69% (DES cereals 2005) | BBS |
| | | | | | | | | | 3.2 | (11) Orient food and nutrition program through data | Effective information supports planning, monitoring and evaluation of food security policies and interventions. | 3.2.1 | Behavioural change communication (BCC) operational | last update in 2008 | National nutritional surveys |
| 3.2.2 | Desirable Dietary Pattern (DDP) established and updated | INFS 1998 / BIDS-INFS-WFP 2008 | INFS/ DU | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2.2 | Food Composition Tables (FCT) updated | last update in 1988 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.3 | (12) Food Safety and Quality Improvement | National food safety control management, and food borne illness surveillance services are strengthened | 3.3.1 | # of compulsory food items standardized by BSTI (3.6.1 PoA Monitoring Report) | 58 (2009) | | | | BSTI | | | | | | |
| | | | 3.3.2 | Variation of diarrhea in under 5 children (in two week period) | Diarrhea 10% (2007) | | | | BDHS/ NIPORT | | | | | | |
| | | | 3.3.3 | Variation in coverage of safe water supply for domestic use (3.5.1 PoA Monitoring Report) | 97% (2009) | | | | DPHE/ UNICEF/ SOWC | | | | | | |
| | | | 3.3.4 | Variation in access to safe drinking water in arsenic affected areas (3.5.3 PoA Monitoring Report) | 68% (2009) | | | | UNICEF/ WHO/ FAO/ DPHE | | | | | | |

Expected Outputs, Expected Sub-outputs (CIP Priority Investment Areas)

| CIP COMPONENTS / OUTCOMES/ IMPACTS | | | CIP PROGRAMMES / OUTPUTS | | | CIP INVESTMENT AREAS / SUB-OUTPUTS | |
|---|---|--|---------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| No | COMPONENTS | EXPECTED IMPACT STATEMENTS | No | Programme Titles | PROGRAMME EXPECTED AGGREGATE OUTPUTS | No. | Priority Interventions |
| 1 | Food Availability | Adequate and stable supply of safe and nutritious food achieved at national level | 1.1 | (1) Sustainable and diversified agriculture through integrated research and extension | Productivity is enhanced, food production is diversified and resilience to climate change is increased through effective generation and propagation of sustainable technical solutions. | 1.1.1 | Enhance research & knowledge generation and adoption to increase agricultural productivity and diversity in a sustainable manner |
| | | | | | | 1.1.2 | Improve extension services to propagate knowledge & practices, supported by community-based experimentation & learning and indigenous knowledge |
| | | | | | | 1.1.3 | Promote the development of responses to adapt agricultural systems to climate change |
| | | | 1.2 | (2) Improved Water Management and Infrastructure for Irrigation Purposes | Sustainable and efficient water management is ensured for responding to farmer needs | 1.2.1 | Improve water management in water distribution systems and at farm level |
| | | | | | | 1.2.2 | Improve & increase efficiency of surface water irrigation, in particular in the south |
| | | | | | | 1.2.3 | Reduce impact of saline water intrusion in the South |
| | | | | | | 1.2.4 | Enhance river water flow to the South |
| | | | 1.3 | (3) Improved quality of input and soil fertility | Access to quality inputs is improved and soil fertility is enhanced. | 1.3.1 | Enhance availability of agricultural inputs, tested and certified for quality of diversified crops |
| | | | | | | 1.3.2 | Develop public private partnerships through capacity development |
| | | | | | | 1.3.3 | Improve and increase sustainability of soil fertility management |
| | | | | | | 1.3.4 | Facilitate access to credit and other financial services by smallholders and the rural poor |
| | | | 1.4 | (4) Fisheries & Aquaculture Development | Sustainable increase of fishery production through improved technology and natural resources management | 1.4.1 | Develop small scale aquaculture, through access to quality inputs, advice and skills |
| | | | | | | 1.4.2 | Improve management of fisheries resources |
| | | | | | | 1.4.3 | Develop public private partnerships in support of infrastructure and services development |
| | | | | | | 1.4.4 | Promote production in the South through sustainable shrimp and prawn development and community based co management of wetlands. |
| | | | 1.5 | (5) Livestock Development, with a focus on poultry and dairy production | Sustainable increase of livestock production is developed through improved technology, better animal health and resilient management practices. | 1.5.1 | Strengthen animal health services, including better diagnosis and surveillance systems to mitigate disease outbreaks |
| 1.5.2 | Strengthen husbandry capacity at household level through community based improved knowledge and advisory services | | | | | | |
| 1.5.3 | Improve availability and quality of inputs through public private partnerships | | | | | | |
| 1.5.4 | Research on livestock development, including genetic improvement | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|--|-----|--|--|-------|---|
| 2 | Food Access | Increased purchasing power and access to food by the people | 2.1 | (6) Improved access to markets, value-addition in agriculture, and to non farm incomes | Value chains are developed contributing to better access to food and increased rural incomes. | 2.1.1 | Improve physical access to markets, facilities and information |
| | | | | | | 2.1.2 | Mobilize and promote producer & marketing groups for improved market access and knowledge |
| | | | | | | 2.1.3 | Develop adequate storage, processing & value addition and reduce waste through public-private partnerships |
| | | | | | | 2.1.4 | Promote and assist the development of off farm activities and rural businesses |
| | | | 2.2 | (7) Strengthened capacities for implementation and monitoring of NFP and CIP actions | National capacities to design, implement and monitor NFP PoA and investment operations are strengthened | 2.2.1 | Strengthen capacities to implement, monitor and coordinate National Food Policy-Plan of Action and CIP; |
| | | | | | | 2.2.2 | Strengthen national capacities for design, implementation & monitoring of CIP projects |
| | | | | | | 2.2.3 | Strengthen capacities of civil society organizations to contribute to CIP development & implementation |
| | | | 2.3 | (8) Enhanced Public Food Management Systems | Enhanced efficiency and effectiveness of Public Food Management Systems | 2.3.1 | Enhance efficiency and effectiveness of Public Food Management Systems and improve its impact on price stabilization |
| | | | | | | 2.3.2 | Build capacities of Ministry of Food and Disaster Management and Directorate of Food to better manage the food system |
| | | | | | | 2.3.3 | Increase and modernize public storage and handling facilities, including in disaster prone areas. |
| | | | 2.4 | (9) Institutional Development and Capacity Development for more effective safety nets. | Effectiveness and targeting of social safety net programmes are improved through strengthened institutional capacities to design and implement them. | 2.4.1 | Strengthen institutional capacities to effectively operate social safety net programmes and formulate a new integrated strategy for social safety net programmes to: (i) coordinate and streamline them; (ii) enhance impact and targeting; (iii) improve governance; |
| | | | | | | 2.4.2 | Investment in employment and income generation of social safety nets (including in ADP). |
| 3 | Food Utilization | Adequate nutrition achieved for all individuals, especially women and children | 3.1 | (10) Community based nutrition programmes and services | Nutrition and health are improved at community level through integrated short and long term interventions. | 3.1.1 | Community based livelihood and nutrition programmes, linked to National Nutrition Services (NNS) |
| | | | | | | 3.1.2 | Support community based efforts of homestead gardening, rearing small livestock, aquaculture and awareness building for improved nutrition |
| | | | | | | 3.1.3 | Link long term with immediate treatment of acute malnutrition, in particular through therapeutic and supplementary feeding |
| | | | 3.2 | (11) Orient food and nutrition program through data | Effective information supports planning, monitoring and evaluation of food security policies and interventions. | 3.2.1 | Undertake comprehensive national nutrition survey including food consumption survey and update food composition tables and studies |
| | | | | | | 3.2.2 | Undertake study of dietary diversification and supplementation needs and develop advocacy, awareness and educational materials to facilitate behavioural change in eating habits and practices |
| | | | | | | 3.2.3 | Strengthen national capacities in surveying and analysis to facilitate evidence based decisions |
| | | | 3.3 | (12) Food Safety and Quality Improvement | National food safety control management, and food borne illness surveillance services are strengthened | 3.3.1 | Improve surveillance system of food borne illnesses |
| | | | | | | 3.3.2 | Develop and enhance capacities of laboratories and systems for food quality assurance and safety and control of food |
| | | | | | | 3.3.3 | Develop food control management |

ANNEX 3: PROGRAMMES DESCRIPTION TABLES

Programme 1: Sustainable and diversified agriculture through integrated research and extension

| A. Key Features | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|--------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 | Programme Aggregate Output | Productivity is enhanced, food production is diversified and resilience to climate change is increased through effective generation and propagation of sustainable technical solutions | | | | |
| 2 | Output Indicators | <input type="checkbox"/> No of new rice varieties adapted to CC (1.1.1 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> No of new non-rice varieties developed (maize, wheat and pulses) (1.1.2 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> No. of extension workers trained on CC adaptation <input type="checkbox"/> No. of farmers benefitting from training or info campaign programmes on CC adaptation. <input type="checkbox"/> No of trained farmers applying sustainable/cc adapted agriculture practices | | | | |
| 3 | Relevant Government policies, strategies and plans | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ NSAPRII (Section 3.2.4); ✓ The Outline Perspective Plan 2010-2021 (Section 7.2); ✓ National Medium Term Priority Framework (Chapters 2 & 3); ✓ Research priorities in Bangladesh Agriculture, BARC, 2010 ✓ National Agricultural Technology Project 2008 (Chapter 1); ✓ NFP Plan of Action, Matrix 1.1; ✓ New Agriculture Extension Policy (1996); ✓ National IPM Policy 2002 (Chapter 2). ✓ BCCSAP and NAPA, 2009 ✓ Agriculture Policy, Draft, 2010 ✓ SFYP draft, 2011 | | | | |
| 4 | Major on-going investment operations | <i>Major investments are underway for technology generation through research for diversification and improvement of agricultural production and improved extension and information services from NARS, CGIAR and extension agencies. Among the major investment projects: the National Agricultural Technology Project (NATP), implemented by a number of GOB agencies including BARC, DAE and KGF, and the DANIDA-GOB funded Agricultural Extension Component (AEC of the ASPs-II). Other significant investments focus on climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction – as the DAE and DLS parts of the Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme (CDMP-II) and the Community based adaptation to CC & water security (LDCF). Other investments implemented by various agencies focus on programmes for dissemination of information on integrated agricultural development system and farm mechanization.</i> | | | | |
| 5 | Costs and financing requirements (from Annex 4) | Priority Rank | Total | Existing | Total Gap | Priority gap |
| | 1.1 Enhance research & knowledge generation and adoption to increase agricultural productivity and diversity in a sustainable manner | H | 186.92 | 31.87 | 155.05 | 108.53 |
| | 1.2 Improve extension services to propagate knowledge & practices, supported by community-based experimentation & learning and indigenous knowledge | H | 493.71 | 136.80 | 356.91 | 249.84 |
| | 1.3 Promote the development of responses to adapt agricultural systems to climate change | T | 100.61 | 8.50 | 92.11 | 82.89 |

B. Priority Interventions

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 6 | Priorities from Consultation Process (Brief description of activities) | <p>From various consultations the emerging key priority is strengthening of technology generation and adoption for diversified agricultural production. Also there was a strong call for interventions on climate change adaptation and mitigation. Research and extension were considered as key drivers for boosting agricultural productivity in the country. There is a need to develop more adapted crop varieties that will contribute to strengthened and diversified sustainable agricultural production. Support will be required to strengthen physical and human capacities of the key players in research and extension to ensure effective interventions in this programme area.</p> <p>The prioritization of activities linked to each of the interventions is as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Enhance research & knowledge generation and adoption to increase agricultural productivity and diversity in a sustainable manner</i></p> <p><i>Crops</i> Enhance capacity of NARS in terms of infrastructure and HRD (T). <i>Varietal development:</i> High yielding varieties of major crops with production technology (T). Develop public-private partnership on biotechnology and tissue culture facilities (H). Short maturing Aus and Aman rice, summer season hybrid vegetables and lean season fruits (H). Rice varieties rich in Vitamin, Zinc and Iron (M). Develop low-input but high output varieties (Hybrid, green super rice) (M). Collection, conservation and preservation of germplasm (M). <i>Management Practices:</i> Water and soil conserving technologies (T). Cropping pattern for high Barind with short maturing HYV Aus varieties (T). Adaptive trials for direct seeded rice cultivars and all technology developed by NARS (H). Technology for pre and post harvest loss minimization (H). Technology for organic farming of horticultural crops (H). Cultural practices for fertilizer, seedling age and short maturing rice varieties (H). Low-cost technology for hill, char, haor land and coastal areas (M). Introduce leguminous crops into the cropping pattern (M). Strengthened plant quarantine services (H).</p> <p><i>Livestock</i> Development of capacity for livestock research (T). Human resource and ICT skill development & digitalization of livestock research (H). <i>Disease control:</i> Development of control measures of emerging, re-emerging and trans-boundary zoonotic diseases (H). <i>Dairy and poultry development:</i> Dairy research and development (H). Poultry technology development for sustainable farming (H). <i>Value addition:</i> Research on value addition of livestock and poultry_products (milk, meat and eggs) (H). <i>Genetics:</i> Conservation and improvement of livestock (cattle, buffalo, goat and sheep), poultry and feeds and fodder germplasm (H).</p> <p><i>Fisheries</i> Strengthening research capacity and building online information networking of BFRI (H). <i>Coastal Aquaculture & marine fishery:</i> Integrated coastal rice-shrimp-prawn-fish farming system for sustainable management of land-water resources (T). Shrimp culture and value chain addition (T). Captive breeding, seed and grow-out production techniques of commercially important marine and brackish water species (M). Research on interventions for new grounds in deep sea fishing (M). <i>Inland aquaculture:</i> Quality brood, seed and sustainable grow-out production of freshwater giant prawn (T). Rationalization of feed development and feeding method for yield optimization and reducing costs (T). Improvement and standardization of species and location specific cage aquaculture (T). Fish hygiene and quality control (T). Disease and health management of shrimp and fish (T). Integrated homestead aquaculture, agriculture and livestock system (T). Participatory cohort or rotational breeding for sustainable supply of quality seed of cultured fish species (H). Brood development and breeding techniques for indigenous flood plain fish species (H). Extensive research on depletion of fishes in Kaptai lake (H). Research on conflict management of water bodies (H). Location specific aquaculture technology (H).</p> |
|---|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Improve extension services to propagate knowledge & practices, supported by community-based experimentation & learning and indigenous knowledge</p> <p>Capacity development: Capacity development of farmers' organizations (T). Capacity development of extension departments (DAE, DLS and DOF) (M). Technology adoption & community based learning: Farmers' skill training on seeds, balanced fertilizers, production of crops, livestock and fishery (T). Soil health improvement (T). Cropping zone for high value crops with support of agro-technology (T). Productivity increase of <i>Aus</i> and <i>Aman</i> rice (T). Agriculture diversification (crops, livestock, fishery) (H). Farm mechanization with machinery at reasonable price to face labour crisis (H). Contract farming with public-private partnership (M). Cultivation of quick growing vegetable, spices and fruits (M). Application of lime in low PH soil areas for upland crops (I). Promote sustainable agriculture: Develop a master plan for the southern delta of Bangladesh (T). Sustainable agricultural method for USG, LCC, Drum seeder, OM, soil test, etc. (H). Disseminate GIS based agro information (H). Promote e-agro-technology transfer system and support creation of nationwide digitized agricultural data base system (H). Strengthen linkage among research, extension and input services (H). Management of soil fertility- Facilitate application of fertilizers on the basis of soil test, supplying soil testing kits locally and strengthening of soil testing laboratories (T). Promote improved soil health management practices, introduce crop rotation with legumes (M). Expansion of arsenic mitigation technology (M).</p> <p>Promote the development of responses to adapt agricultural systems to climate change</p> <p>Capacity Development: Strengthening regional research infrastructure and activities to cope with climate change situations (H). Building capacity and creating awareness on climate change impacts (H). Strengthening dissemination of e-technology for rapid adaptation of climate change vulnerabilities (H). Research: Research on stress tolerant variety development (T). Adaptation trial in the vulnerable climatic regions based on the priority of NAPA and BCCSAP (T). Strengthen research on new insects and diseases due to climate change (H). Develop new flexible HYVs to meet climatic hazards (H). Enhance livestock research for adaptation to climate change (H). Adaptation: Development of master plan for accelerating climate resilient technology for unfavourable eco-system (T). Establishment of specialized food storage facility in disaster-prone areas (T). Dissemination of programme on climate resilient sustainable technology through AIS and DAE, DOF and DLS and all concerned (H). Digitize agro-climatic and ecological data base and localized agricultural content (M). Creation of data base on agricultural resources to determine climate change impact (M). Management of dry, wet and char land and biodiversity towards better livelihood (M).</p> |
|--|--|---|

| C. Implementation Features | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 8 | Main national implementation institutions | The implementation institutes are NARS institutes, DAE, DLS, DOF, Universities, Private sector, FD, AIS, Mass Media, DMB, DRR, DOE, BADC, ECGIS, IWM and BMDA. Collaboration among the Ministries and agencies is essential for effective implementation of this programme. |
| 9 | Main international DPs | <i>Almost all the major multilateral and bilateral DPs as WB-IDA, ADB, IFAD IDB, DANIDA and USAID are supporting investment projects and programmes. These include the IFAD-WB-GOB funded NATP (around 60 M US\$ will be invested during the CIP implementation period), the DANIDA-GOB funded AEC/ASPS-II and the DFID-UE-AusAid-SIDA-Norway-UNDP funded DAE and DLS parts of CDMP-II for climate change adaptation. In addition to this, DANIDA has recently pledged an investment of around 75 M US\$ in the sector. The overall coordination of DPs in the sector is mainly driven through the through the LCG/ARDFS and the LCG on Environment and CC.</i> |
| 10 | Main implementation challenges | Capacities, both human and physical, of public agencies will need to be strengthened in order to properly implement these interventions. |

Note: The activities prioritized as Top (T), high (H) medium (M) and low (L).

Programme 2: Improved Water Management and Infrastructure for Irrigation Purposes

| A. Key Features | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|--------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 | Programme Aggregate Output | Sustainable and efficient water management is ensured for responding to farmer needs | | | | |
| 2 | Output Indicators | <input type="checkbox"/> % of cropped area under irrigation (1.2.1 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> Surface water irrigation area as % of total irrigation area (1.2.2 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> Irrigation cost as % of total Boro production cost (1.2.3 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> Coefficient of variation of water flows in dry season major rivers over previous 10 years | | | | |
| 3 | Relevant Government policies, strategies and plans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSAPRII (Section 7.2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outline Perspective Plan 2010-202 (Section 7.6); <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Water Policy 1999 (Section 4.7); <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Water Management Plan 2004 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Medium Term Priority Framework 2010 (Section 2.4.5); <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA Monitoring Report 2010 (Section V.2) and NFP Plan of Action Matrix 1.2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SFYP draft, 2011 | | | | |
| 4 | Major on-going investment operations | <i>Major investments are underway for expansion of irrigation though enhancement of irrigation efficiency by improvement of water distribution systems and installation of new surface water irrigation infrastructures such as rubber dams by BADC. Investments on augmentation of river flows through dredging and undertaking measures for mitigating river erosion are also ongoing. Among the major investment programmes: the BWDB Water Management Improvement Project (WMIP) and the Participatory Small Scale Water Resources Sector Project and the Gorai River Restoration Project. An important subsector requiring higher investments is the reduction of the impact of saline water intrusion in the South.</i> | | | | |
| 5 | Costs and financing requirements (from Annex 4) | Priority Rank | Total | Existing | Total Gap | Priority gap |
| | 2.1 Improve water management in water distribution systems and at farm level | M | 580.01 | 366.41 | 213.60 | 106.80 |
| | 2.2 Improve & increase efficiency of surface water irrigation, in particular in the south | H | 714.95 | 265.08 | 449.87 | 314.91 |
| | 2.3 Reduce impact of saline water intrusion in the South | H | 68.01 | 0.39 | 67.63 | 47.34 |
| | 2.4 Enhance river water flow to the South | T | 267.41 | 140.16 | 127.24 | 114.52 |

| B. Priority Interventions | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 6 | Priorities from Consultation Process (Brief description of activities) | <p>The emerging priorities that arose from various consultations are the need to increase surface water irrigation and reduce ground water depletion, enhancing on-farm water use efficiency through capacity development of water users, and rehabilitation of infrastructures.</p> <p>The prioritization of activities linked to each of the interventions is as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Improve Water management in water distribution systems and at farm level</i></p> <p>Improve water distribution system of minor irrigation buried pipe and concrete canal (T). Survey and monitoring of availability of irrigation water in Bangladesh (H). Improve cost effectiveness of irrigation and irrigation efficiency (M). This should include capacity strengthening at both the grass roots and system-wide levels in order to, reduce irrigation costs by developing more efficient water saving technologies and promoting a more cost effective distribution system.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Improve & increase efficiency of surface water irrigation, in particular in the South</i></p> <p>Nationwide conservation and utilization of surface water by excavation/dredging/reclamation of canals, bills, river/water bodies etc. (T). Surface water management in the South and flood plains, Haors, hills and Char lands (T). Supplementary irrigation for T. Aman and Aus rice to promote water saving rice cultivation technology for less dependence on irrigated Boro (T). Improvement of drainage condition in the rainy season for the arable lands (H). Capacity development of water users, providing training and support for protection of river erosion (H). Flood control measures (H). Establish effective drainage to bringing vast area fit for timely planting of Boro rice in the South (H). Support uninterrupted electricity for irrigation (L).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Reduce impact of saline water intrusion in the South and enhance river water flow</i></p> <p>Dredging of Garai river to increase water in the South (T). Rehabilitation of polders and their management (T). Protection of vast area of Rupsha-Terokhada Beel, Dakatia- Dumuria Beel against saline water intrusion (T). Surface water irrigation in the south with improved brackish water management practices (H).</p> |

| C. Implementation Features | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 8 | Main national implementation institutions | <p>The national implementation institutes are BADC, BCIC, SCA, DAE, DLS, DOF, BMDA and Private sector.</p> <p>Collaboration between the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Water Resource is essential, with DAE, BWDB, LGED and BMDA as the participating institutes. Involvement of farmer organizations and stakeholders from the private sector on farm level water management will also be key</p> |
| 9 | Main international DPs | <p><i>Major DPs like IDA, ADB, IFAD, IDB and JICA are funding projects in this sub-programme. A significant contribution is being channelled to the country by ADB, IFAD, and the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands (EKN). The latter is also chairing the LCG on Water Resource Management. The support, beyond investment projects in water management, includes also as support to the contributions of the private sector for infrastructural development (dredging).</i></p> |
| 10 | Main implementation challenges | <p>There are many current challenges to water management in Bangladesh, including declining aquifer levels, arsenic contamination, silting and increased salinity in coastal areas, climate change causing drainage congestion due to rise in sea level and river bed rise.</p> |

Note: The activities prioritized as Top (T), high (H) medium (M) and low (L).

Programme 3: Improved quality of inputs and soil fertility

| A. Key Features | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|--|--------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 | Programme Aggregate Output | <i>Access to quality inputs is improved and soil fertility is enhanced</i> | | | | |
| 2 | Output Indicators | <input type="checkbox"/> Rate of growth of food (crops, livestock and fishery) GDP increased from the base line, <input type="checkbox"/> Key food import dependency reduced from base line, <input type="checkbox"/> Coefficient of variation of rice and non-rice foods production over the last 10 years <input type="checkbox"/> Share of rice value added in total food value added in current prices <input type="checkbox"/> Nutrient status in soil improved | | | | |
| 3 | Relevant Government policies, strategies and plans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSAPRII (Section 3.2.4); <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Perspective Plan 2010-2021 (Section 7.2); <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Medium Term Priority Framework , 2010-15 (Chapters 2 & 3); <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NFP Plan of Action, Matrix 1.1; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Draft Agriculture Policy, 2011 New Agriculture Extension Policy (1996); <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National IPM Policy 2002 (Chapter 2). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Draft Sixth Five Year Plan, Crop production Plan, 2010, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DAE, Research Priorities in Bangladesh Agriculture, 2010. | | | | |
| 4 | Major on-going investment operations | <i>Major investments are undertaken to strengthen the production and distribution of quality seeds of different crops. Other interventions encompass the production, procurement and distribution of fertilizers and other inputs. Major investments are undertaken to strengthen the production and distribution of quality seeds of different crops, mainly rice and wheat but support other crops too such as pulse, oil and spices seeds. Other interventions encompass the production, procurement and distribution of fertilizers and other inputs. Others aim at crop diversification & intensification, soil fertility and fertilizer use technology improvement, promotion and management of fertility. The major investment projects are the Second Crop Diversification Project, the Enhancement of Quality Seeds and the Soil Fertility Component of Food Security Programme 2006. In addition, the DPs assistance encompasses the distribution of input and other support services following natural disasters. Besides, other investments on vaccines production and distribution, AI services and fingerlings are covered mainly under programme 4 and 5.</i> | | | | |
| 5 | Costs and financing requirements (from Annex 4) | Priority Rank | Total | Existing | Total Gap | Priority gap |
| | 3.1 Enhance availability of agricultural inputs, tested and certified for quality of diversified crops | H | 256.76 | 94.71 | 162.05 | 113.44 |
| | 3.2 Develop public private partnerships through capacity development | T | 20.00 | - | 20.00 | 18.00 |
| | 3.3 Improve and increase sustainability of soil fertility management | H | 46.24 | 16.48 | 29.77 | 20.84 |
| | 3.4 Facilitate access to credit and other financial services by smallholders and the rural poor | T | 20.00 | - | 20.00 | 18.00 |

| B. Priority Interventions | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| 6 | Priorities from Consultation Process (Brief description of activities) | <p>Availability of quality inputs is a serious problem. All consultations put availability of quality inputs at affordable prices as top priority. There is a strong need for quality control, certification and accountability of inputs providers as well as a strengthened regulatory system. The question of inputs links directly to another issue that arose—soil fertility. Declining soil fertility in Bangladesh is resulting in micro nutrient deficiency in the soil. Due to intensive cropping and unbalanced use of fertilizer the soil fertility is declining fast. There is a strong need to promote balanced fertilizer use for different crops.</p> <p>The prioritization of activities linked to each of the interventions is as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Capacity development for seed sector</p> <p>Expansion of number of seed multiplication farms, seed processing and preservation facilities of NARS, DAE, and contract growers (T). Strengthening capacity of SCA in terms of HRD and laboratories (T). Participation of NGOs and private sector in seed distribution (H). Production of quality seeds by the farmers (H). Establishing high capacity laboratory of NARS, BADC and DAE for testing quality of seeds, fertilizers, pesticides water and soils (M).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Enhance availability of agricultural inputs, tested and certified for quality of diversified crops</p> <p>Ensure availability of good quality and reasonable prices of all agricultural inputs (seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, feeds, chicks, fingerling, semen, broods, and veterinary drugs) (H).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Improve and increase sustainability of soil fertility management</p> <p>Promote improved soil health management practices, introduce crop rotation with legumes (T). Facilitate application of balanced fertilizers on the basis of soil tests, supplying soil testing kits locally and strengthening of soil testing laboratories (H). Expansion of arsenic mitigation technology (M).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Facilitate access to credit and other financial services by smallholders and the rural poor</p> <p>Collateral free Bank loan/credit at low interest for crops, livestock and fishery (H).</p> |

| C. Implementation Features | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 8 | Main national implementation institutions | <p>The national implementation institutes are BADC, BCIC, SCA, DAE, DLS, DOF, NARS institute, SRDI, Bangladesh Bank, BKB, NGOs and Private sector.</p> <p>Seeds: BADC and DAE are entrusted with the task of multiplication, production and supply of high-yielding varieties of crop seeds while DLS is engaged in livestock breeding and DOF for fingerlings. All these institutions need capacity development for enhancing supply of quality seeds. The Seed Certification Agency (SCA) has the mandatory responsibility to test and certify. It also needs capacity development. There is need to create enabling environment for enhanced participation of NGOs and private sector in seed production and distributions.</p> <p>Fertilizer Supply: BADC, BCIC, DAE and private sector are the organizations involved with fertilizer supply. There is need to establish new fertilizer plants of BCIC.</p> <p>Soil fertility: SRDI and DAE are involved in soil fertility management.</p> <p>Credit: Bangladesh Bank, BKB and other banking institutes, and NGOs are involved in distribution of agricultural credit.</p> |
| 9 | Main international DPs | <p><i>Almost all major multilateral and bilateral DPs like WB, ADB, IDB, EC, Danida and USAID support interventions relevant to programme 3. Among the signatories of the JCS, DPs working in the LCG sub-group of Agriculture and Rural Development relevant to Programme 3 are ADB, Australia, Denmark, EU, Japan Korea, Switzerland, USA, WB and the UN (FAO, WFP, UNDP).</i></p> |
| 10 | Main implementation challenges | <p>Current challenges are inadequate capacity, of DAE, BADC, SCA, DLS, DOF, BCIC, BSTI as well as the private sector, to meet the growing demand for quality inputs. Inadequate laboratory facilities for quality testing and monitoring, as well as a weak regulatory system to prevent input adulteration, are also key concerns.</p> |

Note: The activities prioritized as Top (T), high (H) medium (M) and low (L).

Programme 4; Fisheries & Aquaculture Development

| A. Key Features | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|--------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 | Programme Aggregate Output | Sustainable increase of fishery production through improved technology and natural resources management | | | | |
| 2 | Output Indicators | <input type="checkbox"/> GDP from fishery sector as % of agriculture GDP (excluding forest), at constant price 1995-1996 (1.4.4 PoA Monitoring Report). <input type="checkbox"/> % Increase in fishery exports meeting international quality standards <input type="checkbox"/> % increase in national aquaculture production | | | | |
| 3 | Relevant Government policies, strategies and plans | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ PRSP I and II, ✓ Flood Action Plan, ✓ National Food Policy: Plan of Action , ✓ Bangladesh Perspective Plan (2021), ✓ New National Extension Policy, ✓ Fisheries Sector Road Map (2006), ✓ Fisheries Policy 1998 ✓ National Fisheries Strategy 2006, ✓ National Disaster Management Plan (2007-2015), ✓ NMTPF (2010-15), ✓ BFRI. Perspective plan of DoF, ✓ SFYP draft, 2011, ✓ vision 2021, and ✓ Public water body management policy 2009. | | | | |
| 4 | Major on-going investment operations | <i>Major investments are underway for development of small aquaculture through assessing the impact of aquaculture drugs and chemicals on aquatic ecology, restoration of natural breeding habitats in the river system, infrastructure development and Expansion of Aquaculture Technology Services (EATS project, operated by DOF up to Union level). In addition, enhancement of improved extension services for management of fisheries services are also included under the current investment operations. Other significant investment projects are the Regional Fisheries and Livestock Development Project (RFLDP) and the Great Faridpur Fisheries Development Project. DOF is the most important implementing agency.</i> | | | | |
| 5 | Costs and financing requirements (from Annex 4) | Priority Rank | Total | Existing | Total Gap | Priority gap |
| | 4.1. Develop small scale aquaculture, through access to quality inputs, advice and skills | H | 28.86 | 7.99 | 20.86 | 14.60 |
| | 4.2 Improve management of fisheries resources | H | 192.99 | 28.61 | 164.38 | 115.07 |
| | 4.3 Develop public private partnerships in support of infrastructure and services development | M | 134.86 | - | 134.86 | 67.43 |
| | 4.4 Promote production in the South through sustainable shrimp and prawn development and community based co management of wetlands. | L | 36.22 | - | 36.22 | 14.49 |

| B. Priority Interventions | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| 6 | Priorities from Consultation Process (Brief description of activities) | <p>There is tremendous potential for increasing the productivity of fisheries. The importance of this sector can be highlighted in that it is a good source of providing nutritious and protein rich food and it plays an important role for employment generation, poverty reduction, foreign exchange earning, and food and nutrition security in Bangladesh.</p> <p>There is a strong call for development of this sector through development of aquaculture, management of fisheries resources, public private partnership and sustainable shrimp and prawn production and community based co-management of wetlands.</p> <p>The prioritization of activities linked to each of the interventions is as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Develop small scale aquaculture</i></p> <p>Enhance disease diagnosis facility in the field offices of DOF (T). Promote small scale good aquaculture practices with quality feeds, fingerlings and drugs (H). Diversification of fish processing (H).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Improve management of fisheries resources</i></p> <p>Excavation and sanctuaries of water bodies for fish breeding and community based management of open water fisheries with training and credits (T). Establish hatchery locally ensuring supply of disease free fish brood/seeds (H). Assessment and management of stock inland marine fisheries (H).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Promote public private partnerships</i></p> <p>Establish modern fish processing industries with backward and forward linkages (H). Support establishment of cold storage, and cold chains (H). Production of quality fingerlings, feeds and drug (H).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Promote fishery production in the South</i></p> <p>Marine and brackish water fisheries resources management and capacity development (H). 2. Fish Breeding ground development in brackish water system (H). Promote technology for integrated use of embankment areas for fish production (H). Establishment of cold storage for preservation of white fish (all coastal and marine fish) (H). Develop Shrimp policy (M). Land zoning for bagda shrimp (M). Diversification in coastal aquaculture- Crab, mussels, sea weeds, etc. (M).</p> |

| C. Implementation Features | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 8 | Main national implementation institutions | <p>The national implementation institutes are DOF, BFDC, BFRI, Universities and private sector.</p> <p>DOF and BFSC are entrusted with the task of technology dissemination, production and supply of fingerlings, disease control, management of fisheries resources and wetlands and quality testing of shrimp exports. These institutions need capacity development for enhancing fishery extension services. There is need to create enabling environment for enhanced participation of PPP and private sector in feed production, establishment of hatcheries and fish processing. BFRI and universities are engaged in technology development and needs capacity development.</p> |
| 9 | Main international DPs | <p><i>DANIDA is the main contributor in the sector, supporting the implementation of the RFLDP with an amount of 7 M US\$ available for the period of implementation of CIP. WB through the ECRRP is also contributing to the recovery and rehabilitation of fisheries sector in the cyclone Sidr and Aila affected districts. Similarly to Programme 5, the coordination among DPs in the sector passes mainly through the LCG/ARDFS.</i></p> |
| 10 | Main implementation challenges | <p>Current challenges are inadequate capacity, of DOF, BFDC, and BFRI as well as the private sector, to meet the growing demand for delivery of extension and input services and technology generation. Poor quality fingerling, inadequate laboratory facilities for disease diagnosis at field level are also key concerns.</p> |

Note: The activities prioritized as Top (T), high (H) medium (M) and low (L).

Programme 5: Livestock Development, with a focus on poultry and dairy production

| A. Key Features | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|---|--------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 | Programme Aggregate Output | Sustainable increase of livestock production is developed through improved technology, better animal health and resilient management practices | | | | |
| 2 | Output Indicators | <input type="checkbox"/> GDP from poultry/livestock sector as % of agricultural GDP (excluding forest, at constant price 1995-96) (1.4.3 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> % increase of artificial insemination <input type="checkbox"/> % of reduction of poultry deaths | | | | |
| 3 | Relevant Government policies, strategies and plans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PRSP I and II, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Food Policy: Plan of Action, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bangladesh Perspective Plan (2021), <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flood Action Plan, New National Extension Policy, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Disaster Management Plan (2007-2015), <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NMTPF (2010-15), Livestock Policy 2007, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Poultry Development Policy 2008. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SFYP draft, 2011 | | | | |
| 4 | Major on-going investment operations | <i>Major investments are underway to strengthen the diagnostic and surveillance system to mitigate outbreak of animal diseases, as well as strengthening husbandry capacities at homestead level, and extension of improved varieties developed through research, vaccines production and distribution, AI services and fingerlings. The Regional Fisheries and Livestock Development Project (RFLDP– Nohakhali component), the Second Participatory Livestock Development Project and the National Agricultural Technology Project (DLS component) are the most important investment projects in the sector.</i> | | | | |
| 5 | Costs and financing requirements (from Annex 4) | Priority Rank | Total | Existing | Total Gap | Priority gap |
| | 5.1 Strengthen animal health services, including better diagnosis and surveillance systems to mitigate disease outbreaks | M | 347.75 | 21.78 | 325.97 | 162.99 |
| | 5.2 Strengthen husbandry capacity at household level through community based improved knowledge and advisory services | H | 313.67 | 9.94 | 303.73 | 212.61 |
| | 5.3 Improve availability and quality of inputs through public private partnerships | H | 20.00 | - | 20.00 | 14.00 |
| | 5.4 Research on livestock development, including genetic improvement | L | 153.72 | 28.35 | 125.37 | 50.15 |

| B. Priority Interventions | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| 6 | Priorities from Consultation Process (Brief description of activities) | <p>There is tremendous potential to increase the productivity of the livestock sector. The importance of this sector can be highlighted in that it is a good source of providing nutritious and protein rich food and playing important role for employment generation, poverty reduction, foreign exchange earnings from hides and skins, food and nutrition security in Bangladesh.</p> <p>There is a strong call for development of this sector through strengthening the health services of DLS, husbandry capacity at household level, improved availability of quality inputs and research on livestock development.</p> <p>The prioritization of activities linked to each of the interventions is as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Strengthening health services</i></p> <p>Strengthen Veterinary services of DLS (T). Establishing veterinary disease diagnostic and feed analysis laboratory in DLS field offices (T). Strengthen AI services of DLS with development of infrastructure (H). Strengthen disease surveillance system of DLS (H). Strengthening of livestock postgraduate training facilities and research (H).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Strengthen husbandry capacity at household</i></p> <p>Small scale dairy for milk, meat and nutrition security (T). Milk production, processing and marketing through cooperatives (T). Improvement of indigenous chicken (T). Promote rearing of farm animals (goat, sheep, cattle, buffalo) and poultry production (T). Credit and Insurance scheme (H). Fodder production by integrated farming (H). Farmers' skill training on livestock rearing, feed nutrition and disease management (H). Establishment of modern slaughter house (M).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Promote public private partnerships</i></p> <p>Ensure supply of quality feed, day old chicks, AI, breeds and medicine/vaccination (T). Promote public-private partnership for livestock input services (vaccines, drugs, health services and diseases control) (H). Ensure electricity supply for poultry raising (H).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Genetic improvement of farm animals</i></p> <p>Support genetic improvement of poultry, goat, sheep, cattle and buffalo (H).</p> |

| C. Implementation Features | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| 8 | Main national implementation institutions | <p>The national implementation institutes are DLS, BLRI, Universities & private sector.</p> <p>DLS is responsible for delivery of livestock services and technology dissemination, production and supply of vaccines, disease control, and AI services. DLS institution needs capacity development for enhancing delivery livestock services. There is need to create enabling environment for enhanced participation of PPP and private sector in feed production, establishment of hatcheries and livestock processing. BLRI and universities are engaged in technology development and needs capacity development.</p> <p>Collaboration between the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock is essential. DLS, Bangladesh Livestock Research Institute, Universities and the private sector should also participate in the proposed interventions. It will be important to involve community-based organizations of farmers as well as the private sector. An enabling policy environment and policy will be needed for promotion public-private partnerships and enhanced participation of private sector entrepreneurs.</p> |
| 9 | Main international DPs | <p><i>ADB and DANIDA are the main contributors to the fisheries sector providing support to extension of improved varieties developed through research. Similarly to Programme 4, the coordination among DPs in the sector is undertaken mainly by the LCG/ARDFS.</i></p> |
| 10 | Main implementation challenges | <p>Implementation challenges include the weak delivery system of DLS, and BLRI, as well as the private sector, to meet the growing demand for delivery of extension and input services and technology generation. Disease control & surveillance and monitoring, quality problem of feeds, drugs, vaccines and AI, and poor husbandry practices, are key concerns.</p> |

Note: The activities prioritized as Top (T), high (H) medium (M) and low (L).

Programme 6: Improved access to markets, value-addition in agriculture, and to non farm incomes

| A. Key Features | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|--|--------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 | Programme Aggregate Output | Value chains are developed contributing to better access to food and increased rural incomes | | | | |
| 2 | Output Indicators | <input type="checkbox"/> Difference between farm gate and retail price of selected goods <input type="checkbox"/> % difference between wholesale and retail prices in Dhaka City (1.7.1 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> Difference between mill gate/import prices and retail prices of fertilizers <input type="checkbox"/> Variation of per capita rural incomes in real terms <input type="checkbox"/> Rural women self-employed, as % of total rural women employed (2.5.4 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> Rural women engaged in unpaid family work, % of total rural women employed (2.5.5 PoA Monitoring Report) | | | | |
| 3 | Relevant Government policies, strategies and plans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSAPRII (Section 3.2.4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Outline Perspective Plan 2010-2021(Section 7.7.6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Medium Term Priority Framework (Matrix 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NFP Plan of Action, Matrix 1.6; PoA Monitoring Report- 2008-2009 (Section V.7). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Food Policy: Plan of Action, | | | | |
| 4 | Major on-going investment operations | <i>Programme 6 is one of the largest programmes of the CIP. Major current investments under the programme are development of roads and culverts for improvement of accessibility to markets, and improvement of physical facilities at market places. In addition, development of rural agribusiness and improvement of marketing systems including development of value addition chains are the other operations under the programme. LGED is the main agency, implementing project such as the Second Rural Infrastructure Improvement (RIP-2), the Infrastructure Development Project (2nd Revised), the Market Infrastructure Development in Charland Regions, and the Market Access Infrastructure Development Project of the ASPs-II.</i> | | | | |
| 5 | Costs and financing requirements (from Annex 4) | Priority Rank | Total | Existing | Total Gap | Priority gap |
| | 6.1 Improve physical access to markets, facilities and information | M | 962.24 | 563.82 | 398.42 | 199.21 |
| | 6.2 Mobilize and promote producer & marketing groups for improved market access and knowledge | T | 130.70 | 48.72 | 81.98 | 73.78 |
| | 6.3 Develop adequate storage, processing & value addition and reduce waste through public-private partnerships | H | 90.45 | - | 90.45 | 63.31 |
| | 6.4 Promote and assist the development of off farm activities and rural businesses | M | 74.90 | 10.87 | 64.03 | 32.01 |

| B. Priority Interventions | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| 6 | Priorities from Consultation Process (Brief description of activities) | <p>There is a wide scope to increase farm income and employment in the country through improved market access and value addition activities in agriculture. Farmers often face problems related to the marketing of their farm products including lack of access to market and market information and price signals. Moreover, there are inadequate transportation and storage facilities as well as post harvest losses due to lack of processing and preservation. There is a strong call for improvement of market access and value addition activities in agriculture. through improved physical access to markets, mobilize and promote producers & marketing groups, develop adequate storage, processing and value addition activities, promote and assist the development of off farm activities.</p> <p>The prioritization of activities linked to each of the interventions is as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Improve physical access to markets, facilities and information</i></p> <p>Strengthening market information system (T). Construction of link road and feeder road for connecting local improved markets (H). Monitoring of markets and agricultural products prices (H). Develop market infrastructures for fish landing sites (M). Establish Modern slaughter house and live poultry marketing facilities (M).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Mobilize and promote producer & marketing groups</i></p> <p>Promote cooperatives for group marketing and developing supply chain for the farmers (H)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Develop adequate storage, processing & value addition through PPPs</i></p> <p>Credit scheme to the farmers for storage of perishable crops and establishment of cold storage (T). Establish mini processing industries at farmers' level (H). Develop storage facilities of agricultural products at rural level by GOs and Private sectors (H). Strengthen training and demonstration for proper packaging of agricultural products (H). Skill development of farmers and women for value addition, product handling, preservation and storage (H). Promote cooling chain for carrying products to distance markets (M). Training on packing of agricultural products (T).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Promote and assist the development of off farm activities and rural businesses</i></p> <p>Generation of income of landless and distressed women through off farm activities (H). Preparation of spare parts of power tiller, pumps, etc for rural employment generation (M). Skill development of farmers and women for value addition, product handling, preservation and storage (T),</p> |

| C. Implementation Features | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 8 | Main national implementation institutions | <p>The national implementation institutes are DAM, DAE, DLS, DOF, AIS, BFDC, BSTI, LGED and private sector.</p> <p>DAM is responsible for collection and dissemination of market information and price signals. DAE, DLS, DOF and DOF are engaged with development of agribusiness and supply chain. There is need to create enabling environment for enhanced participation of PPP and private sector in agribusiness and value addition activities.</p> <p>Collaboration between the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock and the Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives is essential. DAE, DLS, DOF, Directorate of Agricultural Marketing and LGED, NGOs, CSO and private sector should also participate in the proposed interventions. It will be important to promote community based organizations of the farmers and involve the private sector. An enabling policy environment will be needed for promotion of public-private partnerships in processing and value addition activities and enhanced participation of private sector entrepreneurs.</p> |
| 9 | Main international DPs | <p><i>Almost all the DPs operating in Bangladesh support current investments in the sector. The most committed DPs are IFAD, ADB, WB, EKN and DANIDA. Investments are funded also by IDB, DFID, JICA, GTZ and KFW. DPs commitment aims mainly at improving access to markets, developing rural agribusiness and of value chains. The issue is cross-cutting along various LCG sub groups, including ARDFS, Water, CC and Environment, Disaster and Emergency Relief and Poverty.</i></p> |
| 10 | Main implementation challenges | <p>The implementation challenges are lack of coordination among different ministries and line agencies. Inadequate market access for smallholder farmers. Problems faced relate to marketing, access to markets, lack of market information and price signals, inadequate transportation and storage facilities and presence of trade syndicates in the markets are key concerns.</p> |

Note: The activities prioritized as Top (T), high (H) medium (M) and low (L).

Programme 7: Strengthened capacities for implementation and monitoring of NFP and CIP actions

| A. Key Features | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|-------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 | Programme Aggregate Output | National capacities to design, implement and monitor NFP PoA and CIP investment operations are strengthened. | | | | |
| 2 | Output Indicators | <input type="checkbox"/> No. and value of new investment operations nationally designed <input type="checkbox"/> CIP available budget execution performance (%) | | | | |
| 3 | Relevant Government policies, strategies and plans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SP II Policy Matrix 11: Strategic Goal 4: Creating an Enabling Framework for Food Security <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Outline Perspective Plan 2010-2021(Section 7.7.6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NFP Plan of Action, Matrix 1.6; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PoA Monitoring Report- 2008-2009 (Section V.7). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Food Policy: Plan of Action, | | | | |
| 4 | Major on-going investment operations | <i>Major investments under the programme are capacity strengthening for monitoring food policy implementation and institutional strengthening for agriculture and food security investment programmes. The most important project in the sector is the National Food Policy Capacity Strengthening Program (FPMU). In addition, minor investments to be expanded target capacity development of civil society organizations in respect of agriculture and food security investment.</i> | | | | |
| 5 | Costs and financing requirements (from Annex 4) | Priority Rank | Total | Existing | Total Gap | Priority gap |
| | 7.1 Strengthen capacities to implement, monitor and coordinate National Food Policy-Plan of Action and CIP; | H | 18.87 | 10.89 | 7.97 | 5.58 |
| | 7.2 Strengthen national capacities for design, implementation & monitoring of CIP projects | H | 43.17 | 2.88 | 40.29 | 28.20 |
| | 7.3 Strengthen capacities of civil society organizations to contribute to CIP development & implementation | H | 51.18 | 0.82 | 50.36 | 35.25 |

| B. Priority Interventions | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 6 | Priorities from Consultation Process (Brief description of activities) | <p>Government's capacity to ensure long term food security to a growing population and avoid sudden food insecurity in the short term requires, among others, capacity of the concerned government institutions to undertake informed policy decisions on the issues having impact on food security needs to be improved.</p> <p>Two areas currently partly covered by NFPCSP need stronger focus: early warning system and production, collation and dissemination of information among all stakeholders. Moreover, the capacity to implementation and monitoring of the implementation of the Country Investment Plan and to Formulate and Monitor the implementation of investment programs needs to be developed. From various consultations the issue arose that insufficient organizational and human capacities are a major impediment to the design and effective implementation of investment operations in food and nutrition security.</p> <p>The prioritized interventions are as follows:</p> <p><i>Strengthen capacities to implement, monitor and coordinate NFP and CIP</i> It is proposed to build on the on-going NFP-CSP to further enhance the Government capacity in overall policy development and monitoring in the field of food security. Also, there is need to develop capacity to monitor the overall implementation (resource mobilization and use) of the CIP and its results.</p> <p><i>Strengthen national capacities for design, implementation & monitoring of CIP operations</i> The proposed activities are the development of national capacities in the field of investment cycle management (planning, design, implementation, management and monitoring and evaluation).</p> <p><i>Strengthen capacities of civil society organizations</i> The purposed interventions are to strengthen both the institutional capacities for better involvement of the CSOs in the policy dialogue and overall CIP updating process and their more effective participation in the CIP investment operations at community level.</p> <p><i>The prioritized activities are:</i> Food monitoring facilities should be increased in field level (H). Strengthening and expanding capacity to implement, monitor and coordinate NFP-PoA (H). Strengthening the capacity to formulate, implement, monitor and coordinate the CIP programme (H).</p> |

| C. Implementation Features | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 8 | Main national implementation institutions | The national implementation institutes are FPMU, NARS institutes, Universities and Food division. |
| 9 | Main international DPs | <i>USAID and EC are the main contributors in capacity development for the implementation of the national food policy, along with a lower but significant investment of ADB. The LCG/ARDFS has been leading the sector coordinating DPs.</i> |
| 10 | Main implementation challenges | The current challenge to achieving food security lies in implementing the Plan of Action while the future challenge also lies in preparing an updated National Food Policy and Plan of Action beyond 2015 and implementation of CIP. Careful attention must be needed to take full advantage of the potential for synergies and collaboration. The implementation challenges are effective coordination among different ministries and line agencies. |

Note: The activities prioritized as Top (T), high (H) medium (M) and low (L).

Programme 8: Enhanced Public Food Management Systems

| A. Key Features | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|--------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 | Programme Aggregate Output | Enhanced efficiency and effectiveness of Public Food Management Systems | | | | |
| 2 | Output Indicators | <input type="checkbox"/> Effective grain storage capacity at close of fiscal year in mt (1.11.1 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> Quantity of rice distributed through OMS as % of total supply (1.11.4 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> Ratio of foodgrain quantity distributed by MoFDM through GR and VGF (in kg) and number of individuals affected by natural disasters in that particular year (2.2.2 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> Public food grain domestic procurement as a % of food grain production <input type="checkbox"/> Public food grain import as a % of food grain supply | | | | |
| 3 | Relevant Government policies, strategies and plans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PRSP II Policy Matrix 11: - Strategic Goal 5: Assuring low cost food supply. - Strategic Goal 6: Ensuring food security of the poor and the vulnerable. - Strategic Goal 7: Smoothing fluctuation in food consumption. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NFP Plan of Action (2008-15): -Area of Intervention#1.11: Public Stock Management/Price Stabilization. | | | | |
| 4 | Major on-going investment operations | <i>The Food Directorate is the main implementing agency for Programme 8. Its major investments include construction and rehabilitation of go downs to enhance the storage capacity of food grains in the country. In addition, a study is underway to determine Bangladesh's modernized food storage requirement.</i> | | | | |
| 5 | Costs and financing requirements (from Annex 4) | Priority Rank | Total | Existing | Total Gap | Priority gap |
| | 8.1 Enhance efficiency and effectiveness of Public Food Management Systems and improve its impact on price stabilization | T | 12.78 | - | 12.78 | 11.50 |
| | 8.2 Build capacities of Ministry of Food and Disaster Management and Directorate of Food to better manage the food system | T | 21.79 | - | 21.79 | 19.61 |
| | 8.3 Increase and modernize public storage and handling facilities, including in disaster prone areas. | H | 602.76 | 344.17 | 258.59 | 181.02 |

| B. Priority Interventions | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| 6 | Priorities from Consultation Process (Brief description of activities) | <p>In view of the global food market context, the Government of Bangladesh needs to maintain a higher food stock in the future in order to achieve food security during crisis. Also Public food stock need to increase to support an expanding safety net programmes. Sudden sharp increase in food prices along with normal seasonal upward movement of prices will also require larger public intervention to have an effect on the expanding market. Further, increased frequency of natural disasters with greater damage to the economy requires higher emergency food operation. The size of the stock will depend on the size of the PFDS and other factors including anticipated food grain situation in the domestic and international markets and trade policies of exporting countries. Proper management mechanisms that ensure quality and effective distribution are key to taking full advantage of these stocks and reducing the vulnerability of Bangladesh to external shocks.</p> <p>Management of a larger food stock also represents a challenge in terms of determining the size of stock (which involves an opportunity cost of resources), quality storage, release of stock and monitoring.</p> <p>The prioritized interventions are as follows:</p> <p><i>Enhance efficiency and effectiveness of Public Food Management Systems and improve its impact on price stabilization</i></p> <p>The key activities proposed were digitization of the food stock/storage monitoring system in the field level to improve its efficiency and management and reduce losses in food stocks. Further, enhanced quality control, through the establishment of labs in the district level, will further strengthen the systems.</p> <p><i>Build capacities of Ministry of Food and Disaster Management and Directorate of Food to better manage the food system</i></p> <p>Interventions are needed to expand capacity building to handle public food distribution systems. This includes staff training in public food management or effective response to emergencies and improving supervisory and monitoring activities through logistics support. Additional capacity strengthening in training and operational research is also emphasized.</p> <p><i>Increase and modernize public storage and handling facilities, including in disaster prone areas</i></p> <p>Interventions were proposed for repair of unused warehouses and building of modern storage facilities that are better equipped to resist external shocks.</p> <p><i>The prioritized activities are:</i> Enhance efficiency of Public Management Systems (improve operational procedure (T). Adopt ICT and computerization and develop operation research) (H). Build capacities of MoFDM and Directorate of food to manage the food system (M). Increase and modernize public storage and handling facilities. Strengthen capacity of quality control of food and food stuffs (H).</p> |

| C. Implementation Features | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 8 | Main national implementation institutions | The national implementation institutes are Directorate of Food, FPMU, BARC, Universities and CSOs and private sector. |
| 9 | Main international DPs | <i>Most of the investments in Programme 8 are funded by WB and the JDCF. The sector requires an expansion of the storage capacities of food grain reserves as well as capacity development to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of food management system.</i> |
| 10 | Main implementation challenges | A major challenge relies in the need to ensure adequate coordination among the multiple government institutions involved in implementation and monitoring of NFP and CIP actions. |

Note: The activities prioritized as Top (T), high (H) medium (M) and low (L).

Programme 9: Institutional Development and Capacity Development for more effective safety nets

| A. Key Features | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|----------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 | Programme Aggregate Output | Effectiveness and targeting of social safety net programmes are improved through strengthened institutional capacities to design and implement them | | | | |
| 2 | Output Indicators | <input type="checkbox"/> Budgeted coverage of VGF and VGD, million cards (2.4.1 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> % of safety net programmes expenditure over safety net budget | | | | |
| 3 | Relevant Government policies, strategies and plans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PRSP II Policy Matrix 11: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strategic Goal 2: Extending Coverage of Safety Net Programmes ○ Strategic Goal 5: Assuring low cost food supply ○ Strategic Goal 6: Ensuring food security of the poor and the vulnerable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NFP PoA Objective 2: Increased Purchasing Power and Access to Food by the People <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AoI #2.4. Effectiveness of targeted food security programmes and other safety nets | | | | |
| 4 | Major on-going investment operations | <i>A number of investment programmes are being implemented aiming to employment generation, livelihoods development, vulnerable group development, empowerment of the poorest, enhancing resilience, school feeding, training and rehabilitation of destitute and orphan children, and disaster management. The DMB implemented Operation Support to the Employment generation Programme for the Poorest is ongoing to strengthen the capacities to effectively operate, coordinate and streamline the impact and targeting.</i> | | | | |
| 5 | Costs and financing requirements (from Annex 4) | Priority Rank | Total | Existing | Total Gap | Priority gap |
| | 9.1 Strengthen institutional capacities to effectively operate social safety net programmes and formulate a new integrated strategy for social safety net programmes to: (i) coordinate and streamline them; (ii) enhance impact and targeting; (iii) improve governance; | T | 56.42 | 5.27 | 51.15 | 46.04 |
| | 9.2 Investment in employment and income generation of social safety nets (including in ADP). | H | 1,008.14 | 587.48 | 420.66 | 294.46 |

| B. Priority Interventions | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 6 | Priorities from Consultation Process (Brief description of activities) | <p>Bangladesh has an elaborate system of social safety nets operated by 13 different ministries and some NGOs covering various target groups. Some of these programmes are food based, some are cash based, and some are both food and cash based. Some of the major SSNs are food based and are provided to offer food security to the target groups. An important problem that beset this programmes is mis-targeting, i.e., exclusion of eligible ones and inclusion of non-eligible ones. There are serious gaps in coverage with some of the vulnerable groups insufficiently covered or not covered at all, for example, the elderly and the urban poor. There is still scope for enhancing the development impact of SSNs.</p> <p>The prioritized interventions are as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Strengthen institutional capacities</i></p> <p>Institutional capacity development was emphasized as a key priority in order to effectively operate SSN programmes, coordinate and streamline them; enhance impact and targeting; and improve governance. Attempts should also be undertaken to improve synergies between safety net programmes with productive infrastructure (food or cash for work) such as for irrigation, rural transport and markets. Targeting effectiveness needs to be improved to ensure that the benefits of the programmes reach the poorest and the most food insecure.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Investment in employment and income generation of social safety nets (including in ADP)</i></p> <p>It was proposed to build on existing innovative SSNs in order to develop their scopes. They are included in the ADP because they are considered as investment interventions. They are aimed to contribute to income generation, income generation and infrastructure development.</p> <p><i>The prioritized activities are:</i> Ensure access of vulnerable groups to food through safety net card/program under a wider scale program (T). Expand VGD facilities for the fisher of different char lands and conserve water bodies and biodiversity (M).</p> |

| C. Implementation Features | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| 8 | Main national implementation institutions | <p>The national implementation institutions are Food Division, DWA, DMB, DRR, Ministry of Social Welfare, universities, CSOs & private sector.</p> <p>Collaboration among the Ministry of Food and Disaster Management, Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock and the Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives and Ministry of Women Affairs, etc. is essential.</p> |
| 9 | Main international DPs | <p><i>DPs like UNDP, WFP, EU, EKN and DFID are supporting the major investments targeting employment generation, livelihoods development, vulnerable group development, empowerment of the poorest, enhancing resilience, school feeding, training and rehabilitation of destitute and orphan children, and disaster management. A number of DPs have expressed interest in improving the governance of social safety net programmes for improved effectiveness and efficiency of the safety nets systems in the country.</i></p> |
| 10 | Main implementation challenges | <p>The current challenge to achieving food security lies in implementing the Plan of Action while the future challenge also lies in preparing an updated National Food Policy and Plan of Action beyond 2015 and implementation of CIP.</p> <p>The implementation challenges are effective coordination among different ministries and line agencies. A good collaboration between various stakeholders is needed. It is necessary to review issues related to scaling up of effective SSN programmes, sustainability of programme benefits, and monitoring and evaluations of the programmes to ensure that the benefits reach the largest proportion of food insecure in the country. Cost effectiveness of means-tested versus geographic targeting for different population segments/geographical locations need to be defined through research & simulation</p> |

Note: The activities prioritized as Top (T), high (H) medium (M) and low (L).

Programme 10: Community Based Nutrition Programmes and Services

| A. Key Features | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|--------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 | Programme Aggregate Output | Community nutrition improvement is supported by strengthened National Nutrition Services (NNS) | | | | |
| 2 | Output Indicators | <input type="checkbox"/> % of poor households raising home gardening and backyard poultry (3.3.1 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> Proportion of children receiving minimum acceptable diet at 6-23 months of age as a % <input type="checkbox"/> Share of cereals in dietary energy supply <input type="checkbox"/> % of safety net programmes expenditure over safety net budget | | | | |
| 3 | Relevant Government policies, strategies and plans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSAPR II (Revised): Section 3.4.2 and 3.5.2; Perspective Plan of Bangladesh 2010-2021: Section 3.5, 7.3 and 7.4; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NFP Plan of Action: objective no. 3.1 - 3.5 and 3.8; National Food and Nutrition Policy: Section 4.1 - 4.6 & 5.0, and strategies under section 6.0; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPAN: Section 4 under objective and target 3 and Strategic section 4.3; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NMTPF: sections 3.1, 3.3, 3.17, 3.19, and thrust areas 1 and 2; National Health Policy: 4 th goal. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SFYP draft, 2011 | | | | |
| 4 | Major on-going investment operations | <i>Various investments are underway to enhance national nutritional security through awareness building and provision of micronutrient supplements to mothers and children. The National Nutrition Services under the MoHFW is the major investment programme, pooling resources from various DPs and from the GOB. The Protecting and Promoting Food Security and Nutrition for Families and Children in Bangladesh (MDG-F), implemented by various GOB Agencies under different ministries (MoA, MoHFW), involving WFP, FAO and UNICEF and a number of NGOs represents the effort for a coordinated investment in nutrition in the country.</i> | | | | |
| 5 | Costs and financing requirements (from Annex 4) | Priority Rank | Total | Existing | Total Gap | Priority gap |
| | 10.1 Community based livelihood and nutrition programmes, building on the National Nutrition Services (NNS) | T | 537.23 | 20.55 | 516.68 | 465.01 |
| | 10.2 Support community based efforts of homestead gardening, rearing small livestock, aquaculture and awareness building for improved nutrition | H/T | 18.23 | 0.10 | 18.13 | 12.69 |
| | 10.3 Link long term strategies with immediate treatment of acute malnutrition, in particular through therapeutic and supplementary feeding | T | 2.59 | - | 2.59 | 2.33 |

B. Priority Interventions

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 6 | <p>Priorities from Consultation Process (Brief description of activities)</p> | <p>Children, adolescent girls and pregnant women the worst victims of malnutrition and poor diet diversification. Faulty infant and young child feeding in the community and inadequate community services for management of severely acute malnutrition and maternal malnutrition are of serious concern. Inadequate consumption of pulses and animal foods due to high price limits availability of protein required for growth and development of the children and pregnant and lactating women.</p> <p>A focus will be required on nutrition improvement of infants and young children and women, but with a life cycle approach being adopted. Enhanced extension services and technical assistance through DAE for establishing food and nutrition security activities like integrated home gardening, horticulture, raising small animals, community fish ponds, developing local nutritious recipes and value added processed products, group and community savings are areas of priority. Dietary diversification through increased production of fruits, vegetables and animal products and enhancing their consumption are priorities of the government. Collaborative and strengthening links with health based areas of MoHFW should be established.</p> <p>The prioritization of activities linked to each of the interventions is as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Community based livelihood and nutrition programmes, building on the National Nutrition Services (NNS)</i></p> <p>Developing awareness on nutrition through media and training (T). Support training for developing awareness in nutrition (T). Building complementarities to the National Nutrition Services (NNS) process to assist rural communities to develop their own nutrition activities, through a livelihood approach, complemented by health oriented awareness campaigns (H). Conduct nutrition survey (H). Campaign on diversification of food habits which leads to creation of demand for cheaper nutritious foods (H). Promote food processing and refinement of food processing technology for improvement of nutrition (M).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Support community based efforts of homestead gardening, rearing small livestock, aquaculture and awareness building for improved nutrition</i></p> <p>Planned intervention on gardening, farming of crop, livestock and fishery (T). Strengthen “one home and one farm project” activities for homestead production of vegetables, fruits and fisheries and livestock (T). Promote production of NARS developed nutrient rich pulses (T). Develop and promote horticultural production (H). Special emphasis on conservation and production of nutrient dense fish species (H). Strengthening linkages among agriculture, livestock, fisheries health services and local government (H).</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Link long term strategies with immediate treatment of acute malnutrition, in particular through therapeutic and supplementary feeding</i></p> <p>It was proposed that agricultural and food based activities should be linked with health-based nutrition capacity building interventions. There should be a focus on BCC strategies for maternal, infant and young child nutrition, as well as micronutrient supplementation and fortification.</p> <p>Link long term with immediate management of acute malnutrition (under & over) (H).</p> |
|---|---|--|

| C. Implementation Features | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 8 | Main national implementation institutions | <p>The national implementation institutes are DGHS, DAE, DOF, DLS, BARI, BINA, Universities, BANHRDB, BNNC, CSOs and private sector.</p> <p>Collaboration among the Ministry of Health, Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock and the Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives is essential.</p> |
| 9 | Main international DPs | <p><i>Nutrition is a major priority in the country, catalyzing the interest of various DPs. The LCG on Health, Nutrition and Population is the most relevant among the sub-groups, although nutrition is being addressed also within the LCG/ARDFS sub-group for the indirect interventions. All the major multilateral and bilateral donors are providing support to the programme of nutritional advancement in Bangladesh. The Health, Population and Nutrition Sector Development Program (HPNSDP), to be implemented by MoHFW between 2011-2016, represents an important joint effort of DPs and GOB (revenue and ADP budget) to deliver significant results in the health and nutrition sector. The Nutrition Working Group is also active technical body that discusses and disseminates key policy and programmatic issues.</i></p> |
| 10 | Main implementation challenges | <p>Current nutrition programmes focus predominantly on service delivery rather than on more sustainable interventions, which would use a community mobilization approach. A focus will be required on nutrition improvement of infants and young children and women, but with a life cycle approach being adopted. There is also poor multi-sector collaboration and coordination when it comes to nutrition programmes, and thus a clear need to strengthen coordination between partners. The programme should seek synergies with other mechanisms such as SUN (with strategic focus on the first 1000 days of life) REACH, MDG-F and project Laser Beam, for which Bangladesh has been selected as a pilot country.</p> <p>Implementation challenges to be addressed are management and coordination, Commitment of the implementers, Availability of logistics in time, Regular fund flow from DPs and Government to the implementing NGOs, Training of management and implementing personnel.</p> |

Note: The activities prioritized as Top (T), high (H) medium (M) and low (L).

Programme 11: Orient Food and Nutrition Program Through Data

| A. Key Features | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|---|-------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 | Programme Aggregate Output | <i>Effective information supports planning, monitoring and evaluation of food security policies and interventions</i> | | | | |
| 2 | Output Indicators | <input type="checkbox"/> Desirable Dietary Pattern (DDP) established and updated Proportion of children receiving minimum acceptable diet at 6-23 months of age as a % <input type="checkbox"/> Food Composition Tables (FCT) updated <input type="checkbox"/> Behavioural change communication (BCC) operational | | | | |
| 3 | Relevant Government policies, strategies and plans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSAPR II (Revised): Section 3.4.2 and Section 3.5.2; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Perspective Plan of Bangladesh 2010-2021: Section 3.5; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NFP Plan of Action: objective no. 3.1 - 3.5 and 3.8; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Food and Nutrition Policy: section 5.1, 5.6 and 5.7 and 6.2 strategies 'A'; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPAN: Objective and target 3.2 in section 4 and Strategy section 4.3; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NMTPF: Section 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.20, thrust area 2; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Health Policy: 4 th goal. | | | | |
| 4 | Major on-going investment operations | <i>Major projects within Programme 11 target the improvement of statistics services to provide the country data for evidence based decisions and policy making. The most important investments include nutritional surveillance for food consumption and food composition, processing and analysis of agricultural census data and monitoring the situation of children and women in the country.</i> | | | | |
| 5 | Costs and financing requirements (from Annex 4) | Priority Rank | Total | Existing | Total Gap | Priority gap |
| | 11.1 Undertake comprehensive national nutrition and food consumption survey and update national food composition tables | M | 15.45 | 8.98 | 6.47 | 3.24 |
| | 11.2. Undertake study of dietary diversification and supplementation needs and develop advocacy, awareness and educational materials to facilitate behavioural change in eating habits and practices | H | 10.56 | - | 10.56 | 7.39 |
| | 11.3 Strengthen national capacities in surveying and analysis to facilitate evidence based decisions | M | 7.15 | 2.31 | 4.84 | 2.42 |

B. Priority Interventions

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 6 | Priorities from Consultation Process (Brief description of activities) | <p>Throughout the consultation process, nutrition has emerged as a key priority for Bangladesh, especially with reference to maternal and young children’s nutrition improvement. In order to strengthen nutrition interventions and orient nutrition policies, key food and nutrition information is required. There is currently a lack of available, up-to-date nutrition-related data. The national nutrition survey was conducted every 10 years since the early 1960’s, but the last available data is from 1995/1996.</p> <p>Updating and establishing national Food Consumption Table (FCT) is required to : serve as a nutrition planning tool in agriculture, food, health and trade sectors; agriculture and nutrition research, nutritional assessment, formulation of national and institutional diets, nutrition education and training, epidemiological research on relationship between diet and disease, nutrition labelling, food standards and safety regulations .</p> <p>The key prioritized interventions are as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Undertake comprehensive national survey of food consumption & update food composition</i></p> <p>An updated and comprehensive food consumption survey is essential to inform programme implementers on actual food and nutrient intakes, track dietary changes, identify nutritional gaps and set food production and consumption targets, based on nutrition improvement goals and indicators. In the context of the recent introduction of high yielding crop and non crop varieties (HYVs), an update of food composition tables will be key to orient research, extension and production of improved seeds. An updated FCT is required for setting food and nutrition standards specific to Bangladesh, as well as recommended dietary allowances for all nutrients as well as bioactive compounds essential for good health.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Undertake study of dietary diversification and supplementation needs and develop advocacy, awareness and educational materials to facilitate behavioural change in eating habits and practices</i></p> <p>This activity will be key in establishing associations between dietary diversity and nutrient adequacy, and between dietary diversity and household food security and strengthening the evidence base of nutrition interventions especially for the vulnerable groups in Bangladesh.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Strengthen national capacities in surveying and analysis to facilitate evidence based decisions</i></p> <p>Key organizations involved in strengthening nutrition in Bangladesh – the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and the Institute of Nutrition and Food Science (INFS), Dhaka University– have qualified personnel and good laboratories, however, human and physical capacities still require strengthening. In addition, support in order to undertake field surveys is needed.</p> <p><i>The prioritized activities are:</i> Update food consumption survey, food composition tables (H). Work out updated nutrition messages and build capacities (H).</p> |
|---|--|--|

| C. Implementation Features | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| 8 | Main national implementation institutions | <p>The national implementation institutes are Food Division, BBS, DAE, DLS, DOF, DGHS, BANHRDB, BARC, BARI, BRRI, BNNC, INFS, BAU.</p> <p>Capacity strengthening on policy and research on nutrition needs involvement of agriculture, food, health and other relevant sector's support. The INFS has the experience and capacity on conducting nutrition surveys including food consumption surveys and also developing FCT. Besides, ICDDR,B, BNNC, IPHN, and HKI also have experience in conducting different nutrition surveys and surveillance programmes.</p> <p>FPMU of Food Division, MoFDM, DAE and BANHRDB of Ministry of Agriculture, NNP, BNNC and IPHN of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and Ministry of Women and Children Affairs will be engaged in dietary diversification programmes given their involvement in this area.</p> |
| 9 | Main international DPs | <i>EU, FAO and UNFPA are the DPs who provide financial support and technical assistance to nutritional surveillance and technical assistance for data processing and analysis of demographic and agricultural census data. Higher investments are needed to further strengthen the programme.</i> |
| 10 | Main implementation challenges | The implementation challenges are to set effective coordination among different ministries and line agencies. |

Note: The activities prioritized as Top (T), high (H) medium (M) and low (L).

Programme 12: Food Safety and Quality Improvement

| B. Key Features | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|--------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 | Programme Aggregate Output | <i>National food safety and quality assurance and surveillance services are strengthened</i> | | | | |
| 2 | Output Indicators | <input type="checkbox"/> # of food items standardized by BSTI (3.6.1 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> Variation (%) of food-borne diarrhoea in under 5 children (in two week period) <input type="checkbox"/> Variation (%) in coverage of safe water supply for domestic use (3.5.1 PoA Monitoring Report) <input type="checkbox"/> Variation in access to safe drinking water in arsenic affected areas (3.5.3 PoA Monitoring Report) | | | | |
| 3 | Relevant Government policies, strategies and plans | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSAPR II (Revised): Section 3.4.2 and 3.5.2; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NFP Plan of Action: Objective No. 3.6; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Food and Nutrition Policy: section 5.5, strategies A8, and B12; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPAN: Objective and target 3.2 in section 4 and Strategy section 4.3; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NMTBF: Thrust area no. 7; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Agriculture Policy: Section 16.1, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Fisheries Policy: Section 7.16 - 7.19, 9.1.1, 9.1.3, 9.2.1-9.2.8, 9.3.1 – 9.3.3; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Livestock Policy: Section 4.1- 4.2 and 4.7-4.8. | | | | |
| 4 | Major on-going investment operations | <i>The most significant investment in programme 12 is the Improving Food Safety, Quality and Food Control in Bangladesh, implemented by FAO and the IPH (MoHFW).</i> | | | | |
| 5 | Costs and financing requirements (from Annex 4) | Priority Rank | Total | Existing | Total Gap | Priority gap |
| | 12.1 Improve surveillance system of food borne illnesses | M | 8.79 | 2.67 | 6.12 | 3.06 |
| | 12.2 Develop and enhance capacities of laboratories and systems for food quality assurance and safety and control of food | M | 163.21 | 1.78 | 161.43 | 80.72 |
| | 12.3 Support the development of a modern food control management system | M | 14.46 | 4.46 | 10.00 | 7.00 |

| B. Priority Interventions | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 6 | Priorities from Consultation Process (Brief description of activities) | <p>Food safety represents an important cornerstone of both nutrition and public health. There are several challenges in the sector, including a lack of strong policy support.</p> <p>Food safety and quality is critical to nutrition security and to ensure access of all citizens to food that is safe, nutritious and of adequate quality. The lack of a National Food Safety and Quality Policy and Action Plan, supported by an effective system of food inspection and monitoring is constraining improvements.</p> <p>The key prioritized interventions are as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Improve surveillance system of food borne illnesses</i></p> <p>The establishment and expansion of sentinel/pilot sites for surveillance of food borne illnesses is a key intervention. It will deepen understanding of the extent of the disease burden, its health and nutritional implications, and the development of evidence-based interventions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Develop and enhance capacities of laboratories and systems for food quality assurance and safety and control of food</i></p> <p>There is a need to provide technical and administrative support to the establishment of a well-equipped and resourced National Food Analysis Laboratory. Further, there is a need to support Sanitary Inspectors with analytical data to ensure the enforcement of laws and improvements in food control.</p> <p><i>The prioritized activities are:</i> Develop regional laboratories (H). Encourage production and utilization of safe food (H). Improve surveillance system of food borne illnesses (M). Enhance capacities and laboratories for food control and safety (H).</p> |

| C. Implementation Features | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| 8 | Main national implementation institutions | <p>The national implementation institutes are Food Division, BSTI, DGHS, private sector, BCSIR, and AEC.</p> <p>Collaboration among the Ministry of Food and Disaster Management, Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock, Ministry of Industries and the Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives is essential.</p> |
| 9 | Main international DPs | <p><i>EU is currently supporting the food safety project implemented by FAO and DGHS of the MoHFW (around 9 M USD). The Asian Development Bank is currently formulating a project (around 28 M USD) for SAARC region to enhance the food safety laboratory capacities, potentially including Bangladesh. Food safety is a cross cutting issue that is attracting higher interest by the GOB, consumers associations and by the DPs. More investments are required to enhance the food control management system and to enhance the capacities of laboratories and systems for food quality assurance, food safety and control of food.</i></p> |
| 10 | Main implementation challenges | <p>There are many opportunities and a great need for collaboration among partners to ensure successful implementation of this programme. The implementation challenges are effective coordination among different ministries and line agencies.</p> |

Note: The activities prioritized as Top (T), high (H) medium (M) and low (L)

ANNEX 4: COST AND FINANCING

This Annex provides background data and calculation tables used to estimate costs and financing requirements. In this Annex, the term “project” is used to describe on-going and planned investment interventions whether or not they represent actual projects (e.g. financed by some DPs) or development activities streamlined in the Government system. The ADP (Annual Development Programme) is the tool used by the Government to gather “projects” approved to be supported within the next five year time frame. All investments undertaken by the Government are channelled through it. In turn, part of the DP contribution is channelled through the ADP (i.e. complementing the budget contributions to projects); part is channelled outside of the ADP, e.g. when DPs finance NGOs to undertake certain activities. Annex 4 is divided in 3 sections:

1. Table 4.1 provides the summary cost tables by CIP component, programmes and sub-programmes;
2. Tables 4.2 to 4.4 provide information on DPs on-going financing (both through ADP and non ADP) and potential future contributions;
3. Tables 4.5 and 4.6: database of respectively all on-going “projects” relevant to the CIP (to calculate available financing) and intended future “projects” as a means to evaluate further needs (financing gap)

The exchange rate used for calculation is US\$ 1 = Taka 69.5. Other currencies (eg: DPs contributions) were converted in US\$ at the actual rate at the moment of disbursement or at the rate provided by the respective DPs.

Note on Food Utilization - Costing CIP’s direct interventions on nutrition

1. The key goal of the CIP is to enhance the nutrition and health of the Bangladeshi population through all CIP components, through both indirect and direct interventions. While the investment cost of indirect interventions is covered by various projects of relevance of CIP, the costing of direct interventions can be identified through the **Health and Population and Nutrition Sector Development Programme (HPNSDP)**. The MoHFW is one of the key executors of direct nutrition interventions, which focus mainly on population, health and nutrition. The DGHS and DGFP are the key implementers of the activities related to nutrition relevant for the CIP in particular, programme 10.

2. One of the broad aims of the CIP is to improve the nutritional status of the population as reflected in the overall structure and in the cost estimates of the programmes. In order to further mainstream nutrition in the availability and access components, the updated version of the CIP has incorporated more systematically indirect nutrition interventions in the programmes related to crop, livestock, and fisheries, including a strong focus on diversification of food production activities, which would contribute to provide the basis for more diversified diets supplying essential nutrients.

3. Direct interventions have been mainly incorporated in **Programme 10** “Community based nutrition programmes and services”. The main reference for costing was the recently drafted **Health and Population and Nutrition Sector Development Program (HPNSDP)**, composed of a set of 32 Operation Plans (OP), addressing health and nutrition. The most relevant OP for CIP is the **National Nutrition Services** (17. NNS), aimed at reducing malnutrition (especially among children and women) and at achieving sustainable improvements in nutritional status. NNS’ total estimated budget is 1,621 crore TK (around 233 M USD). For CIP costing, the OPs most relevant to nutrition have been taken into consideration. These include the entire NNS, and a part of other OPs mainly focused on health, but which have significant impact on nutritional status. It has been estimated that only a share of the total cost would be relevant for nutrition and for the CIP (this percentage varies between 10 and 20%). The OPs taken into consideration are:

- OP 3 - Community Based Health Care (16.5% of its total cost, i.e.: 52.9 M USD): including services such as de-worming, provision of vitamin A capsules, iron-folic tablets. OP 7 -Non-Communicable Diseases Control (12.8% of its total cost, i.e.: 9.46 M USD): such as diabetes, heart diseases and other conditions related to inappropriate diets and unhealthy lifestyles.
- OP 18 - Maternal, Reproductive and Adolescent health (16.9 % of its total cost, i.e.: 21.76 M USD): provision of essential service packages.
- OP 23 - Information, Education and Communication (19.4% of its total cost, i.e.: 3.35 M USD): health, nutrition and family planning.

4. The OP 13 - Planning, Monitoring and Research (DGHS) has been accounted for in **Programme 11** (Orient food and nutrition actions through data). This takes into consideration those actions which do not directly address nutrition but provide the evidence base and data that will assist and contribute to key decisions on nutrition policies and programmes.

5. The total budget of HPNSDP – at its final stage of approval, is around 56,665 crore TK (**US\$ 8.15 billion**), 59% expected to be covered by revenue budget, 15% by ADP and 26% by DPs. A pool fund is being established, comprising contributions from AusAid, CIDA, DFID, EC, KfW, GTZ, JICA, SIDA, UNFPA, WB, UNAIDS, UNICEF, WHO, and USAID. So far, DPs have committed a total amount of around US\$ 1.3 billion for the 32 OPs of HPNSDP. As soon as HPNSDP is approved **the ratio existing / future investments for programme 10 will be updated accordingly**.

Food Access – Investments and Interventions on for Social Safety Nets in Bangladesh

6. Social Safety Nets and social protection programmes, including major programmes of graduation from poverty and food insecurity receive significant contribution from the revenue budget of the GOB. The cost is around 12.7% of the revenue budget, corresponding to 2.04% of the total GDP. For financial year 2010-2012 the total amount allocated for Social Safety Nets from the revenue budget is US\$ 2.295 billion. Out of this, a significant part is dedicated to Food Security Programmes (US\$ 824 M). Moreover, despite not directly targeting food security, Cash Transfer Programmes (US\$ 879 M) contribute to increase the cash availability of disadvantaged people who tend to dedicate the largest share of their available income to food consumption. The table below summarizes the revised budget for financial year 2009-2010 and the figures for financial year 2010-11.

| Social Safety Net Programmes | Budget (Taka in crore) | |
|--|------------------------|------------------|
| | Revised (2009-10) | Budget (2010-11) |
| (A.1) Cash Transfer (Allowances) Programmes & Other Activities: | 5539.28 | 6056.71 |
| (A.1.1) Social Protection | 5527.68 | 6042.10 |
| (A.1.2) Social Empowerment | 11.60 | 14.61 |
| (A.2) Cash Transfer (Special) Programme | 161.00 | 55.52 |
| (A.2.1) Social Empowerment | 161.00 | 55.52 |
| Total: A (A.1 + A.2) = | 5700.28 | 6112.23 |
| (B) Food Security Programmes: Social Protection (upto 24-03-2010) | 4932.48 | 5726.25 |
| Total: B = | 4932.48 | 5726.25 |
| (C.1) Micro-Credit Programmes: Social Empowerment | 395.00 | 359.50 |
| (C.2) Miscellaneous Funds: Social Empowerment | 112.19 | 112.51 |
| (C.3) Miscellaneous Funds: Social Protection | 2984.15 | 3633.50 |
| (C.4) New Fund: Social Protection | 0.00 | 6.32 |
| Total: C (C1+C2+C3+C4) = | 3491.34 | 4111.83 |
| Total in Crore TK | 14124.1 | 15950.3 |
| Total in billion USD | 2.032 | 2.295 |
| | | |
| Running Development Programmes | 2581.71 | 3395.39 |
| New Development Programmes | 0.00 | 151.29 |
| Total in Crore TK | 2581.71 | 3546.68 |
| Total in billion USD | 0.371469065 | 0.510313669 |

Source: Elaborations based on figures provided by Ministry of Finance, March 2011.

Explanations on Table 4.1

Table 4.1 represents the synthesis of an inventory of projects selected through an inclusive process of consultation among different stakeholders. The cost revision implied a more accurate analysis of the ongoing investments and a thorough consultation on the upcoming and desired areas of investment (including projects in the pipeline). A template was circulated among the GOB Agencies and Departments most involved in the implementation of CIP.

The structure of Table 4.1 follows the CIP Programme and Focus and priority areas of intervention (sub-programmes), indicating for each of the programmes the budget available for relevant investments and the total additional requirement. The CIP implementation period was taken as a reference (July 2010 – June 2015). An estimate of the budget allocation for the reference period was done when the information was not available.

Table 4.1 is structured in three main areas:

- Ongoing investments: the amount allocated by programme and sub-programmes is indicated in Column A. The information derives from a mapping exercise aimed to identify the ongoing investments of the most relevant GOB agencies and department, channelled through the Annual Development Programme (ADP). Column B and Column C specify the source of funding, with almost equal contributions from GOB ADP budget and Development partners' contribution (DPs). Total amount of current investments is **US\$ 2.8 billion**, 42% for the Food Availability component, 56% for Food Access and 1% for Food Utilization.
- Additional requirement for new investments: the purpose of the CIP was also to fine tune the areas of investments to contribute to the CIP impact and outcomes. The amounts in Column D are estimates of the required investments indicated by the stakeholders' priorities. In some cases the needs indicated by the implementing agencies were rationalized to better fit with various institutional constraints and the potential capacity of absorption. The total of additional requirements is **US\$ 5.1 billion**, with a share of around 56% in Food Availability, 30% in Food Access and 15% Food Utilization.

Post prioritization requirements: the consultation process led to a fine tuning of the programmes and consequently to a prioritization of the investment requirement by sub-programmes. The criteria leading to a classification of priorities between Top and Low are explained in the main report. The total amount post prioritization is US\$ 3.4 billion, 54% in Food Availability, 29% in Food Access and 17% in Food Utilization.

Table 4.1: Existing Financing and Incremental Cost per programme and sub-programme

| ID | CIP Component | CIP Programme | Rank | Sub programmes | Ongoing projects | | | New Projects | | |
|----|-------------------|---|-------|---|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | Total approved budget | Approved by GOB | Approved by DPs | Total additional requirement | Post prioritization requirement | |
| 1 | Food Availability | Sustainable and diversified agriculture through integrated research and extension | 1 | Enhance research & knowledge generation and adoption to increase agricultural productivity and diversity in a sustainable manner | H | 31.87 | 3.16 | 28.71 | 155.05 | 108.53 |
| | | | 2 | Improve extension services to propagate knowledge & practices, supported by community-based experimentation & learning and indigenous knowledge | H | 136.80 | 30.70 | 106.10 | 356.91 | 249.84 |
| | | | 3 | Promote the development of responses to adapt agricultural systems to climate change | T | 8.50 | - | 8.50 | 92.11 | 82.89 |
| | | | TOTAL | | | 177.16 | 33.86 | 143.30 | 604.06 | 441.26 |
| | | | | | | | | 11.9% | 12.9% | |
| 2 | Food Availability | Improved water management and infrastructure for irrigation purposes | 1 | Improve water management in water distribution systems and at farm level | M | 366.41 | 137.90 | 228.51 | 213.60 | 106.80 |
| | | | 2 | Improve & increase efficiency of surface water irrigation, in particular in the south | H | 265.08 | 138.83 | 126.25 | 449.87 | 314.91 |
| | | | 3 | Reduce impact of saline water intrusion in the South | H | 0.39 | 0.39 | - | 67.63 | 47.34 |
| | | | 4 | Enhance river water flow to the South | T | 140.16 | 133.71 | 6.45 | 127.24 | 114.52 |
| | | | TOTAL | | | 772.03 | 410.82 | 361.21 | 858.34 | 583.57 |
| | | | | | | | | 17.0% | 17.1% | |
| 3 | Food Availability | Improved quality of input and soil fertility | 1 | Enhance availability of agricultural inputs, tested and certified for quality of diversified crops | H | 94.71 | 26.13 | 68.57 | 162.05 | 113.44 |
| | | | 2 | Develop public private partnerships through capacity development | T | | | | 20.00 | 18.00 |
| | | | 3 | Improve and increase sustainability of soil fertility management | H | 16.48 | 2.00 | 14.48 | 29.77 | 20.84 |
| | | | 4 | Facilitate access to credit and other financial services by smallholders and the rural poor | T | | | | 20.00 | 18.00 |
| | | | TOTAL | | | 111.19 | 28.13 | 83.06 | 231.82 | 170.27 |
| | | | | | | | | Ongoing projects | New Projects | |

| ID | CIP Component | CIP Programme | | Sub programmes | Rank | Total approved budget | Approved by GOB | Approved by DPs | Total additional requirement | Post prioritization requirement | |
|----|-------------------|---|--|--|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 4 | Food Availability | Fisheries and aquaculture development | 1 | Develop small scale aquaculture, through access to quality inputs, advice and skills | H | 7.99 | 7.99 | - | 20.86 | 14.60 | |
| | | | 2 | Improve management of fisheries resources | H | 28.61 | 11.66 | 16.96 | 164.38 | 115.07 | |
| | | | 3 | Develop public private partnerships in support of infrastructure and services development | M | - | - | - | 134.86 | 67.43 | |
| | | | 4 | Promote production in South through sustainable shrimp & prawn development and community based co management of wetlands | L | - | - | - | 36.22 | 14.49 | |
| | | | | TOTAL | | 36.61 | 19.65 | 16.96 | 356.32 | 211.58 | |
| | | | | | | | | 7.0% | 6.2% | | |
| 5 | Food Availability | Livestock development, with a focus on poultry and dairy production | 1 | Strengthen animal health services, including better diagnosis and surveillance systems to mitigate disease outbreaks | M | 21.78 | 7.10 | 14.68 | 325.97 | 162.99 | |
| | | | 2 | Strengthen husbandry capacity at household level through community based improved knowledge and advisory services | H | 9.94 | 2.01 | 7.93 | 303.73 | 212.61 | |
| | | | 3 | Improve availability and quality of inputs through public private partnerships | H | - | - | - | 20.00 | 14.00 | |
| | | | 4 | Research on livestock development, including genetic improvement | L | 28.35 | 12.94 | 15.41 | 125.37 | 50.15 | |
| | | | | TOTAL | | 60.08 | 22.06 | 38.02 | 775.07 | 439.74 | |
| | | | | | | | | 15.3% | 12.9% | | |
| | | | Sub-Total Food Availability | | 1,157.07 | 514.52 | 642.55 | 2,825.61 | 1,846.43 | | |
| | | | Share of Food Availability on total CIP | | 42% | | | 56% | 54% | | |
| 6 | Food Access | Improved access to market, value addition in agriculture and non farm incomes | 1 | Improve physical access to markets, facilities and information | M | 563.82 | 400.53 | 163.29 | 398.42 | 199.21 | |
| | | | 2 | Mobilize and promote producer & marketing groups for improved market access and knowledge | T | 48.72 | 16.48 | 32.23 | 81.98 | 73.78 | |
| | | | 3 | Develop adequate storage, processing & value addition and reduce waste through PPPs | H | | | | 90.45 | 63.31 | |
| | | | 4 | Promote and assist the development of off farm activities and rural businesses | M | 10.87 | - | 10.87 | 64.03 | 32.01 | |
| | | | | TOTAL | | 623.41 | 417.01 | 206.40 | 634.88 | 368.32 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Ongoing projects | New Projects | | | |

| ID | CIP Component | CIP Programme | | Sub programmes | Rank | Total approved budget | Approved by GOB | Approved by DPs | Total additional requirement | Post prioritization requirement |
|-------------------------|---------------|---|---|---|------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 7 | Food Access | Strengthened capacities for implementation and monitoring of NFP and CIP actions | 1 | Strengthen capacities to implement, monitor and coordinate NFP PoA and CIP; | H | 10.89 | 0.19 | 10.71 | 7.97 | 5.58 |
| | | | 2 | Strengthen national capacities for design, implementation & monitoring of CIP projects | H | 2.88 | - | 2.88 | 40.29 | 28.20 |
| | | | 3 | Strengthen capacities of civil society organizations to contribute to CIP development & implementation | H | 0.82 | - | 0.82 | 50.36 | 35.25 |
| | | | | TOTAL | | 14.60 | 0.19 | 14.41 | 98.62 | 69.04 |
| | | | | | | | | 1.9% | 2.0% | |
| 8 | Food Access | Enhanced public food management system | 1 | Enhance efficiency and effectiveness of Public Food Management Systems and improve its impact on price stabilization | T | - | - | - | 12.78 | 11.50 |
| | | | 2 | Build capacities of Ministry of Food and Disaster Management and Directorate of Food to better manage the food system | T | - | - | - | 21.79 | 19.61 |
| | | | 3 | Increase and modernize public storage and handling facilities, including in disaster prone areas. | H | 344.17 | 142.15 | 202.01 | 258.59 | 181.02 |
| | | | | TOTAL | | 344.17 | 142.15 | 202.01 | 293.17 | 212.13 |
| | | | | | | | | 5.8% | 6.2% | |
| 9 | Food Access | Institutional Development and Capacity Development for more effective safety nets | 1 | Strengthen institutional capacities to effectively operate social safety net programmes and formulate a new integrated strategy for social safety net programmes to: (i) coordinate and streamline them; (ii) enhance impact and targeting; (iii) improve governance; | T | 5.27 | 0.05 | 5.21 | 51.15 | 46.04 |
| | | | 2 | Investment in employment and income generation of social safety nets (including in ADP). | H | 587.48 | 116.51 | 470.97 | 420.66 | 294.46 |
| | | | | TOTAL | | 592.75 | 116.57 | 476.18 | 471.81 | 340.50 |
| | | | | | | | | 9.3% | 10.0% | |
| | | | | Sub-Total Food Access | | 1,574.92 | 675.92 | 899.00 | 1,498.47 | 989.98 |
| | | | | Share of Food Access on total CIP | | 57% | | | 30% | 29% |
| Ongoing projects | | | | | | | | | New Projects | |

| ID | CIP Component | CIP Programme | | Sub programmes | Rank | Total approved budget | Approved by GOB | Approved by DPs | Total additional requirement | Post prioritization requirement |
|----|------------------|---|---|--|------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 10 | Food Utilization | Community based nutrition programmes and services | 1 | Community based nutrition programmes linked with National Nutrition Services (NNS) | T | 20.55 | 5.10 | 15.45 | 516.68 | 465.01 |
| | | | 2 | Support community based efforts of homestead gardening, rearing small livestock, aquaculture and awareness building for improved nutrition | H | 0.10 | 0.10 | - | 18.13 | 12.69 |
| | | | 3 | Link long term strategies with immediate treatment of acute malnutrition, in particular through therapeutic and supplementary feeding | T | - | - | - | 2.59 | 2.33 |
| | | | | TOTAL | | 20.65 | 5.20 | 15.45 | 537.40 | 480.03 |
| | | | | | | | | 10.6% | 14.0% | |
| 11 | Food Utilization | Orient food and nutrition actions through data | 1 | Undertake comprehensive national nutrition and food consumption survey and update national food composition tables | M | 8.98 | - | 8.98 | 6.47 | 3.24 |
| | | | 2 | Undertake study of dietary diversification and supplementation needs and develop advocacy, awareness and educational materials to facilitate behavioural change in eating habits and practices | H | - | - | - | 10.56 | 7.39 |
| | | | 3 | Strengthen national capacities in surveying & analysis to facilitate evidence based decisions | M | 2.31 | 1.22 | 1.08 | 4.84 | 2.42 |
| | | | | TOTAL | | 11.29 | 1.22 | 10.06 | 21.87 | 13.05 |
| | | | | | | | | 0.4% | 0.4% | |
| 12 | Food Utilization | Food safety and quality improvement | 1 | Improve surveillance system of food borne illnesses | M | 2.67 | 0.39 | 2.28 | 6.12 | 3.06 |
| | | | 2 | Develop and enhance capacities of laboratories and systems for food quality assurance and safety and control of food | M | 1.78 | 0.26 | 1.52 | 161.43 | 80.72 |
| | | | 3 | Support the development of a modern food control management system | H | 4.46 | 0.66 | 3.80 | 10.00 | 7.00 |
| | | | | TOTAL | | 8.91 | 1.31 | 7.60 | 177.55 | 90.77 |
| | | | | | | | | 3.5% | 2.7% | |
| | | | | sub-Total Food Utilization | | 40.85 | 7.73 | 33.12 | 736.81 | 583.85 |
| | | | | Share of Food Utilization on total CIP | | 1% | | | 15% | 17% |
| | | | | TOTAL CIP | | 2,772.84 | 1,198.18 | 1,574.66 | 5,060.89 | 3,420.27 |

Explanations on Tables 4.2 to 4.4 (DPs contributions)

1. As part of the costing revision of the CIP, a survey was undertaken among the Development Partners (DPs) – bilateral and multilaterals, aiming to identify the main ongoing and future commitment in the 12 areas of CIP. About 150 projects were identified as contributing to the achievement of CIP. Half of them are classified by GOB as ADP, the rest are outside but still relevant. The group of DPs, mostly members of the LCG/ARDFS, included: ADB, AusAid, DANIDA, DFID, EKN (Netherlands), EU, FAO, IDB, IFAD, JICA, SDC, UNDP, UNICEF, USAID, WB and WFP. Secondary source of the following tables was the screening done for the Country Partnership Framework, updated in Oct 2010. The sample represents therefore an indication of the interests of the most relevant DPs, rather than an exhaustive representation of the DPs' investments in the sector.
2. Table 4.2 shows **ongoing interventions** implemented in collaboration with the Government of Bangladesh channelled through the ADP, Table 4.3 provides an indication of the **interventions outside the ADP**, and Table 4.4 indicates the **future DPs' commitments** as potential contribution to the CIP.
3. The classification of the ongoing and future interventions into the 12 areas of CIP was done according to the indications of the DPs, following the projects' core area of intervention. A further revision for consistency purposes – complemented by contacts with the respective donors when required. For cross cutting projects an approximation was needed (eg: projects in support of the livelihoods intervene in various areas, income generation, health and nutrition...). Those interventions could not be univocally classified within one specific CIP programme and were either reclassified according to the main outcome or split under various programmes. Multi-sector projects were separated into different relevant CIP programmes. . An example is given by the DANIDA funded ASPs-II, structured in different components contributing to: 1. Extension, 4. Fisheries, 5. Livestock and 6. Rural infrastructures for market access.
4. Overall, the figures show a total amount of DPs ongoing investments for **US\$ 1.390 billion**, for the period of CIP implementation (**Table 4.2**). Beyond this, the survey could identify:
 - a. A significant additional commitment – around **US\$ 518 million (Table 4.3)**, channelled outside the ADP (mainly through NGOs or GOB organizations non-classified in the ADP). Compared to the inventory of ongoing investments within the CIP, the totals may differ due to a different classification followed by the Government Agencies. The projects selected here should not be disregarded as their implementation too contributes to the achievements of CIP outcomes and impacts.
 - b. The survey allowed also an estimate of DP's future commitments of around US\$ 884 million (Table 4.4), investments not yet operational but to be undertaken during the CIP implementation period. This amount will partially address the requirements of the CIP (US\$ 5.1 billion, or the prioritized US\$ 3.4 billion). The figures show a slight preference of the DPs in interventions in the areas of Climate Change, Safety Nets and Nutrition.
 - c. A pool fund is being established, comprising GOB funds and contributions from various DPs (AusAid, CIDA, DFID, EC, KfW, GTZ, JICA, SIDA, UNFPA, WB, UNAIDS, UNICEF, WHO, and USAID) for the 32 OPs of HPNSDP, expected to be approved in June 2011. So far, a total amount of around US\$ 1.3 billion has been committed from DPs (of which an estimated 15% are contributions for direct interventions on nutrition).

Table 4.2: Inventory of Ongoing DP projects channelled through the ADP

Figures in million US\$

| ID | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| CIP Component | Food Availability | | | | | | Food Access | | | | | Food Utilization | | | | |
| Ongoing DPs' investments 2010-2015 within ADP | Research, Extension and CC | Water Mgt | Agri Inputs | Fisheries | Livestock | subtotal Availability | Mkt Access | Food policy | Food Mgt | Safety Nets | subtotal Access | Comm-based nutrition | Food data | Food safety | subtotal Utilization | Total CIP |
| ADB | 1.50 | 67.40 | 28.57 | | 4.80 | 102.27 | 85.58 | 0.29 | | | 85.86 | | | | - | 188.14 |
| Aus Aid | | | | | 12.53 | 12.53 | | | | 13.39 | 13.39 | | | | - | 25.91 |
| DANIDA | 7.21 | | | 10.22 | 10.21 | 27.64 | 37.42 | | | | 37.42 | | | | - | 65.06 |
| DFID | 99.71 | | | | 104.09 | 203.80 | 8.45 | | | 173.56 | 182.01 | | | | - | 385.81 |
| EKN | | 184.15 | | | | 184.15 | | | | | - | | | | - | 184.15 |
| EU | | | 12.01 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 13.43 | | 3.46 | | 50.00 | 53.46 | 20.27 | 8.98 | 9.02 | 38.27 | 105.16 |
| FAO (*) | 0.50 | 0.10 | | | | 0.60 | | | | | - | | 0.21 | | 0.21 | 0.81 |
| IDB | | | 35.00 | 4.54 | | 39.54 | | | | | - | | | | - | 39.54 |
| IFAD | 14.12 | 22.86 | | | | 36.98 | 3.74 | | | | 3.74 | | | | - | 40.72 |
| JICA | | 62.00 | | | | 62.00 | 13.00 | | 35.00 | | 48.00 | | | | - | 110.00 |
| SDC | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| UNDP | 21.33 | 3.64 | 0.38 | 5.52 | | 31.22 | | | | 9.67 | 9.67 | | | | - | 40.89 |
| UNICEF | | | | | | - | | | | 15.00 | 15.00 | | | | - | 15.00 |
| USAID | | | | | | - | | 4.99 | | | 4.99 | | | | - | 4.99 |
| WB | 87.26 | 84.80 | 10.80 | | | 182.86 | | | | | - | | | | - | 182.86 |
| WFP | | | | | | - | | | | 8.33 | 8.33 | 1.53 | | | 1.53 | 9.86 |
| Sub-Totals DP | 231.6 | 424.9 | 86.8 | 21.0 | 132.3 | 887.8 | 148.2 | 8.7 | 35.0 | 265.0 | 456.9 | 21.8 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 40.0 | 1,398.9 |
| Share on total | 16.6% | 30.4% | 6.2% | 1.5% | 9.5% | 64.1% | 10.6% | 0.6% | 2.5% | 19.3% | 33.0% | 1.6% | 0.7% | 0.6% | 2.9% | 100.0% |

(*) FAO contribution only includes core funds, i.e. excludes portfolio financed by other DPs

Table 4.3. Mapping of DP Contribution Outside the ADP

| ID | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
|---|----------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|-------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------------|-----------|
| CIP Component | Food Availability | | | | | | Food Access | | | | | Food Utilization | | | | |
| Ongoing DPs Investments 2010-2015 non included in the ADP | Research, Extension and CC | Water Mgt | Agril Inputs | Fisheries | Livestock | subtotal Availability | Mkt Access | Food policy | Food Mgt | Safety Nets | subtotal Access | Comm-based nutrition | Food data | Food safety | subtotal Utilization | Total CIP |
| ADB | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| Aus Aid | | | | | | - | | | | 33.00 | 33.00 | | | | - | 33.00 |
| DANIDA | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| DFID | | | | | | - | | | | 50.70 | 50.70 | | | | - | 50.70 |
| EKN | 7.55 | | | | | 7.55 | | | | | - | | | | - | 7.55 |
| EU | 27.62 | | | | 2.61 | 30.23 | | | | 36.53 | 36.53 | | | | - | 66.76 |
| FAO | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| IDB | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| IFAD | | | | | | - | 38.56 | | | | 38.56 | | | | - | 38.56 |
| JICA | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| SDC | 3.40 | 0.22 | 3.39 | 0.87 | 2.16 | 10.04 | 2.45 | | | | 2.45 | | | | - | 12.49 |
| UNDP | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| UNICEF | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| USAID | 55.06 | | 30.26 | 31.13 | 25.85 | 142.31 | 11.29 | 20.49 | | | 31.79 | 116.50 | | | 116.50 | 290.59 |
| WB | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| WFP | | | | | | - | | | | 16.30 | 16.30 | 2.00 | | | 2.00 | 18.30 |
| | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| Sub-Totals DP | 93.6 | 0.2 | 33.7 | 32.0 | 30.6 | 190.1 | 52.3 | 20.5 | - | 136.5 | 209.3 | 118.5 | - | - | 118.5 | 517.9 |
| Share on total | 18.1% | 0.0% | 6.5% | 6.2% | 5.9% | 36.7% | 10.1% | 4.0% | 0.0% | 26.4% | 40.4% | 22.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 22.9% | 100.0% |

Table 4.4. Possible future contributions by DPs

| ID | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|-------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------------|-----------|
| CIP Component | Food Availability | | | | | | Food Access | | | | | Food Utilization | | | | |
| Future DPs' Investments 2010-2015 | Research, Extension and CC | Water Mgt | Agril Inputs | Fisheries | Livestock | subtotal Availability | Mkt Access | Food policy | Food Mgt | Safety Nets | subtotal Access | Comm-based nutrition | Food data | Food safety | subtotal Utilization | Total CIP |
| ADB | 40.00 | | | | 30.00 | 70.00 | | | | | - | | | | - | 70.00 |
| Aus Aid | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| DANIDA | 75.00 | | | | | 75.00 | | | | | - | | | | - | 75.00 |
| DFID | | | | | | - | 18.25 | | | | 18.25 | | | | - | 18.25 |
| EKN | | 126.20 | | | | 126.20 | | | | | - | | | | - | 126.20 |
| EU | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| FAO (*) | 1.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 3.00 | | | | | - | 1.00 | 0.40 | | 1.40 | 4.40 |
| IDB | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| IFAD | 27.03 | | | | | 27.03 | | | | | - | | | | - | 27.03 |
| JICA | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| SDC | | | | | | - | 15.00 | | | | 15.00 | | | | - | 15.00 |
| UNDP | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| UNICEF | | | | | | - | | 5.00 | | 50.00 | 55.00 | | 25 | | 25.00 | 80.00 |
| USAID | | | | 0.08 | | 0.08 | 33.00 | | | | 33.00 | 36.00 | | | 36.00 | 69.08 |
| WB | | | | 62.50 | 8.00 | 70.50 | | | | | 200.00 | | | | - | 270.50 |
| WFP | | | | | | - | | | | 14.48 | 14.48 | 114.35 | | | 114.35 | 128.83 |
| | | | | | | - | | | | | - | | | | - | - |
| Sub-Totals DP | 143.0 | 126.7 | 0.5 | 63.1 | 38.5 | 366.0 | 66.25 | 5.00 | 200.0 | 64.48 | 335.7 | 151.4 | 25.4 | - | 176.8 | 884.3 |
| Share on total | 16.2% | 14.3% | 0.1% | 7.2% | 4.4% | 42.0% | 7.5% | 0.6% | 22.6% | 7.3% | 38.0% | 17.2% | 2.9% | 0.0% | 20.0% | 100.0% |

(*) FAO contribution only includes core funds, i.e. excludes portfolio financed by other DPs

Annex 4.5: Database of on-going projects relevant to the CIP

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M USD | | total M USD | |
|--|--|------------------------|--------|--------|---|--------|--------|-----------|-------------|-------|-------------|--|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA | |
| Programme 1: Sustainable and diversified agriculture through integrated research and extension | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 1.1 : Enhance research & knowledge generation and adoption to increase agricultural productivity and diversity in a sustainable manner | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BARC | National Agricultural Technology Project (BARC) | 17,872 | 869 | 17,003 | 17,312 | 627 | 16,685 | IDA, IFAD | 24.91 | 0.90 | 24.01 | |
| BARC | Agricultural Sector Support Programme | 365 | - | 365 | 202 | - | 202 | DANIDA | 0.29 | - | 0.29 | |
| BARI | Orange Development Project (BARI) | 403 | 403 | - | 111 | 111 | - | | 0.16 | 0.16 | - | |
| BARI | Agriculture Sector Programme Support (BARI) | 365 | - | 365 | 180 | - | 180 | Danida | 0.26 | - | 0.26 | |
| BRRRI | Strengthening and Capacity Building of Biotechnology Laboratory in BRRRI | 1,004 | 1,004 | - | 523 | 523 | - | | 0.75 | 0.75 | - | |
| BRRRI | Research and Development of Hybrid Rice in Bangladesh | 758 | 758 | - | 468 | 468 | - | | 0.67 | 0.67 | - | |
| IRRI | Cereal System Initiative South Asia (CSISA) | | | | 2,884 | | 2,884 | USAID | 4.15 | | 4.15 | |
| BRRRI | Research and Development of Hybrid Rice in Bangladesh | 758 | 758 | - | 468 | 468 | - | | 0.67 | 0.67 | - | |
| | | 21,526 | 3,793 | 17,733 | 22,149 | 2,198 | 19,951 | | 31.87 | 3.16 | 28.71 | |
| Sub Programme 1.2: Improve extension services to propagate knowledge & practices, supported by community-based experimentation & learning and indigenous knowledge | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DAE | National Agricultural Technology Project (KGF) | 7,991 | 184 | 7,807 | 7,262 | 184 | 7,078 | IDA, IFAD | 10.45 | 0.26 | 10.18 | |
| DAE | Agricultural Extension Component (AEC) under ASPs-II | | | | 5,011 | | 5,011 | DANIDA | 7.21 | | 7.21 | |
| LGED | Sunamganj Community Based Resource Management Project | 7,784 | | 7,784 | 7,784 | | 7,784 | IFAD | 11.20 | | 11.20 | |
| MOA | Integrated Agriculture Development Project (IADP) (Component A & B) | | | | 34,750 | | 34,750 | WB | 50.00 | | 50.00 | |
| DAE | National Agricultural Technology Project (DAE) | 12,389 | 936 | 11,453 | 7,444 | 486 | 6,959 | IDA, IFAD | 10.71 | 0.70 | 10.01 | |
| DAE | Greater Rangpur Agriculture & Rural Development(DAE) | 4,745 | 1,339 | 3,406 | 1,757 | 558 | 1,199 | IDB | 2.53 | 0.80 | 1.73 | |
| DAE | Strengthening Mushroom Development Project | 5,451 | 5,451 | - | 3,404 | 3,404 | - | | 4.90 | 4.90 | - | |
| DAE | Orange Development Project (DAE) | 1,912 | 1,912 | - | 260 | 260 | - | | 0.37 | 0.37 | - | |
| DAE | Improvement of Crops Production through Farm Mechanization | 14,925 | 14,925 | - | 13,487 | 13,487 | - | | 19.41 | 19.41 | - | |
| DAE | Construction of Rubber Dams in Small & medium River for Increasing Food Production | 843 | 843 | - | 774 | 774 | - | | 1.11 | 1.11 | - | |
| DAE | Agriculture Sector Programme Support (DAE) | 10,725 | 1,346 | 9,379 | 4,427 | 794 | 3,633 | Danida | 6.37 | 1.14 | 5.23 | |
| MOA | National Agricultural Technology Project (PCU) | 7,624 | 409 | 7,215 | 7,604 | 389 | 7,215 | IDA, IFAD | 10.94 | 0.56 | 10.38 | |
| AIS | Intensification of Agriculture Information Service in Ten Agriculture Regions | 1,545 | 1,545 | - | 1,000 | 1,000 | - | | 1.44 | 1.44 | - | |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD |
|---|---|------------------------|--------|--------|---|--------|--------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA |
| AIS | Agriculture Sector Programme Support (AIS) | 285 | - | 285 | 109 | - | 109 | Danida | 0.16 | - | 0.16 |
| | | 76,218 | 28,889 | 47,329 | 95,073 | 21,336 | 73,737 | | 136.80 | 30.70 | 106.10 |
| Sub Programme 1.3: Promote the development of responses to adapt agricultural systems to climate change | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) TA for project development (Planned in 2011) | 1,043 | - | 1,043 | 1,043 | - | 1,043 | ADB | 1.50 | - | 1.50 |
| MoEF | Community based adaptation to CC & water security (LDCF) | 2,085 | - | 2,085 | 2,085 | - | 2,085 | UNDP | 3.00 | - | 3.00 |
| DLS | Disaster and Climate Risk Management in Livestock Sector, CDMP II | 174 | - | 174 | 174 | - | 174 | DFID, EU Sida, UNDP Norway, AusAID, | 0.25 | - | 0.25 |
| DLS | Disaster and Climate Risk Management in Fisheries Sector, CDMP II | 174 | - | 174 | 174 | - | 174 | | 0.25 | - | 0.25 |
| DAE | Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme CDMP II (DAE component) | 2,433 | - | 2,433 | 2,433 | - | 2,433 | | 3.50 | - | 3.50 |
| | | 5,908 | - | 5,908 | 5,908 | - | 5,908 | | 8.50 | - | 8.50 |
| Funds committed for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | Total | GOB | PA |
| SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 1 | | | | | 123,129 | 23,534 | 99,595 | | 177.16 | 33.86 | 143.30 |
| Programme 2: Improved Water Management and Infrastructure for Irrigation Purposes | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 2.1: Improve water management in water distribution systems and at farm level | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BADC | Expansion of Irrigation Through Utilization of Surface Water by Double Lifting (2 nd Phase) | 9,200 | 9,200 | - | 7,305 | 7,305 | - | | 10.51 | 10.51 | - |
| BWDB | Water Management Improvement Project | | | | 58,936 | | 58,936 | ADB | 84.80 | | 84.80 |
| BWDB | Participatory Small scale Water Resources Sector Project | 78,106 | 18,949 | 59,157 | 78,088 | 18,931 | 59,157 | ADB/IFAD | 112.36 | 27.24 | 85.12 |
| BWDB | IPSWAM – Integrated planning for sustainable water management | | | | 10,425 | | 10,425 | EKN | 15.00 | | 15.00 |
| BBMDA | Barind Integrated Area Development Project (Phase-III) | 28,428 | 28,428 | - | 10,660 | 10,660 | - | | 15.34 | 15.34 | - |
| BBMDA | Activating Inoperable Deep Tube wells for Irrigation | 20,128 | 20,128 | - | 12,179 | 12,179 | - | | 17.52 | 17.52 | - |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M USD | | total M USD | |
|--|--|------------------------|---------|--------|---|----------------|----------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA | |
| BBMDA | Command Area Development & Training Project (2 nd Phase) | 16,154 | 16,154 | - | 9,154 | 9,154 | - | - | 13.17 | 13.17 | - | - |
| BBMDA | Deep Tubewell Installation Project | 24,785 | 24,785 | - | 24,585 | 24,585 | - | - | 35.37 | 35.37 | - | - |
| LGED | Small Scale Water Resources Project in Greater Mymensingh, Sylhet and Faridpur Areas | 47,015 | 15,015 | 32,000 | 43,320 | 13,024 | 30,295 | JBIC/JICA | 62.33 | 18.74 | 43.59 | - |
| | | 223,816 | 132,659 | 91,157 | 254,651 | 95,838 | 158,813 | | 366.41 | 137.90 | 228.51 | - |
| Sub Programme 2.2: Improve & increase efficiency of surface water irrigation, in particular in the south | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BADC | Asuganj-Polash Agro Irrigation (4 th Phase) | 2,353 | 2,353 | - | 1,455 | 1,455 | - | - | 2.09 | 2.09 | - | - |
| BWDB | Teests Barrage Project, 2 nd Phase | 24,862 | 24,862 | - | 15,434 | 15,434 | - | - | 22.21 | 22.21 | - | - |
| BWDB | Matamuhuri Irrigation Project | 6,220 | 6,220 | - | 850 | 850 | - | - | 1.22 | 1.22 | - | - |
| BWDB | Muhuri-Kahua Flood Control, Drainage and Irrigation Project | 13,929 | 13,929 | - | 9,557 | 9,557 | - | - | 13.75 | 13.75 | - | - |
| BWDB | Southwest Area integrated Water Resources Planning and Management Project | 28,300 | 8,739 | 19,561 | 24,094 | 7,885 | 16,208 | ADB | 34.67 | 11.35 | 23.32 | - |
| BWDB | Kurigram Irrigation Project (North Unit) | 10,997 | 10,997 | - | 9,537 | 9,537 | - | - | 13.72 | 13.72 | - | - |
| BWDB | Kurigram Irrigation Project (South Unit) | 20,780 | 20,780 | - | 19,481 | 19,481 | - | - | 28.03 | 28.03 | - | - |
| BWDB | Dhepa-Punarbhaba Water Management under Biral Upazilla in Dinajpur District | 2,157 | 2,157 | - | 1,729 | 1,729 | - | - | 2.49 | 2.49 | - | - |
| BWDB | Water Management Project | 98,301 | 19,723 | 78,578 | 89,962 | 18,426 | 71,536 | IDA | 129.44 | 26.51 | 102.93 | - |
| LGED | Construction of Rubber Dams in Small & medium Rivers for Increasing Food Production | 13,486 | 13,486 | - | 12,130 | 12,130 | - | - | 17.45 | 17.45 | - | - |
| | | 221,385 | 123,246 | 98,139 | 184,228 | 96,483 | 87,745 | | 265.08 | 138.83 | 126.25 | - |
| Sub Programme 2.3: Reduce impact of saline water intrusion in the South | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SRDI | Strengthening of soil salinity management research program in salinity management | 270 | 270 | - | 270 | 270 | - | - | 0.39 | 0.39 | - | - |
| | | 270 | 270 | - | 270 | 270 | - | - | 0.39 | 0.39 | - | - |
| Sub Programme 2.4: Enhance river water flow to the South | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BWDB | Gorai River Restoration Project | 94,215 | 94,215 | - | 92,930 | 92,930 | - | - | 133.71 | 133.71 | - | - |
| | Jamuna-Meghna River Erosion Mitigation Project | | | | 4,483 | | 4,483 | ADB | 6.45 | | 6.45 | - |
| | | 94,215 | 94,215 | - | 97,413 | 92,930 | 4,483 | | 140.16 | 133.71 | 6.45 | - |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 2 | | | | 536,292 | 285,252 | 251,041 | | 771.64 | 410.43 | 361.21 | - |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M USD | | total M USD | |
|---|--|------------------------|--------|--------|---|---------------|---------------|--------|---------------|--------------|--------------|------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA | |
| Programme 3: Improved quality of input and soil fertility | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 3.1: Enhance availability of agricultural inputs, tested and certified for quality of diversified crops | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BADC | Pulse and Oils Seed (2 nd Phase) | 2,992 | 2,992 | - | 1,686 | 1,686 | - | - | 2.43 | 2.43 | - | - |
| DAE | Second Crop Diversification Project | 34,978 | 7,498 | 27,480 | 23,296 | 4,994 | 18,302 | ADB | 33.52 | 7.19 | 26.33 | - |
| | Enhancement of Quality Seeds | | | | 24,325 | | 24,325 | IDB | 35.00 | | 35.00 | - |
| | Support to Assist Landless, Marginal and Small Farmers to Overcome Soaring Input and Food Prices in Impoverished Areas of Bangladesh | | | | | | | | | | | 0.71 |
| BADC | Modernization and Strengthening of Facilities to increase Supply of Quality Seed | 30,613 | 30,613 | | 3,549 | 3,549 | - | - | 5.11 | 5.11 | - | - |
| BBMDA | Quality Seed Production at Farmers Level | 1,032 | 1,032 | - | 553 | 553 | - | - | 0.80 | 0.80 | - | - |
| BRRI | Strengthening of Rice Breeder Seed Production & Maintenance of Nucleus Stock | 1,415 | 1,415 | - | 692 | 692 | - | - | 1.00 | 1.00 | - | - |
| DAE | Production, Storage, Distribution of Quality Rice, Wheat and Jute Seeds at Farmers Level | 8,497 | 8,497 | - | 4,679 | 4,679 | - | - | 6.73 | 6.73 | - | - |
| DAE | Production, Storage, Distribution of Quality Seeds of Pulse, Oil, and Onion at Farmers Level | 3,108 | 3,108 | - | 1,942 | 1,942 | - | - | 2.79 | 2.79 | - | - |
| MOA | Agriculture Sector Programme Support (MOA, Seed Wing) | 830 | 69 | 761 | 509 | 69 | 440 | DANIDA | 0.73 | 0.10 | 0.63 | - |
| DAE | Emergency 2007 Cyclone & Restoration Project: Recovery of Agriculture Sector & Improvement | 4,137 | - | 4,137 | 4,099 | - | 4,099 | WB | 5.90 | - | 5.90 | - |
| | | | | | 65,823 | 18,164 | 47,659 | | 94.71 | 26.13 | 68.57 | - |
| Sub Programme 3.3: Improve and increase sustainability of soil fertility management | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DAE | Granular Urea Technology Extension Project in 80 additional Upazillas | 800 | - | 800 | 350 | - | 350 | USDA | 0.50 | - | 0.50 | - |
| DoE | CWBMP (Coastal and Wetland Biodiversity Management Project) | 3,836 | - | 3,836 | 3,836 | - | 3,836 | UNDP | 5.52 | - | 5.52 | - |
| DoE | Sustainable Land Management Project | 443 | | 443 | 443 | - | 443 | UNDP | 0.64 | - | 0.64 | - |
| SRDI | Soil fertility assessment, soil degradation and its impact on Agriculture | 935 | 935 | - | 935 | 935 | - | - | 1.35 | 1.35 | - | - |
| SRDI | Food Security Programme 2006, Soil Fertility | 7,825 | 454 | 7,372 | 5,889 | 454 | 5,435 | | 8.47 | 0.65 | 7.82 | - |
| | | | | | 11,453 | 1,389 | 10,064 | | 16.48 | 2.00 | 14.48 | - |
| Funds committed for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD | |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | Total | GOB | PA | |
| SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 3 | | | | | 77,276 | 19,552 | 57,723 | | 111.19 | 28.13 | 83.06 | |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD |
|--|---|------------------------|--------|--------|---|---------------|---------------|--------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA |
| Programme 4 : Fisheries & Aquaculture Development | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 4.1: Develop small scale aquaculture, through access to quality inputs, advice and skills | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BFRI | Impact of Aquaculture Drugs and Chemicals on Aquatic Ecology | 1,798 | 1,798 | - | 1,750 | 1,750 | - | - | 2.52 | 2.52 | - |
| DOF | Restoration of Natural Breeding Habits of the Halda River | 1,369 | 1,369 | - | 1,077 | 1,077 | - | - | 1.55 | 1.55 | - |
| DOF | Infrastructure Development for Flood Plain Aquaculture in Comilla District | 709 | 709 | - | 530 | 530 | - | - | 0.76 | 0.76 | - |
| DOF | Expansion of Aquaculture Technology Services upto Union Level | 2,227 | 2,227 | - | 2,198 | 2,198 | - | - | 3.16 | 3.16 | - |
| | | 6,103 | 6,103 | - | 5,556 | 5,556 | - | - | 7.99 | 7.99 | - |
| Sub Programme 4.2 : Improve management of fisheries resources | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DOF | Regional Fisheries and Livestock Development Project | 10,083 | 923 | 9,160 | 4,870 | 536 | 4,334 | DANIDA | 7.01 | 0.77 | 6.24 |
| DOF | Capacity Building for Marine Fisheries | | | | 3,155 | | 3,155 | | 4.54 | | 4.54 |
| DOF | National Agricultural Technology Development Project (Fisheries Component) | 5,535 | 1,762 | 3,773 | 3,420 | 1,208 | 2,212 | | 4.92 | 1.74 | 3.18 |
| DOF | Greater Faridpur Fisheries Development Project | 6,714 | 6,714 | - | 4,798 | 4,798 | - | | 6.90 | 6.90 | - |
| DOF | Brood Bank Establishment Project | 1,250 | 1,250 | - | 452 | 452 | - | | 0.65 | 0.65 | - |
| DOF | ECRRP (Fisheries Component) | 2,085 | - | 2,085 | 2,085 | - | 2,085 | WB | 3.00 | - | 3.00 |
| DOF | Aquaculture and Fisheries Management in Bhabodha Area, Jessore | 986 | 986 | - | 968 | 968 | - | | 1.39 | 1.39 | - |
| BFRI | Support to Sustainable Development of the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem | 198 | 198 | - | 138 | 138 | - | | 0.20 | 0.20 | - |
| | | 26,851 | 11,833 | 15,018 | 19,887 | 8,101 | 11,786 | | 28.61 | 11.66 | 16.96 |
| Funds committed for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD |
| | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | Total | GOB | PA | |
| SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 4 | | | | | 25,443 | 13,657 | 11,786 | | 37 | 20 | 17 |
| Programme 5 : Livestock Development, with a focus on poultry and dairy production | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 5.1 : Strengthen animal health services, including better diagnosis and surveillance systems to mitigate disease outbreaks | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DLS | Avian Influenza Preparedness & Response Proj | 10,730 | 1,030 | 9,700 | 8,852 | 769 | 8,083 | | 12.74 | 1.11 | 11.63 |
| DLS | Modernization of Vaccine Production Technology & Extension of Laboratory Facilities | 5,687 | 5,687 | - | 3,974 | 3,974 | - | | 5.72 | 5.72 | - |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M USD | | |
|---|---|------------------------|--------|-------|---|---------------|---------------|--------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA |
| DLS | Strengthening Of Support Of combating Avian Influenza (HPA1) in Bangladesh Project | 3,569 | 190 | 3,379 | 2,313 | 190 | 2,123 | | 3.33 | 0.27 | 3.05 |
| | | | | | 15,139 | 4,933 | 10,206 | | 21.78 | 7.10 | 14.68 |
| Sub Programme 5.2 : Strengthen husbandry capacity at household level through community based improved knowledge and advisory services | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DLS | Support Service for Small holder Dairy and Poultry Farmers at 22 Selected Districts | 1,560 | 1,560 | - | 1,400 | 1,400 | - | | 2.01 | 2.01 | - |
| DLS | ECRRP (Livestock Component) | 2,085 | - | 2,085 | 2,085 | - | 2,085 | WB | 3.00 | - | 3.00 |
| DLS | Emergency 2007 (Sidr) Cyclone Recovery and Restorstion Project | 3,436 | - | 3,436 | 3,425 | - | 3,425 | | 4.93 | - | 4.93 |
| | | | | | 6,910 | 1,400 | 5,510 | | 9.94 | 2.01 | 7.93 |
| Sub Programme 5.4: Research on livestock development, including genetic improvement | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DLS | Breed Upgradation Through Progeny Test Project | 1,058 | 1,058 | - | 712 | 712 | - | | 1.02 | 1.02 | - |
| DLS | Artificial Insemination & Embryo Transfer Technology Project | 4,533 | 4,533 | - | 4,194 | 4,194 | - | | 6.04 | 6.04 | - |
| DLS | Buffaloe Development Project | 1,756 | 1,756 | - | 1,749 | 1,749 | - | | 2.52 | 2.52 | - |
| BLRI | Regional Fisheries & Livestock Development Project (Noakhali Component) | 9,672 | 1,045 | 8,627 | 5,516 | 914 | 4,602 | DANIDA | 7.94 | 1.32 | 6.62 |
| DLS | Second Participatory Livrstock Development Project | 3,764 | 2,252 | 1,512 | 2,045 | 1,052 | 993 | ADB | 2.94 | 1.51 | 1.43 |
| DLS | National Agricultural Technology Project (DLS Component) | 7,185 | 494 | 6,691 | 5,489 | 374 | 5,115 | | 7.90 | 0.54 | 7.36 |
| | | | | | 19,706 | 8,996 | 10,710 | | 28.35 | 12.94 | 15.41 |
| Funds committed for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | Total | GOB | PA |
| SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 5 | | | | | 41,754 | 15,329 | 26,425 | | 60.08 | 22.06 | 38.02 |
| Programme 6 : Improved access to markets, value-addition in agriculture, and to non farm incomes | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 6.1 : Improve physical access to markets, facilities and information | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LGED | Greater Rangpur Agriculture & Rural Development (DAE-LGED) | 2,911 | 335 | 2,576 | 499 | 196 | 302 | IDB | 0.72 | 0.28 | 0.43 |
| LGED | Development of Integrated Infrastructure | 9,592 | 2,773 | 6,819 | 2,407 | 450 | 1,957 | IDB | 3.46 | 0.65 | 2.82 |
| LGED | Union Infrastructure Development Project (Dinajpur, Panchagarh, Thakurgaon, Rangpur, Lalmonirhat, Kurigram, Gaibandha Nilphamari) | 13,985 | 13,985 | - | 6,407 | 6,407 | - | | 9.22 | 9.22 | - |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M USD | | total M USD | |
|------------|--|------------------------|---------|---------|---|---------|---------|-----------------------|-------------|--------|-------------|---|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA | |
| LGED | Village Road and Hat Bazar Development Project: Greater Sylhet | 19,635 | 19,635 | - | 16,185 | 16,185 | - | - | 23.29 | 23.29 | - | - |
| LGED | Market Infrastructure Development in Charland Regions | 29,437 | 8,813 | 20,624 | 19,267 | 6,965 | 12,302 | IFAD, Netherlands | 27.72 | 10.02 | 17.70 | - |
| LGED | Greater Barisal District Rural Roads & Market Development Project | 39,750 | 39,750 | - | 37,773 | 37,773 | - | - | 54.35 | 54.35 | - | - |
| LGED | Construction of Village Road, Bridge /Culvert& other Infrastructure of Underdeveloped Upazilla of North West Bangladesh | 42,500 | 42,500 | - | 41,652 | 41,652 | - | - | 59.93 | 59.93 | - | - |
| LGED | Agriculture Sector Programme Support (ASPS) Phase-II Rural Road & Market Access Infrastructure Development Project | 42,552 | 21,302 | 21,250 | 17,514 | 12,239 | 5,275 | DANIDA | 25.20 | 17.61 | 7.59 | - |
| LGED | Rural Infrastructure Development Project (2 nd Revised) | 44,650 | 44,650 | - | 6,967 | 6,967 | - | - | 10.02 | 10.02 | - | - |
| LGED | Development of Rural Roads and Hat/Bazars on Priority Basis | 50,000 | 50,000 | - | 40,691 | 40,691 | - | - | 58.55 | 58.55 | - | - |
| LGED | Rural Infrastructure Development Project in Eastern Region of Bangladesh: Greater Chittagong, Noakhali and Sylhet District | 99,497 | 23,065 | 76,432 | 9,286 | 3,494 | 5,791 | JICA | 13.36 | 5.03 | 8.33 | - |
| LGED | Rural Infrastructure Development(Public Priority Rural Communication and Hat-Bazar Development & Rehabilitation) Part-II | 99,500 | 99,500 | - | 42,183 | 42,183 | - | - | 60.69 | 60.69 | - | - |
| LGED | Second Rural Infrastructure Improvement (RIP-2) | 144,370 | 53,980 | 90,390 | 89,972 | 36,705 | 53,267 | ADB, KfW, DFID, & GTZ | 129.46 | 52.81 | 76.64 | - |
| LGED | Rural Infrastructure Development (Public Priority Rural Communication and Hat-Bazar Development & Rehabilitation) | 212,816 | 212,816 | - | 7,771 | 7,771 | - | - | 11.18 | 11.18 | - | - |
| LGED | Rural Development Project: Infrastructure Development-26 (2 nd Revised) | 260,287 | 92,137 | 168,150 | 53,283 | 18,691 | 34,592 | IDA | 76.67 | 26.89 | 49.77 | - |
| | | 1,111,483 | 725,241 | 386,242 | 391,855 | 278,368 | 113,487 | | 563.82 | 400.53 | 163.29 | - |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD |
|--|---|------------------------|--------|--------|--|----------------|----------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA |
| Sub Programme 6.2: Mobilize and promote producer & marketing groups for improved market access and knowledge | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BFDC | Establishment of Fish Marketing Facilities in Dhaka Metropolis | 807 | 807 | - | 329 | 329 | - | | 0.47 | 0.47 | - |
| DAE | National Agricultural Technology Project (Hortex) | 3,613 | 164 | 3,449 | 3,245 | 126 | 3,119 | IDA, IFAD | 4.67 | 0.18 | 4.49 |
| DAM | Bangladesh Agri. Business Development Project | 38,232 | 11,151 | 27,081 | 30,284 | 11,001 | 19,283 | | 43.57 | 15.83 | 27.75 |
| | | 42,652 | 12,122 | 30,530 | 33,858 | 11,456 | 22,402 | | 48.72 | 16.48 | 32.23 |
| Sub Programme 6.4: Promote and assist the development of off farm activities and rural businesses | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Agribusiness Development Project | | | | 5,317 | | 5,317 | ADB | 7.65 | | 7.65 |
| | Regulatory and Investment Systems for Enterprise and Growth (RISE): component supporting South Asia Enterprise Development Facility (SEDF) - | | | | | | | | | | 3.13 |
| | Strengthening Project Management on Agribusiness | | | | 67 | | 67 | ADB | 0.10 | | 0.10 |
| | | | | | 7,555 | - | 7,555 | | 10.87 | - | 10.87 |
| | | | | | Funds committed for the period 2010-2015 | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | Total | GOB | PA |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 6 | | | | 433,269 | 289,824 | 143,445 | | 623.41 | 417.01 | 206.40 |
| Programme 7 : Strengthened capacities for implementation and monitoring of NFP and CIP actions | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 7.1 : Strengthen capacities to implement, monitor and coordinate National Food Policy-Plan of Action and CIP | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FPMU | National Food Policy Capacity Strengthening Project (2nd phase) | 7,344 | 90 | 7,254 | 7,344 | 90 | 7,254 | USAID/E C | 10.57 | 0.13 | 10.44 |
| Food Directorate | Strengthening the Government Institutional Capacity of DG Food for Improving Food Security (Component-A) | 274 | 25 | 249 | 149 | 25 | 124 | ADB | 0.21 | 0.04 | 0.18 |
| MoA | Strengthening the Government Institutional Capacity of MOA for Improving Food Security (Component-B) | 178 | 16 | 162 | 79 | 16 | 63 | ADB | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.09 |
| | | 7,796 | 131 | 7,665 | 7,572 | 131 | 7,441 | | 10.89 | 0.19 | 10.71 |
| Sub Programme 7.2 : Strengthen national capacities for design, implementation & monitoring of CIP projects | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MOA | Technical Assistance Component Capacity development in Agriculture and Food Security Investment Programmes (Institutions) | 2,000 | | 2,000 | 2,000 | - | 2,000 | ABD | 2.88 | - | 2.88 |
| | | 2,000 | - | 2,000 | 2,000 | - | 2,000 | | 2.88 | - | 2.88 |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD |
|--|--|------------------------|-----|-------|---|-----|-----|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA |
| Sub Programme 7.3 : Strengthen capacities of civil society organizations to contribute to CIP development & implementation | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MOA | Technical Assistance Component Capacity development in Agriculture and Food Security Investment Programmes (Civil Society) | 572 | | 572 | 572 | - | 572 | | 0.82 | - | 0.82 |
| | | 572 | - | 572 | 572 | - | 572 | | 0.82 | - | 0.82 |
| Funds committed for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD |
| | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | Total | GOB | PA | |
| SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 7 | | | | | | | | 10,144 | 131 | 10,013 | |
| | | | | | | | | 14.60 | 0.19 | 14.41 | |

| Programme 8 : Enhanced Public Food Management Systems | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------|--------|-------|---------|--------|-------|----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| Sub Programme 8.3: Increase and modernize public storage and handling facilities, including in disaster prone areas. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food Directorate | Construction of 1.10 lakh MT Capacity Food Godown in the Northern region of the Country | 24,032 | 24,032 | - | 22,358 | 22,358 | - | DRGACF | 32.17 | 32.17 | - |
| Food Directorate | Reconstruction of Dilapidated Food Godowns and Ancillary Infrastructures of DOF | 2,415 | 2,415 | - | 1,940 | 1,940 | - | | 2.79 | 2.79 | - |
| Food Directorate | Construction of 0.84 lakh MT Capacity Food Godown at Halishar CSD campus | 21,871 | 21,871 | - | 21,871 | 21,871 | - | | 31.47 | 31.47 | - |
| Food Directorate | Construction of 1.35 lakh MT capacity Godowns | 28,300 | 28,300 | - | 28,300 | 28,300 | - | | 40.72 | 40.72 | - |
| Food Directorate | Bangladesh Modernized Food Storage Study Project (BMSFP) | 1,400 | - | 1,400 | 1,400 | - | 1,400 | WB | 2.01 | - | 2.01 |
| Food Directorate | Construction of a Concrete Grain Silo of 50,000 MT capacity at Mongla Port with Ancillary Facilities | 24,494 | 24,494 | - | 24,329 | 24,329 | - | JDCF | 35.01 | 35.01 | - |
| | | | | | 100,198 | 98,798 | 1,400 | | 144.17 | 142.16 | 2.01 |
| Funds committed for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD |
| | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | Total | GOB | PA | |
| SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 8 | | | | | | | | 100,198 | 98,798 | 1,400 | |
| | | | | | | | | 144.17 | 142.16 | 2.01 | |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD |
|--|---|------------------------|--------|--------|---|--------|--------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA |
| Programme 9 : Institutional Development and Capacity Development for more effective safety nets. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 9.1: Strengthen institutional capacities to effectively operate social safety net programmes and formulate a new integrated strategy for social safety net programmes to: (i) coordinate and streamline them; (ii) enhance impact and targeting; (iii) improve governance; | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DMB (MOFDM) | Operation Support to the employment generation programme for the poorest (EGPP) | 3,660 | 37 | 3,623 | 3,660 | 37 | 3,623 | | 5.27 | 0.05 | 5.21 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 3,660 | 37 | 3,623 | 3,660 | 37 | 3,623 | | 5.27 | 0.05 | 5.21 |
| Sub Programme 9.2: Investment in employment and income generation of social safety nets (including in ADP). | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Char Livelihoods Programme (CLP II) | | | | 80,620 | | 80,620 | DFID | 116.00 | | 116.00 |
| LGED | CDSP- Char Development & Settlement project | | | | 10,425 | | 10,425 | IFAD, EKN | 15.00 | | 15.00 |
| | Capacity Building for VGD | | | | 1,112 | | 1,112 | WFP | 1.60 | | 1.60 |
| | Capacity building for School feeding | | | | 4,629 | | 4,629 | WFP | 6.66 | | 6.66 |
| | Urban Partnerships for Poverty Reduction | | | | 54,905 | | 54,905 | DFID | 79.00 | | 79.00 |
| | Food and Livelihood security | | | | 23,317 | | 23,317 | EU | 33.55 | | 33.55 |
| | Vulnerable Group Development of the Ultra Poor (VGDUP) | | | | 6,839 | | 6,839 | EU | 9.84 | | 9.84 |
| LGED | Rural Employment and Road Maintenance Programme | 94,300 | 94,300 | - | 57,533 | 57,533 | - | | 82.78 | 82.78 | - |
| LGED | Rural Employment Opportunity for Public Assets (REOPA) | 17,367 | 425 | 16,942 | 397 | 393 | 4 | EU, UNDP | 0.57 | 0.56 | 0.01 |
| Dept of Women Affairs | Development Programme of Ultra Poor Women (WA) | 17,630 | 430 | 17,200 | 5,948 | 287 | 5,660 | | 8.56 | 0.41 | 8.14 |
| BRDB | Economic Empowerment of the Poorest in Bangladesh | 88,674 | 274 | 88,400 | 77,196 | 265 | 76,931 | DFID | 111.07 | 0.38 | 110.69 |
| LGED | Enhancing Resilience under Bangladesh Country Programme | 19,885 | 9,820 | 10,065 | 13,534 | 6,585 | 6,949 | WFP | 19.47 | 9.47 | 10.00 |
| BRDB | Employment Guarantee Scheme for Hardcore Poor of Northern Region | 2,479 | 2,479 | - | 671 | 671 | - | | 0.97 | 0.97 | - |
| BRDB | One House One Farm | 11,970 | 11,970 | - | 11,251 | 11,251 | - | | 16.19 | 16.19 | - |
| DMB (MOFDM) | ECRRP-Disaster Risk Mitigation and Reduction | 5,516 | - | 5,516 | 5,283 | - | 5,283 | | 7.60 | - | 7.60 |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M USD | | total M USD | |
|---|--|------------------------|-----------|-----------|--|---------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA | |
| DMB (MOFDM) | Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme (2 nd Phase) | 36,100 | 601 | 35,500 | 35,890 | 601 | 35,290 | DFID, EU, Sida, Norway, AusAID, UNDP | 51.64 | 0.86 | 50.78 | |
| BRDB | Urban Based Marginal Women Development | 1,882 | 1,882 | - | 1,732 | 1,732 | - | | 2.49 | 2.49 | - | |
| DSS | Training and Rehabilitation Centre for the Destitute and Orphan Children | 1,173 | 1,173 | - | 974 | 974 | - | | 1.40 | 1.40 | - | |
| DSS | Services for Children at Risk | 6,425 | 197 | 6,228 | 2,733 | 50 | 2,683 | | 3.93 | 0.07 | 3.86 | |
| DPE | EC Assisted School Feeding Programme | 13,436 | 636 | 12,800 | 13,313 | 636 | 12,677 | EU | 19.16 | 0.92 | 18.24 | |
| | | 316,836 | 124,186 | 192,650 | 408,301 | 80,976 | 327,324 | | 587.48 | 116.51 | 470.97 | |
| | | | | | Funds committed for the period 2010-2015 | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD | |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | Total | GOB | PA | |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 9 | | | | 411,961 | 81,013 | 330,947 | | 592.75 | 116.57 | 476.18 | |
| Programme 10 : Community based nutrition programmes and services | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 10.1: Community based livelihood and nutrition programmes, building on the National Nutrition Service (NNS) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MoH&FW | National Nutrition Programme | 125,051 | 14,344 | 110,708 | 5,000 | 2,000 | 3,000 | | 7.19 | 2.88 | 4.32 | |
| Various | Protecting and Promoting Food Security and Nutrition for Families and Children in Bangladesh | 6,000 | - | 6,000 | 5,699 | | 5,699 | MDG-F (Spain) | 8.20 | | 8.20 | |
| | Behavioural Change communication (focus on nutrition) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MoH&FW | Micro Nutrient Supplementation | 10,492 | 2,756 | 7,736 | 3,585 | 1,544 | 2,041 | | 5.16 | 2.22 | 2.94 | |
| | | 141,543 | 17,100 | 124,444 | 14,284 | 3,544 | 10,740 | | 20.55 | 5.10 | 15.45 | |
| Sub Programme 10.2 : Support community based efforts of homestead gardening, rearing small livestock, aquaculture and awareness building for improved nutrition | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DLS | Conservation & Improvement of Native Sheep Through Community Farming 7 Commercial Farming Project (Component- B) | 1,026 | 1,026 | - | 67 | 67 | - | | 0.10 | 0.10 | - | |
| | | 3,527,027 | 1,870,910 | 1,656,117 | 67 | 67 | - | | 0.10 | 0.10 | - | |
| | | | | | Funds committed (2010-2015) | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD | |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | Total | GOB | PA | |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 10 | | | | 14,351 | 3,611 | 10,740 | | 20.65 | 5.20 | 15.45 | |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD |
|---|--|------------------------|-------|-------|---|------------|--------------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA |
| Programme11 : Orient food and nutrition program through data: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 11.1 : Undertake updated & comprehensive national survey of food consumption & food composition | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Food Security 2006: Nutritional Surveillance | | | | 6241.1 | | 6241.1 | EU | 8.98 | | 8.98 |
| | | | | | 6241.1 | 0 | 6241.1 | | 8.98 | - | 8.98 |
| Sub Programme 11.3 : Strengthen national capacities in surveying and analysis to facilitate evidence based decisions | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BBS | Assistance in the data processing and analysis of the Bangladesh census of agriculture | 11 | - | 11 | 11 | - | 11 | | 0.02 | - | 0.02 |
| BBS | Agriculture Census Project 2008 | 4,343 | 3,995 | 348 | 1,156 | 808 | 348 | FAO | 1.66 | 1.16 | 0.50 |
| BBS | Monitoring the situation of Children and Women (Phase 2) | 1,062 | 58 | 1,004 | 437 | | 395 | | 0.63 | 0.06 | 0.57 |
| | | 5,416 | 4,053 | 1,363 | 1,604 | 850 | 754 | | 2.31 | 1.22 | 1.08 |
| Funds committed (2010-2015) | | | | | | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | Total | GOB | PA |
| SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 11 | | | | | 7,845 | 850 | 6,995 | | 11.29 | 1.22 | 10.06 |
| Programme 12 : Food Safety and Quality Improvement | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 12.1 : Improve surveillance system of food borne illnesses | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DGHS | Improving Food Safety, Quality and Food Control in Bangladesh | 7,320 | 921 | 6,399 | 6,193 | 912 | 5,281 | EU | 2.67 | 0.39 | 2.28 |
| | | | | | 6,193 | 912 | 5,281 | | 2.67 | 0.39 | 2.28 |
| Sub Programme 12.2 : 2. Develop and enhance capacities of laboratories and systems for food quality assurance and safety and control of food | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DGHS | Improving Food Safety, Quality and Food Control in Bangladesh | 7,320 | 921 | 6,399 | 6,193 | 912 | 5,281 | EU | 1.78 | 0.26 | 1.52 |
| | | | | | 6,193 | 912 | 5,281 | | 1.78 | 0.26 | 1.52 |
| Sub Programme 12.3 : Support the development of a modern food control management system | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DGHS | Improving Food Safety, Quality and Food Control in Bangladesh | 7,320 | 921 | 6,399 | 6,193 | 912 | 5,281 | EU | 4.46 | 0.66 | 3.80 |
| | | | | | 6,193 | 912 | 5,281 | | 4.46 | 0.66 | 3.80 |
| Funds committed (2010-2015) | | | | | | | | | total M USD | total M USD | total M USD |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | Total | GOB | PA |
| SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 12 (ongoing) | | | | | 6,193 | 912 | 5,281 | | 8.91 | 1.31 | 7.60 |
| Total Existing Resources Available for CIP | | | | | | | | | 2,772.45 | 1,197.79 | 1,574.66 |

Annex 4.6: Database of intended future projects relevant to the CIP

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total USD | M | total USD | M | total USD | M |
|---|---|------------------------|--------|-------|---|--------|-------|----|-----------|-------|-----------|---|-----------|---|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA | | | |
| Programme 1 : Sustainable and diversified agriculture through integrated research and extension | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme` 1.1 : Enhance research & knowledge generation and adoption to increase agricultural productivity and diversity in a sustainable manner | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BRRRI | Strengthening Research Activities and Outreach Infrastructure Development Project | 45,000 | 45,000 | - | 30,000 | 30,000 | - | - | 43.17 | 43.17 | - | - | - | - |
| BINA | Strengthening Research Activities and Sub-Stations Development of BINA | 11,292 | 11,292 | - | 6,000 | 6,000 | - | - | 8.63 | 8.63 | - | - | - | - |
| BJRI | Basic & Applied Research in Jute (BJRI) | 6,593 | 6,593 | - | 6,593 | 6,593 | - | - | 9.49 | 9.49 | - | - | - | - |
| DAE | Citrus Development Project | 6,180 | 6,180 | - | 6,180 | 6,180 | - | - | 8.89 | 8.89 | - | - | - | - |
| BARI | Integrated Qualitative Horticulture Development Project (BARI) | 5,481 | 5,481 | - | 5,481 | 5,481 | - | - | 7.89 | 7.89 | - | - | - | - |
| BARC | Development of technology Packages for new Cropping Pattern, Homestead Farming and mixed or multiple Cropping | 5,000 | 500 | 4,500 | 2,500 | 500 | 2,000 | - | 3.60 | 0.72 | 2.88 | - | - | - |
| BARI | Development of Improved Seeds for Rice, Wheat and Maize | 3,732 | 3,732 | - | 3,732 | 3,732 | - | - | 5.37 | 5.37 | - | - | - | - |
| BARI | Improvement and Quality Seed Production of Rice, Wheat and maize (BARI) | 3,732 | 3,732 | - | 3,732 | 3,732 | - | - | 5.37 | 5.37 | - | - | - | - |
| BARI | Agricultural Machineries Technology Development and Expansion Project (BARI) | 3,194 | 3,194 | - | 3,194 | 3,194 | - | - | 4.60 | 4.60 | - | - | - | - |
| BARI | Tuber Crop Development Project (BARI) | 2,963 | 2,963 | - | 2,963 | 2,963 | - | - | 4.26 | 4.26 | - | - | - | - |
| BARI | Upgrading of Pulses Research Sub-Station, Madaripur to Regional Pulses Research station | 2,436 | 2,436 | - | 2,436 | 2,436 | - | - | 3.50 | 3.50 | - | - | - | - |
| BRRRI | Intensification of Rice-Based Vegetables and Horticultural Crop Production in Greater Mymensingh Region | 2,429 | 2,429 | - | 2,429 | 2,429 | - | - | 3.49 | 3.49 | - | - | - | - |
| BRRRI | Farm Machinery Technology Development and Dissemination | 1,412 | 1,412 | - | 1,412 | 1,412 | - | - | 2.03 | 2.03 | - | - | - | - |
| BRRRI | Crop Intensification in Greater Sylhet Region | 1,276 | 1,276 | - | 1,276 | 1,276 | - | - | 1.84 | 1.84 | - | - | - | - |
| BRRRI | Mujibnagar Integrated Agricultural Development Project | 1,144 | 1,144 | - | 1,144 | 1,144 | - | - | 1.65 | 1.65 | - | - | - | - |
| BARC | Development of Technologies to Reduce Post Harvest Loss and Improve Processing | 1,000 | 100 | 900 | 1,000 | 100 | 900 | - | 1.44 | 0.14 | 1.29 | - | - | - |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total USD | M | total USD | M | total USD | M |
|------------|--|------------------------|---------|--------|---|--------|--------|----|-----------|--------|-----------|---|-----------|---|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA | | | |
| BARC | Development of Technologies for the Production of High Value Horticultural Crops, spices, aromatic and Fine Grain Rice | 1,000 | 100 | 900 | 1,000 | 100 | 900 | | 1.44 | 0.14 | 1.29 | | | |
| BARC | Development of Suitable Technologies for Hill Farming, Char-land and Coastal Agriculture | 1,000 | 100 | 900 | 1,000 | 100 | 900 | | 1.44 | 0.14 | 1.29 | | | |
| BARC | Development of High Yielding and Modern Varieties with Appropriate Production Package Technologies of Major Crops to Increase Production to meet Future Demand | 1,000 | 100 | 900 | 1,000 | 100 | 900 | | 1.44 | 0.14 | 1.29 | | | |
| BRRRI | Magura-Jessore-Narail-Khulna-Satkhira Integrated Agricultural Development Project | 1,000 | 1,000 | - | 1,000 | 1,000 | - | | 1.44 | 1.44 | - | | | |
| BJRI | Development and Dissemination of Agricultural Technologies for Jute and Allied Fiber Crops | 988 | 988 | - | 988 | 988 | - | | 1.42 | 1.42 | - | | | |
| BRRRI | Perojpur-Gopalganj-Bagerhat Integrated Agriculture Development Project | 920 | 920 | - | 920 | 920 | - | | 1.32 | 1.32 | - | | | |
| BSRI | Pilot Date palm, Palmyra Palm and Golpata Development Project | 884 | 884 | - | 884 | 884 | - | | 1.27 | 1.27 | - | | | |
| BSRI | Strengthening of Biotechnology of Sugarcane Research Institute (BSRI) | 862 | 862 | - | 862 | 862 | - | | 1.24 | 1.24 | - | | | |
| BRRRI | Biotechnology Research Facilities Development at BRRRI | 650 | 650 | - | 650 | 650 | - | | 0.94 | 0.94 | - | | | |
| BARD | Minimum water and Guti urea uses in rice for increased production and additional employment: An action research based on Village Group Organization | 581 | 581 | - | 581 | 581 | - | | 0.84 | 0.84 | - | | | |
| BARC | Conservation, Characterization and Utilization of Valuable Germplasm | 500 | 50 | 450 | 500 | 50 | 450 | | 0.72 | 0.07 | 0.65 | | | |
| BRRRI | Minimizing Rice Yield Gap | 300 | 300 | - | 300 | 300 | - | | 0.43 | 0.43 | - | | | |
| BARC | Impact Assessment of the Newly Generated Technologies Towards Increased Productivity and the Factors Affecting Their Adoptions | 100 | 10 | 90 | 100 | 10 | 90 | | 0.14 | 0.01 | 0.13 | | | |
| BARC | Transfer of Rice Land to the Cultivable Land of High Value Crops: Limits and Constraints | 30 | 3 | 27 | 30 | 3 | 27 | | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.04 | | | |
| BARC | National Agricultural Technology Project (BARC) | 17,872 | 869 | 17,003 | 17,872 | 869 | 17,003 | | 25.72 | 1.25 | 24.46 | | | |
| | | 130,549 | 104,879 | 25,670 | 107,757 | 84,587 | 23,170 | - | 155.05 | 121.71 | 33.34 | | | |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M | total M | total M |
|---|--|------------------------|--------|--------|---|--------|--------|----|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | USD | USD | USD |
| Sub Programme 1.2 : Improve extension services to propagate knowledge & practices, supported by community-based experimentation & learning and indigenous knowledge | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DAE | Enhancing Food Production | 50,000 | 16,500 | 33,500 | 16,667 | 5,500 | 11,167 | | 23.98 | 7.91 | 16.07 |
| DAE | Integrated Quality Horticulture Development Project | 19,425 | 19,425 | - | 19,425 | 19,425 | - | | 27.95 | 27.95 | - |
| BADC | Greater Khulna-Jessore-Kushtia Integrated Agricultural Development Project (Phase II) | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | | 16.77 | 16.77 | - |
| BADC | Greater Bogra-Rangpur-Dinajpur Integrated Agricultural Development Project (Phase II) | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | | 16.77 | 16.77 | - |
| BADC | Greater Dhaka Irrigation Area Development Project-2nd Phase | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | | 16.77 | 16.77 | - |
| BADC | Faridpur – Gopalganj-Rajbari Irrigation Area Development Project | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | | 16.77 | 16.77 | - |
| BADC | Sylhet Division Integrated Irrigation Development Project | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | | 16.77 | 16.77 | - |
| BADC | Chittagong Hill Tracts Integrated Agricultural Development Project (Phase II) | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | | 16.77 | 16.77 | - |
| BADC | Greater Mymensingh Area Integrated Agricultural Development Project | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | | 16.77 | 16.77 | - |
| DAE | Farmer's Training at Upazilla level for Transfer of Technology (2 nd Phase) | 8,246 | 8,246 | - | 8,246 | 8,246 | - | | 11.86 | 11.86 | |
| DAE | Integrated Qualitative Horticulture Development Project (DAE) | 7,862 | 7,862 | - | 7,862 | 7,862 | - | | 11.31 | 11.31 | |
| BADC | Integrated Quality Horticulture Development Project | 3,635 | 2,770 | - | 3,635 | 2,770 | 865 | | 5.23 | 3.99 | 1.24 |
| DAE | Integrated Pesticide Management (DAE) | 2,331 | 2,331 | - | 2,331 | 2,331 | - | | 3.35 | 3.35 | |
| DAE | Minimizing Rice Yield Gap Project | 2,000 | 2,000 | - | 2,000 | 2,000 | - | | 2.88 | 2.88 | |
| BARC | Dissemination of newly Developed Agricultural Technologies to the End Users | 1,000 | 100 | 900 | 1,000 | 100 | 900 | | 1.44 | 0.14 | 1.29 |
| DAE | Tuber Crop Development Project (DAE) | 852 | 852 | - | 852 | 852 | - | | 1.23 | 1.23 | |
| DAE | Greater Mymensingh Integrated Agricultural Development Project | 53,310 | 53,310 | - | 24,000 | 24,000 | - | | 34.53 | 34.53 | |
| DAE | Fallow land Utilization and Crop Intensification in Sylhet Region (Phase I) | 47,500 | 47,500 | - | 25,000 | 25,000 | - | | 35.97 | 35.97 | |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total USD | total USD | total USD |
|--|--|------------------------|---------|--------|---|---------|--------|----|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA |
| BADC | Tuber Crop Development Project (BADC) | 38,553 | 38,553 | - | 19,277 | 19,277 | - | - | 27.74 | 27.74 | - |
| DAE | Greater Comilla and Chittagong Integrated Agricultural Development Project | 11,939 | 11,939 | - | 6,000 | 6,000 | - | - | 8.63 | 8.63 | - |
| DAE | Magura Jessore Narail Khulna Shatkira Integrated development project | 10,346 | 10,346 | - | 10,346 | 10,346 | - | - | 14.89 | 14.89 | - |
| LGED | Community Based Resource Management Project | 8,000 | 8,000 | - | 8,000 | 8,000 | - | - | 11.51 | 11.51 | - |
| DAE | Greater Mujimnagar Integrated Agricultural Development Project | 5,171 | 5,171 | - | 5,171 | 5,171 | - | - | 7.44 | 7.44 | - |
| DAE | Reduced Soil Erosion in Chittagong Hill Tracts by introducing Fruits Garden indigenous fruits spices condiments and medicinal plants | 4,257 | 4,257 | - | 4,257 | 4,257 | - | - | 6.13 | 6.13 | - |
| AIS | Promotion of Digital Krishi and Livelihood Improvement through Agriculture & communication Center | 2,414 | 2,414 | - | 2,414 | 2,414 | - | - | 3.47 | 3.47 | - |
| | | 358,412 | 323,147 | 34,400 | 248,053 | 235,121 | 12,932 | - | 356.91 | 338.30 | 18.61 |
| Sub Programme 1.3 : Promote the development of responses to adapt agricultural systems to climate change | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DLS | Impact of climate changes on livestock production and mitigation project | 35,200 | 3,200 | 32,000 | 17,600 | 1,600 | 16,000 | - | 25.32 | 2.30 | 23.02 |
| AIS | ICT Based Climate Resilient E-Agricultural Extension Activities Through Mass Media Service and Infrastructural Development | 10,400 | 10,400 | - | 10,400 | 10,400 | - | - | 14.96 | 14.96 | - |
| BLRI | Development of Strategies for Adaptation and Mitigation of Climate Change Effects on Livestock Production in Bangladesh | 5,943 | 243 | 5,700 | 5,943 | 243 | 5,700 | - | 8.55 | 0.35 | 8.20 |
| BARC | Development of Climate Resilient Crop Varieties and Technologies to address the Challenges of Climate Change through Biotechnological Tools | 1,000 | 100 | 900 | 1,000 | 100 | 900 | - | 1.44 | 0.14 | 1.29 |
| BARC | Salinity Rise in the Coastal Belt and Changes in the Cropping Practices and Household Income | 70 | 6 | 64 | 70 | 6 | 64 | - | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.09 |
| DOF | Socio-economic development of the vulnerable households in the climate change affected areas through aquaculture production and bio-diversity conservation | 21,000 | 3,000 | 18,000 | 21,000 | 3,000 | 18,000 | - | 30.22 | 4.32 | 25.90 |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M | total M | total M | | |
|--|---|------------------------|--------|--------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | USD | USD | USD | | |
| DAE | Sustainable agriculture development in Char Area | 18,735 | 18,735 | - | 8,000 | 8,000 | - | - | 11.51 | 11.51 | - | | |
| | | 92,348 | 35,684 | 56,664 | 64,013 | 23,349 | 40,664 | - | 92.11 | 33.60 | 58.51 | | |
| | | | | | Funds required (GAP) for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | | | | | |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 1 | | | | 419,823.03 | 343,057.4 | 76,765.67 | | 604.06 | 493.61 | 110.45 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Programme2: Improved Water Management and Infrastructure for Irrigation Purposes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 2.1 : Improve water management in water distribution systems and at farm level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BADC | Promotion of water efficient agriculture through on farm water management for increasing crop productivity | 34,750 | 3,475 | 31,275 | 20,000 | 3,475 | 16,525 | ADB, IFAD | 28.78 | 5.00 | 23.78 | | |
| BADC | Rain/Flood water harvesting for crop and livestock | 34,750 | 3,475 | 31,275 | 20,000 | 3,475 | 16,525 | ADB, IFAD | 28.78 | 5.00 | 23.78 | | |
| BADC | Activating Inoperative Deep Tubewell Project | 17,086 | 17,086 | - | 17,086 | 17,086 | - | - | 24.58 | 24.58 | - | | |
| BADC | Pilot Project for Enhancing Agricultural Production and Poverty Alleviation by introducing Force mode Tubewell Irrigation | 2,477 | 2,477 | - | 2,477 | 2,477 | - | - | 3.56 | 3.56 | - | | |
| BADC | Survey and Monitoring Project for Development of Minor Irrigation (3 rd Phase) | 5,300 | 5,300 | - | 5,300 | 5,300 | - | - | 7.63 | 7.63 | - | | |
| BADC | Pabna- Natore- Sirajgang Irrigation Area Development Project (3rd Phase) | 15,174 | 15,174 | - | 15,174 | 15,174 | - | - | 21.83 | 21.83 | - | | |
| BADC | Faridpur – Shariatpur Integrated Irrigation area Development Project | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | 6,000 | 6,000 | - | - | 8.63 | 8.63 | - | | |
| BADC | Pilot Project for Agricultural Production in Monga Prone Area Through Modern Minor Irrigation Practices Irrigation | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | - | 16.77 | 16.77 | - | | |
| BBMDA | Command Area Expansion and Development | 5,125 | 5,125 | - | 5,125 | 5,125 | - | - | 7.37 | 7.37 | - | | |
| BBMDA | Panchagarh, Thakurgaon, Dinajpur and Joypurhat Integrated Agricultural Development Project | 27,095 | 27,095 | - | 14,000 | 14,000 | - | - | 20.14 | 20.14 | - | | |
| BBMDA | Smart Card Based Pre-Paid Pump Uses and Energy Measuring Systems (Phase II) | 2,485 | 2,485 | - | 2,485 | 2,485 | - | - | 3.58 | 3.58 | - | | |
| BBMDA | Sprinkler Irrigation for High Value Crops | 6,500 | 6,500 | - | 6,500 | 6,500 | - | - | 9.35 | 9.35 | - | | |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M | total M | total M |
|---|---|------------------------|---------|---------|---|---------|--------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | USD | USD | USD |
| BADC | Pilot Project for Agricultural Production In Monga Prone Area Through Modern Minor Irrigation Practices (BADC part) | 2,212 | 2,212 | - | 2,212 | 2,212 | - | - | 3.18 | 3.18 | - |
| DAE | Increasing Water Use Efficiency | 20,000 | 6,600 | 13,400 | 20,000 | 6,600 | 13,400 | - | 28.78 | 9.50 | - |
| BARD | Application of Renewable Solar Energy in Shallow Tube Well (STW) Irrigation Management | 442 | 442 | - | 442 | 442 | - | - | 0.64 | 0.64 | - |
| | | 196,704 | 120,754 | 75,950 | 148,455 | 102,005 | 46,450 | - | 213.60 | 146.77 | 47.55 |
| Sub Programme 2.2 : Improve & increase efficiency of surface water irrigation, in particular in the south | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BADC | Coservation and Utilization of Surface water in Southern Region | 139,000 | 13,900 | 125,100 | 50,000 | 3,000 | 47,000 | ADB, IFAD | 71.94 | 4.32 | 67.63 |
| BADC | Surface water lifting from rivers through line canals for expansion of irrigation facility in the southern part | 173,750 | 17,375 | 156,375 | 55,000 | 5,000 | 50,000 | ADB, IFAD | 79.14 | 7.19 | 71.94 |
| BADC | Enhancing use of solar pump | 34,750 | 3,475 | 31,275 | 34,750 | 3,475 | 31,275 | ADB, IFAD | 50.00 | 5.00 | 45.00 |
| BADC | Surface / Sub-surface water management in Haor / Char areas | 139,000 | 13,900 | 125,100 | 17,000 | 1,700 | 15,300 | ADB, IFAD | 24.46 | 2.45 | 22.01 |
| BADC | Innovative Use of Surface Water Project (2nd Phase) | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | - | 16.77 | 16.77 | - |
| BADC | Greater Mymensingh-Tangail Agricultural Development Project-2nd Phase | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | - | 16.77 | 16.77 | - |
| BADC | Innovative Use of Surface Water Project (2 nd Phase) | 2,318 | 2,318 | - | 2,318 | 2,318 | - | - | 3.34 | 3.34 | - |
| BADC | Greater Dhaka Irrigation Area Development Project-2 nd Phase | 9,931 | 9,931 | - | 9,931 | 9,931 | - | - | 14.29 | 14.29 | - |
| BADC | Construction of Rubber Dams in Small & Medium River for Increasing Food Production (BADC) | 2,429 | 2,429 | - | 2,429 | 2,429 | - | - | 3.49 | 3.49 | - |
| BBMDA | Barind Rain Water Conservation and Irrigation Project (Phase II) | 26,198 | 26,198 | - | 13,000 | 13,000 | - | - | 18.71 | 18.71 | - |
| BBMDA | Irrigation Programme Through Surface Water Augmentation | 8,740 | 8,740 | - | 4,000 | 4,000 | - | - | 5.76 | 5.76 | - |
| BWDB | Re-excavation of connecting rivers, Development of irrigation facilities and Fish culture project of Gazner Beel area and | 36,171 | 36,171 | - | 15,000 | 15,000 | - | - | 21.58 | 21.58 | - |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total USD | M | total USD | M | total USD | M |
|--|---|------------------------|---------|---------|---|---------|---------|-----|-----------|--------|-----------|---|-----------|---|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA | | | |
| | Sujanagar Upazilla in Pabna District | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BWDB | Tarail Pachuria Flood control, Drainage and Irrigation Project | 28,145 | 28,145 | - | 14,000 | 14,000 | - | | 20.14 | 20.14 | | | | |
| BWDB | Chandpur-Comilla Integrated Flood Control, Drainage and Irrigation Project | 12,772 | 12,772 | - | 7,000 | 7,000 | - | | 10.07 | 10.07 | | | | |
| BWDB | Rehabilitation of Barisal Irrigation Project | 5,925 | 5,925 | - | 5,925 | 5,925 | - | | 8.52 | 8.52 | | | | |
| BWDB | North Rajshahi Irrigation Project | 110,054 | 110,054 | - | 55,000 | 55,000 | - | | 79.14 | 79.14 | | | | |
| BWDB | Rehabilitation of irrigation schemes | 4,000 | 4,000 | - | 4,000 | 4,000 | - | | 5.76 | 5.76 | | | | |
| | | 756,489 | 318,639 | 437,850 | 312,659 | 169,084 | 143,575 | - | 449.87 | 243.29 | 206.58 | | | |
| Sub Programme 2.3 : Reduce impact of saline water intrusion in the South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BWDB | Rehabilitation of Coastal Infrastructures damaged by Alia (South Western Zone) | 31,538 | 31,538 | - | 31,538 | 31,538 | - | | 45.38 | 45.38 | | | | |
| BWDB | Rehabilitation of Coastal Infrastructures damaged by Alia (Southern Zone) | 15,461 | 15,461 | - | 15,461 | 15,461 | - | | 22.25 | 22.25 | | | | |
| | | 15,461 | 15,461 | - | 46,999 | 46,999 | - | | 67.63 | 67.63 | | | | |
| Sub Programme 2.4 : Enhance river water flow to the South | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BWDB | Buriganga River Restoration Project | 94,409 | 94,409 | - | 40,000 | 40,000 | - | | 57.55 | 57.55 | | | | |
| BWDB | Capital Dredging Of River Systems in Bangladesh | 102,812 | 102,812 | - | 45,000 | 45,000 | - | | 64.75 | 64.75 | | | | |
| BWDB | Feasibility Study and Detail Design of Ganges Barrage project | 3,435 | 3,435 | - | 3,435 | 3,435 | - | | 4.94 | 4.94 | | | | |
| | | 200,656 | 200,656 | - | 88,435 | 88,435 | - | | 127.24 | 127.24 | | | | |
| Funds required (GAP) for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | | | | | | |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 2 | | | | 596,548 | 406,523 | 190,025 | | 858.34 | 584.93 | 254.14 | | | |
| Programme 3: Improved quality of input and soil fertility | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 3.1 : Enhance availability of agricultural inputs, tested and certified for quality of diversified crops | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BADC | Enhancing Quality Seed Supply BADC) | 29,518 | 5,719 | 23,799 | 29,518 | 5,719 | 23,799 | IDA | 42.47 | 8.23 | 34.24 | | | |
| BADC | Establishment of Seed Multiplication Farm in the South-Western Coastal Region Project | 25,360 | 25,360 | - | 25,360 | 25,360 | - | | 36.49 | 36.49 | | | | |
| BADC | Improvement of Fertilizer Distribution Management Network | 16,300 | 16,300 | - | 16,300 | 16,300 | - | | 23.45 | 23.45 | | | | |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total USD | M | total USD | M | total USD | M |
|---|--|------------------------|---------|--------|---|--------|--------|-----|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|-----------|---|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA | | | |
| BADC | Establishment of Fertilizer Testing Laboratory | 1,200 | 1,200 | - | 1,200 | 1,200 | - | - | 1.73 | 1.73 | - | | | |
| BARI | Enhancing Quality Seed Supply (BARI) | 5,803 | 5,803 | - | 5,803 | 5,803 | - | - | 8.35 | 8.35 | - | | | |
| BARC | Development of Technologies for Quality Seed Production, Processing, Packaging and Improve Management / Distribution System | 10,000 | 1,000 | 9,000 | 7,000 | 1,000 | 6,000 | - | 10.07 | 1.44 | 8.63 | | | |
| BBMDA | BMDA Seed Production Strengthening Project | 3,416 | 3,416 | - | 3,416 | 3,416 | - | - | 4.92 | 4.92 | - | | | |
| BRRI | Enhancing Quality Seed Supply (BRRI) | 5,829 | 5,829 | - | 5,829 | 5,829 | - | IDB | 8.39 | 8.39 | - | | | |
| DAE | Strengthening Inputs Support to Farmers | 100,000 | 33,000 | 67,000 | 8,000 | 2,200 | 5,800 | - | 11.51 | 3.17 | 8.35 | | | |
| BADC | Enhancement of Micronutrient Fertilizer Usage | 10,200 | 10,200 | - | 10,200 | 10,200 | - | - | 14.68 | 14.68 | - | | | |
| | | 207,625 | 107,826 | 99,799 | 112,625 | 77,026 | 35,599 | - | 162.05 | 40.93 | 16.98 | | | |
| Sub Programme 3.2 : Develop public private partnerships through capacity development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TBD | Programmes aiming to develop public private partnerships through capacity development | | | | | | | | | | | 17.00 | | |
| | | | | | 13,900 | 2,085 | 11,815 | - | 20.00 | 3.00 | 17.00 | | | |
| Sub Programme 3.3 : Improve and increase sustainability of soil fertility management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DAE | Reduced Soil Erosion in Chittagong Hill Tracts by introducing Fruits Garden indigenous fruits spices condiments and medicinal plants | 4,257 | 4,257 | - | 4,257 | 4,257 | - | - | 6.13 | 6.13 | - | | | |
| BADC | Project for Using Fallow Land and Increasing Cropping Intensity of Sylhet Region | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | 11,653 | 11,653 | - | - | 16.77 | 16.77 | - | | | |
| SRDI | Soil Resource Management and Farmers Service Project (SMFS) | 2,500 | 2,500 | - | 2,500 | 2,500 | - | - | 3.60 | 3.60 | - | | | |
| SRDI | Human resource development of SRDI, DAE & AIS for judicious and profitable use of land and soil resources, | 920 | 920 | - | 920 | 920 | - | - | 1.32 | 1.32 | - | | | |
| SRDI | Establishment of soil and fertilizer testing laboratories and research centres | 422 | 422 | - | 422 | 422 | - | - | 0.61 | 0.61 | - | | | |
| SRDI | Soil fertility assessment, soil degradation and its impact on Agriculture | 935 | 935 | - | 935 | 935 | - | - | 1.35 | 1.35 | - | | | |
| | | 20,687 | 20,687 | - | 20,687 | 20,687 | - | - | 29.77 | 29.77 | - | | | |
| Sub Programme 3.4 : Develop public private partnerships through capacity development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TBD | Programmes aiming to facilitate access to credit and other financial services by smallholders and the rural poor | | | | | | | | | | | 20.00 | | |
| | | | | | 13,900 | - | 13,900 | - | 20.00 | - | 20.00 | | | |
| Funds required (GAP) for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | | | | | | |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 3 | | | | 161,112 | 99,798 | 61,314 | | 231.82 | 73.70 | 53.98 | | | |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total USD | M | total USD | M | total USD | M |
|--|--|------------------------|--------|--------|---|--------|--------|----|-----------|-----|-----------|---|-----------|---|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA | | | |
| Programme 4 : Fisheries & Aquaculture Development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 4.1 : Develop small scale aquaculture, through access to quality inputs, advice and skills | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BFRI | Establishing Haor Fisheries Research Station in | 21,359 | 21,359 | - | 7,000 | 7,000 | - | | 10.07 | | 10.07 | | - | |
| BFRI | Development of Participatory Cohort or | 15,300 | 3,060 | 12,240 | 7,500 | 2,000 | 5,500 | | 10.79 | | 2.88 | | 7.91 | |
| | | 36,659 | 24,419 | 12,240 | 14,500 | 9,000 | 5,500 | - | 20.86 | | 12.95 | | 7.91 | |
| Sub Programme 4.2 : Improve management of fisheries resources | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BFRI | Development and Dissemination of Pearl | 9,634 | 9,634 | - | 4,000 | 4,000 | - | | 5.76 | | 5.76 | | - | |
| BFRI | Strengthening Marine & Coastal Fisheries | 7,950 | 7,950 | - | 7,950 | 7,950 | - | | 11.44 | | 11.44 | | - | |
| BFRI | Online Information Networking for BFRI | 3,789 | 758 | 3,031 | 3,789 | 758 | 3,031 | | 5.45 | | 1.09 | | 4.36 | |
| BFRI | Development of Quality Brood, Seed and | 6,000 | 1,200 | 4,800 | 6,000 | 1,200 | 4,800 | | 8.63 | | 1.73 | | 6.91 | |
| BFRI | Genetic Improvement of Fish & Shrimp by | 2,500 | 2,500 | - | 2,500 | 2,500 | - | | 3.60 | | 3.60 | | - | |
| BFRI | Development of Captive Breeding, Seed and | 7,505 | 1,501 | 6,004 | 7,505 | 1,501 | 6,004 | | 10.80 | | 2.16 | | 8.64 | |
| DOF | Development of brackish-water fish hatchery | 25,500 | 2,500 | 23,000 | 25,500 | 2,500 | 23,000 | | 36.69 | | 3.60 | | 33.09 | |
| DOF | Integrated aquaculture program for agro- | 32,000 | 5,000 | 27,000 | 32,000 | 5,000 | 27,000 | | 46.04 | | 7.19 | | 38.85 | |
| DOF | Strengthening institutional capacity in fisheries | 25,000 | 1,000 | 24,000 | 25,000 | 1,000 | 24,000 | | 35.97 | | 1.44 | | 34.53 | |
| | | 119,878 | 32,043 | 87,835 | 114,244 | 26,409 | 87,835 | - | 164.38 | | 38.00 | | 126.38 | |
| Sub Programme 4.3 : Develop public private partnerships in support of infrastructure and services development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DOF | Community based floodplain aquaculture development project | 25,000 | 2,500 | 22,500 | 12,000 | 1,500 | 10,500 | | 17.27 | | 2.16 | | 15.11 | |
| DOF | Aquaculture and fisheries management in the Haor area through developing infrastructure facilities | 35,000 | 2,500 | 32,500 | 35,000 | 2,500 | 32,500 | | 50.36 | | 3.60 | | 46.76 | |
| BFRI | Improvement of Standardization of Species and Location Specific Cage Aquaculture Technology | 3,925 | 785 | 3,140 | 3,925 | 785 | 3,140 | | 5.65 | | 1.13 | | 4.52 | |
| BFRI | Integrated Coastal Rice-shrimp-prawn-fish Farming System for Sustainable Management of Land-water resources in Saline and Freshwater Interface Areas | 7,800 | 1,560 | 6,240 | 7,800 | 1,560 | 6,240 | | 11.22 | | 2.24 | | 8.98 | |
| DOF | Hilsa fisheries development and management project | 35,000 | 2,500 | 32,500 | 35,000 | 2,500 | 32,500 | | 50.36 | | 3.60 | | 46.76 | |
| | | 106,725 | 9,845 | 96,880 | 93,725 | 8,845 | 84,880 | - | 134.86 | | 12.73 | | 122.13 | |
| Sub Programme 4.4 : Promote production in the South through sustainable shrimp and prawn development and community based co management of wetlands. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BFRI | Jatka conservation, alternate income generation for Jatka Fisheries and research (BFRI part) | 406 | 406 | - | 168 | 168 | - | | 0.24 | | 0.24 | | - | |
| BFRI | Infrastructural Development and Research Strengthening of Fisheries Research Institute | 3,597 | 3,597 | - | 3,502 | 3,502 | - | | 5.04 | | 5.04 | | - | |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M | total M | total M |
|--|--|------------------------|--------|---------|---|--------|---------|----|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | USD | USD | USD |
| BFRI | Rationalization of Feed Development and Feeding Method for Optimization of Production and Reducing the Production Cost | 4,500 | 900 | 3,600 | 4,500 | 900 | 3,600 | | 6.47 | 1.29 | 5.18 |
| DOF | Socio economic development of the coastal and marine fisher folk through alternative livelihoods support programme. | 37,500 | 2,500 | 35,000 | 17,000 | 1,500 | 15,500 | | 24.46 | 2.16 | 22.30 |
| | | 46,003 | 7,403 | 38,600 | 25,170 | 6,070 | 19,100 | - | 36.22 | 8.73 | 27.48 |
| Funds required (GAP) for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Total | GoB | PA | | | | |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 4 | | | | 247,639 | 50,324 | 197,315 | | 356.32 | 72.41 | 283.91 |
| Programme 5 : Livestock Development, with a focus on poultry and dairy production | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 5.1 : Strengthen animal health services, including better diagnosis and surveillance systems to mitigate disease outbreaks | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DLS | Strengthening of the Institutional Capacity and policy reform of DLS | 100,000 | - | 100,000 | 50,000 | - | 50,000 | | 71.94 | - | 71.94 |
| DLS | Conservation and improvement of native sheep through community farming system. | 68,200 | 6,200 | 61,800 | 34,100 | 3,500 | 35,000 | | 49.06 | 5.04 | 50.36 |
| DLS | Improvement of reproductive performance and prevention of calf mortality | 35,200 | 3,200 | 32,000 | 17,600 | 3,200 | 32,000 | | 25.32 | 4.60 | 46.04 |
| DLS | Modernization of Vaccine Production Technology and Extension of Laboratory Facilities | 103,400 | 9,400 | 94,000 | 51,700 | 4,000 | 46,000 | | 74.39 | 5.76 | 66.19 |
| DLS | Animal health services extension Project | 99,000 | 9,000 | 90,000 | 49,500 | 5,000 | 45,000 | | 71.22 | 7.19 | 64.75 |
| DLS | Establishment of epidemiology service in Bangladesh | 45,100 | 4,100 | 41,000 | 22,550 | 2,000 | 18,000 | | 32.45 | 2.88 | 25.90 |
| DLS | Emerging, re-emerging and zoonotic disease control project | 1,100 | 100 | 1,000 | 1,100 | 100 | 1,000 | | 1.58 | 0.14 | 1.44 |
| | | 452,000 | 32,000 | 419,800 | 226,550 | 17,800 | 227,000 | - | 325.97 | 25.61 | 326.62 |
| Sub Programme 5.2 : Strengthen husbandry capacity at household level through community based improved knowledge and advisory services | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DLS | Community Based Fodder & Other Unconventional Feed Production and Development for Animal Nutrition Project | 11,000 | 1,000 | 10,000 | 11,000 | 1,000 | 10,000 | | 15.83 | 1.44 | 14.39 |
| DLS | Dairy & Beef Development for Employment Generation and Poverty Reduction | 55,000 | 5,000 | 50,000 | 27,500 | 5,000 | 50,000 | | 39.57 | 7.19 | 71.94 |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M | total M | total M |
|---|---|------------------------|--------|---------|---|--------|---------|----|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | USD | USD | USD |
| DLS | Goat development in small and marginal families for poverty reduction | 50,600 | 4,600 | 46,000 | 25,300 | 2,500 | 22,500 | | 36.40 | 3.60 | 32.37 |
| DLS | Genetic improvement of local cattle for enhancing production and employment generation | 96,800 | 8,800 | 88,000 | 48,400 | 1,200 | 48,800 | | 69.64 | 1.73 | 70.22 |
| DLS | Smallholder Dairy and Beef Development for income generation and nutrition project | 56,100 | 5,100 | 51,000 | 28,050 | 2,500 | 22,500 | | 40.36 | 3.60 | 32.37 |
| DLS | Duck development for income generation and poverty reduction in low lying areas | 55,000 | 5,000 | 50,000 | 27,500 | 2,500 | 47,500 | | 39.57 | 3.60 | 68.35 |
| DLS | Conservation of local germplasm and development of backyard poultry production project | 44,000 | 4,000 | 40,000 | 22,000 | 2,500 | 11,500 | | 31.65 | 3.60 | 16.55 |
| BLRI | Community dairy development through multiplication and dissemination of elite cows | 6,342 | 127 | 6,215 | 6,342 | 127 | 6,215 | | 9.13 | 0.18 | 8.94 |
| LGED | Raising fields for Cattle Shelters during floods | 30,000 | 30,000 | - | 15,000 | 15,000 | - | | 21.58 | 21.58 | - |
| | | 404,842 | 63,627 | 341,215 | 211,092 | 32,327 | 219,015 | - | 303.73 | 46.51 | 315.13 |
| Sub Programme 5.3 : Improve availability and quality of inputs through public private partnerships | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TBD | Programmes aiming to improve availability and quality of inputs through public private partnerships | | | | | | | | | | 17.00 |
| | | | | | 13,900 | 2,085 | 11,815 | - | 20.00 | 3.00 | 17.00 |
| Sub Programme 5.4 : Research on livestock development, including genetic improvement | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DLS | Buffalo dairy development through selective breeding project | 66,000 | 6,000 | 60,000 | 33,000 | 2,000 | 18,000 | | 47.48 | 2.88 | 25.90 |
| DLS | Technology transfer and extension of feeds and fodder development project | 55,000 | 5,000 | 50,000 | 27,500 | 2,500 | 15,500 | | 39.57 | 3.60 | 22.30 |
| BLRI | Strengthening livestock research and regional capacity building of BLRI | 32,313 | 2,689 | 29,624 | 16,157 | 1,000 | 11,000 | | 23.25 | 1.44 | 15.83 |
| BLRI | Diversification of value addition technologies of milk, meat and eggs, and capacity enhancing for supporting public health, food safety and quality control systems | 10,694 | 239 | 10,455 | 5,347 | 200 | 5,400 | | 7.69 | 0.29 | 7.77 |
| BLRI | Establishment of post-graduate training and research facilities on livestock | 10,257 | 262 | 9,995 | 5,129 | 200 | 4,800 | | 7.38 | 0.29 | 6.91 |
| | | 174,264 | 14,190 | 160,074 | 87,132 | 5,900 | 54,700 | - | 125.37 | 8.49 | 78.71 |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 5 | | | | 538,674 | 58,112 | 512,530 | | 775.07 | 83.61 | 737.45 |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total USD | total USD | total USD |
|---|--|------------------------|--------|--------|---|---------|--------|----|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA |
| Programme 6 : Improved access to markets, value-addition in agriculture, and to non farm incomes | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 6.1: Improve physical access to markets, facilities and information | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BMDA | Rural Communication Development for marketing of Agricultural Products (BMDA) | 29,800 | 29,800 | - | 29,800 | 29,800 | - | - | 42.88 | 42.88 | - |
| DAM | Agricultural market infrastructure development project | 2,000 | 500 | 1,500 | 2,000 | 500 | 1,500 | - | 2.88 | 0.72 | 2.16 |
| LGED | Integrated Food Security through rural Infrastructure Development | 70,700 | 3,775 | 66,925 | 70,700 | 3,775 | 66,925 | - | 101.73 | 5.43 | 96.29 |
| LGED | Greater Rangpur-Dinajpur village Roads and Other Infrastructure Development Project | 48,000 | 48,000 | - | 48,000 | 48,000 | - | - | 69.06 | 69.06 | - |
| LGED | Rural Infrastructure Development (Public Priority Rural Communication & Rural Market Development & Rehabilitation) Project : Part-II | 43,000 | 43,000 | - | 43,000 | 43,000 | - | - | 61.87 | 61.87 | - |
| LGED | Market Infrastructure Development Project in Charland Regions | 17,100 | 17,100 | - | 17,100 | 17,100 | - | - | 24.60 | 24.60 | - |
| LGED | Project for Improvement of Rural Roads & Hat-Bazars Infrastructure on Priority Basis | 16,500 | 16,500 | - | 16,500 | 16,500 | - | - | 23.74 | 23.74 | - |
| LGED | Rural Infrastructure Development (Public Priority Rural Communication and Hat-Bazar Development & Rehabilitation) | 7,500 | 7,500 | - | 7,500 | 7,500 | - | - | 10.79 | 10.79 | - |
| LGED | Agriculture Sector Programme Support-II (ASPS-II): Rural Road & Market Access Component-3 (RRMA-3) | 3,000 | 3,000 | - | 3,000 | 3,000 | - | - | 4.32 | 4.32 | - |
| MOFDM | Construction of Bridges/Culverts on the Rural Roads | 39,302 | 25,632 | 13,670 | 39,302 | 25,632 | 13,670 | - | 56.55 | 36.88 | 19.67 |
| | | | | | 276,902 | 194,807 | 82,095 | - | 398.42 | 280.30 | 118.12 |
| Sub Programme 6.2: Mobilize and promote producer & marketing groups for improved market access and knowledge | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BARC | Studies on Agro-Business in Horticultural Crops | 50 | 5 | 45 | 50 | 5 | 45 | - | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.06 |
| BARC | BADC's Seed Production Programmes: Limits and Constraints | 30 | 3 | 27 | 30 | 3 | 27 | - | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.04 |
| BFDC | Strengthening of BFDC & Development of Fish Marketing Network | 31,800 | 525 | 31,275 | 31,800 | 525 | 31,275 | - | 45.76 | 0.76 | 45.00 |
| BRDB | Assist Rural Producers with Financial and other Support for Marketing of their Commodities in Local and Urban Markets | 2,430 | 2,430 | - | 2,430 | 2,430 | - | - | 3.50 | 3.50 | - |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total USD | total USD | total USD |
|---|---|------------------------|--------|--------|---|--------|--------|----|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA |
| DLS | Establishment and Development of Dairy Society for Product Marketing | 11,000 | 1,000 | 10,000 | 11,000 | 1,000 | 10,000 | | 15.83 | 1.44 | 14.39 |
| DOC | Ensuring Cooperative based Milk Production | 7,557 | 7,557 | - | 7,557 | 7,557 | - | | 10.87 | 10.87 | - |
| DOC | Expansion of Milk Producers Cooperative in greater Faridpur, Barisal and Khulna District for Reduction of Poverty | 4,110 | 4,110 | - | 4,110 | 4,110 | - | | 5.91 | 5.91 | - |
| | | 56,977 | 15,630 | 41,347 | 56,977 | 15,630 | 41,347 | - | 82 | 22 | 59 |
| Sub Programme 6.3: Develop adequate storage, processing & value addition and reduce waste through public-private partnerships | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BARC | An Integrated Farming System: The Study of Profitable Enterprise Combinations | 100 | 10 | 90 | 100 | 10 | 90 | | 0.14 | 0.01 | 0.13 |
| BARC | Marketing Channels, Price Fluctuations and State Interventions Towards Price Stability of Farm Products including Milk and Eggs | 80 | 8 | 72 | 80 | 8 | 72 | | 0.12 | 0.01 | 0.10 |
| BARC | Identification of Production Potential Areas for Pulses, Oilseeds and Spices and also for Fish, Ducks, Goats etc. | 70 | 7 | 63 | 70 | 7 | 63 | | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.09 |
| BARC | Subsidy on Inputs (Fertilizer and Irrigation) and Price Supports to Farm Products | 50 | 5 | 45 | 50 | 5 | 45 | | 0.07 | 0.01 | 0.06 |
| BRDB | Build BRDB Warehouse Capacity and Ensure Food Security | 3,560 | 3,560 | - | 3,560 | 3,560 | - | | 5.12 | 5.12 | - |
| DAE | Support to Farmers for Quality Product Harvesting, Better Storage, Processing marketing and Value Addition | 100,000 | 33,000 | 67,000 | 50,000 | 20,000 | 30,000 | | 71.94 | 28.78 | |
| DAM | Agricultural commodity storage development project | 2,500 | 500 | 2,000 | 2,500 | 500 | 2,000 | | 3.60 | 0.72 | 2.88 |
| DAM | Promoting groups / contract marketing projects | 1,000 | 200 | 800 | 1,000 | 200 | 800 | | 1.44 | 0.29 | 1.15 |
| DLS | Value Chain Development of Dairy Marketing | 5,500 | 500 | 5,000 | 5,500 | 500 | 5,000 | | 7.91 | 0.72 | 7.19 |
| | | 112,860 | 37,790 | 75,070 | 62,860 | 24,790 | 38,070 | - | 90.45 | 35.67 | 11.61 |
| Sub Programme 6.4 : Promote and assist the development of off farm activities and rural businesses | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DAM | Development of agro-processing in homestead level | 3,000 | 250 | 2,750 | 3,000 | 250 | 2,750 | | 4.32 | 0.36 | 3.96 |
| DAM | Strengthening agricultural market information development project | 2,000 | 250 | 1,750 | 2,000 | 250 | 1,750 | | 2.88 | 0.36 | 2.52 |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M | total M | total M | | |
|--|---|------------------------|--------|--------|---|-----------------|------------------|----|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|--|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | USD | USD | USD | | |
| DAM | Agricultural marketing extension service development project | 2,000 | 250 | 1,750 | 2,000 | 250 | 1,750 | | 2.88 | 0.36 | 2.52 | | |
| DOF | Socio-economic development of the coastal and marine fisher-folk through alternative livelihoods support programme | 37,500 | 37,500 | - | 37,500 | 37,500 | - | | 53.96 | 53.96 | - | | |
| | | 44,500 | 38,250 | 6,250 | 44,500 | 38,250 | 6,250 | - | 64.03 | 55.04 | 8.99 | | |
| | | | | | Funds required (GAP) for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | | | | | |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 6 | | | | 441,239 | 273,477 | 167,762 | | 634.88 | 393.49 | 198.22 | | |
| Programme 7 : Strengthened capacities for implementation and monitoring of NFP and CIP actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 7.1 : Strengthen capacities to implement, monitor and coordinate National Food Policy-Plan of Action and CIP | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FPMU | Forecasting of Demand and Supply of Food Grain (Atoi PM Office) | 1,043 | 1,043 | - | 1,043 | 1,043 | - | | 1.50 | 1.50 | - | | |
| | Programmes aiming to further strengthen the capacities to monitor and implement the NFP-POA | 4,500 | 100 | 4,400 | 4,500 | 100 | 4,400 | | 6.47 | 0.14 | 6.33 | | |
| | | 5,543 | 1,143 | 4,400 | 5,543 | 1,143 | 4,400 | - | 7.97 | 1.64 | 6.33 | | |
| Sub Programme 7.2 : Strengthen national capacities for design, implementation & monitoring of CIP operations | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TBD | Programmes aiming to strengthen national capacities for design, coordination, monitoring and implementation of CIP programs. | 14,000 | 500 | 6,500 | 28,000 | 1,000 | 27,000 | | 40.29 | 1.44 | 38.85 | | |
| | | 14,000 | 500 | 6,500 | 28,000 | 1,000 | 27,000 | - | 40.29 | 1.44 | 38.85 | | |
| Sub Programme 7.3 : Strengthen capacities of civil society organizations to contribute to CIP development & implementation | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TBD | Programmes aiming to strengthen the capacities of civil society organizations to contribute to CIP development and implementation | 35,000 | | 35,000 | 35,000 | - | 35,000 | | 50.36 | - | 50.36 | | |
| | | 35,000 | - | 35,000 | 35,000 | - | 35,000 | - | 50.36 | - | 50.36 | | |
| | | | | | Funds required (GAP) for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | | | | | |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 7 | | | | 68,542.50 | 2,142.50 | 66,400.00 | | 98.62 | 3.08 | 95.54 | | |
| Programme 8 : Enhanced Public Food Management Systems | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 8.1 : Enhance efficiency and effectiveness of Public Food Management Systems and improve its impact on price stabilization | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total USD | M | total USD | M | total USD | M |
|---|---|------------------------|--------|----------|---|--------|----------|-------|-----------|-------|-----------|---|-----------|---|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA | | | |
| DG-Food | ICT Capacity Building | 3,883 | 33 | 3,850 | 3,883 | 33 | 3,850 | GAFSP | 5.59 | 0.05 | 5.54 | | | |
| Food Directorate | Programmes aiming to Enhance efficiency and effectiveness of Public Food Management Systems and improve its impact on price stabilization | 5,000 | 500 | 4,500 | 5,000 | 500 | 4,500 | | 7.19 | 0.72 | 6.47 | | | |
| | | 8,883 | 533 | 8,350 | 8,883 | 533 | 8,350 | - | 12.78 | 0.77 | 12.01 | | | |
| Sub Programme 8.2 : Build capacities of Ministry of Food and Disaster Management and Directorate of Food to better manage the food system | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food Directorate | Operational capacity of Ministry of Food and Disaster management | 3,962 | | 3,962 | 3,962 | - | 3,962 | | 5.70 | - | 5.70 | | | |
| Food Directorate | Capacity Strengthening of Food Management Officials | 5,108 | - | 5,108 | 5,108 | - | 5,108 | | 7.35 | - | 7.35 | | | |
| Food Directorate | Centre for Food Management & Training | 5,433 | - | 5,433 | 5,433 | - | 5,433 | GAFSP | 7.82 | - | 7.82 | | | |
| Food Directorate | Strengthening and Upgrading Food Testing Facilities of Directorate General of Food | 643 | - | 643 | 643 | - | 643 | USAID | 0.93 | - | 0.93 | | | |
| | | 15,145 | - | 15,145 | 15,145 | - | 15,145 | - | 21.79 | - | 21.79 | | | |
| Sub Programme 8.3: Increase and modernize public storage and handling facilities, including in disaster prone areas. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food Directorate | Construction of 50,000 mt capacity Vertical Rice Silo at Baghabari, Sirajganj | 12,800 | 12,800 | | 12,800 | 12,800 | - | | 18.42 | 18.42 | - | | | |
| Food Directorate | Construction of Elevated Warehouses in the Coastal area | 5,074 | | 5,074 | 5,074 | - | 5,074 | | 7.30 | - | 7.30 | | | |
| Food Directorate | Construction of Rice Silo with JICA assistance | 15,400 | - | 15,400 | 15,400 | - | 15,400 | JICA | 22.16 | - | 22.16 | | | |
| Food Directorate | Construction of 100,000 mt capacity Vertical Rice Silo at Santahar Silo Premises , Bogra | 15,400 | 15,400 | - | 15,400 | 15,400 | - | | 22.16 | 22.16 | - | | | |
| Food Directorate | Construction of 100,000 mt capacity Vertical grain silo at Chittagong Silo Premises , Chittagong | 31,087 | 31,087 | - | 31,087 | 31,087 | - | | 44.73 | 44.73 | - | | | |
| Food Directorate | Construction of Rice Silo and Rice Mill in Greater Dinajpur | 13,000 | | 13,000 | 13,000 | - | 13,000 | | 18.71 | - | 18.71 | | | |
| Food Directorate | Postagola Government Modern Flour Mill Project | 13746.06 | | 13746.06 | 13746.06 | - | 13746.06 | | 19.78 | - | 19.78 | | | |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M | total M | total M |
|---|---|------------------------|--------|---------|---|--------|---------|----|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | USD | USD | USD |
| Food Directorate | Construction of 25,000 MT Silo at Barisal/ Khulna | 11,600 | 11,600 | - | 11,600 | 11,600 | - | - | 16.69 | 16.69 | - |
| Food Directorate | Construction of 105,000 mt capacity new Food Godowns with ancillary Facilities at Different Strategic Locations of the Country | 23,428 | 23,428 | - | 23,428 | 23,428 | - | - | 33.71 | 33.71 | - |
| Food Directorate | Construction of 1 million MT Silo (Follow up of BMSFP) | 139,000 | - | 139,000 | 139,000 | - | 139,000 | WB | 200.00 | - | 200.00 |
| | | 280,535 | 94,315 | 172,474 | 280,535 | 94,315 | 172,474 | | 403.66 | 135.71 | 248.17 |
| Funds required (GAP) for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Total | GoB | PA | | | | |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 8 | | | | 304,563 | 94,848 | 195,969 | | 438.23 | 136 | 282 |
| Programme 9: Institutional Development and Capacity Development for more effective safety nets. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 9.1: Strengthen institutional capacities to effectively operate social safety net programmes and formulate a new integrated strategy for social safety net programmes to: (i) coordinate and streamline them; (ii) enhance impact and targeting; (iii) improve governance | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BRDB | Enhance Social Protection | 550 | 550 | - | 550 | 550 | - | - | 0.79 | 0.79 | - |
| TBD | Capacity Development and institutional strengthening for more effective safety nets | 35,000 | 5,000 | 30,000 | 35,000 | 5,000 | 30,000 | - | 50.36 | 7.19 | - |
| | | | | | 35,000 | 5,000 | 30,000 | - | 51 | 7 | - |
| Sub Programme 9.2 : Investment in employment and income generation of social safety nets (including in ADP). | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BSRI | Create Employment Opportunity of Char Dwellers in Greater Rangpur District through Sugarcane Cultivation | 970 | 970 | - | 970 | 970 | - | - | 1.40 | 1.40 | - |
| BRDB | Identification of the People of River Erosion Areas and ensure Employment for them through IGA Base Training and Post Training Supports | 2,475 | 2,475 | - | 2,475 | 2,475 | - | - | 3.56 | 3.56 | - |
| BRDB | Ensuring Employment Opportunities through IGA and Productive Activities | 2,491 | 2,491 | - | 2,491 | 2,491 | - | - | 3.58 | 3.58 | - |
| BRDB | Identify the Hard Core Poor in Backward Areas of CHT, Barisal and Kishorganj and Ensure Employment Opportunity through IGA training and Post Training Support | 2,398 | 2,398 | - | 2,398 | 2,398 | - | - | 3.45 | 3.45 | - |
| BARD | Rural Life Plan for Secured Old Age | 722 | 722 | - | 722 | 722 | - | - | 1.04 | 1.04 | - |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total M | total M | total M | | |
|---|--|------------------------|---------|---------|---|---------|-----------|----|---------|---------|---------|--|--|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | USD | USD | USD | | |
| LGED | Rural Employment & Rural Road Maintenance Project (RERMP) | 94,300 | 94,300 | - | 94,300 | 94,300 | - | - | 135.68 | 135.68 | - | | |
| LGED | Enhancing Resilience under Bangladesh Country Program 2007-2010 | 13,200 | 13,200 | - | 13,200 | 13,200 | - | - | 18.99 | 18.99 | - | | |
| LGED | Rural Road Maintenance Length men (under maintenance budget) | 60,800 | 60,800 | - | 60,800 | 60,800 | - | - | 87.48 | 87.48 | - | | |
| LGED | FFW for reshaping of Earthen Village Roads | 50,000 | 50,000 | - | 50,000 | 50,000 | - | - | 71.94 | 71.94 | - | | |
| LGED | Rural Infrastructure Development Through Integrated Food Security | 65,000 | 65,000 | - | 65,000 | 65,000 | - | - | 93.53 | 93.53 | - | | |
| | | 292,356 | 292,356 | - | 292,356 | 292,356 | - | - | 420.66 | 420.66 | - | | |
| | | | | | Funds required (GAP) for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | | | | | |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 9 | | | | 327,356 | 297,356 | 30,000.00 | - | 471.81 | 427.85 | - | | |
| Programme 10: Community based nutrition programmes and services | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 10.1: Community based livelihood and nutrition programmes, building on the National Nutrition Service (NNS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DGHS | Community Based Health Care (HPNSDP - OP 3) | 223,191 | 164,615 | 58,576 | 36,827 | 27,161 | 9,665 | | 52.99 | 39.08 | 13.91 | | |
| DGHS | Non Communicable Diseases Control (HPNSDP - OP 7) | 51,211 | 363 | 149 | 6,575 | 47 | 19 | | 9.46 | 0.07 | 0.03 | | |
| DGHS | National Nutrition Services - NNS (HPNSDP - OP 17) | 162,100 | 25,028 | 137,082 | 162,100 | 25,028 | 137,082 | | 233.24 | 36.01 | 197.24 | | |
| DGFP | Maternal, Reproductive and Adolescent health (HPNSDP - OP 18) | 89,604 | 69,589 | 20,015 | 15,143 | 11,761 | 3,383 | | 21.79 | 16.92 | 4.87 | | |
| DGFP | Information, Education and Communication IEC (HPNSDP - OP 23) | 12,000 | 7,378 | 4,622 | 2,328 | 1,431 | 897 | | 3.35 | 2.06 | 1.29 | | |
| | Investment in social protection, agriculture and price policies to improve supply , access and demand for foods containing high nutrient values notably non cereal crops | 5,560 | 5,560 | - | 5,560 | 5,560 | - | - | 8.00 | 8.00 | - | | |
| | Investment in agricultural research to improve productivity of non staple foods that have value addition and high nutrient value for ensuring improved diet quality | 5,560 | 5,560 | - | 5,560 | 5,560 | - | - | 8.00 | 8.00 | - | | |
| | Training and capacity building of farmers and extension workers on food based nutrition and health across age groups along with | 5,560 | 5,560 | - | 5,560 | 5,560 | - | - | 8.00 | 8.00 | - | | |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total USD | M | total USD | M | total USD | M |
|--|---|------------------------|---------|---------|---|---------|---------|----|-----------|--------|-----------|---|-----------|---|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA | | | |
| | participatory field monitoring and evaluation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Strengthening and updating nutrition behavior change communication strategies for improving nutritional status, especially women and children | 5,560 | 5,560 | - | 5,560 | 5,560 | - | | 8.00 | 8.00 | | | | |
| | Monitoring and evaluation framework of health, agriculture, food and other relevant sectors. | 5,560 | 5,560 | - | 5,560 | 5,560 | - | | 8.00 | 8.00 | | | | |
| DOF | Poverty Reduction and Livelihood Security for of the People of Economically Depressed Areas | 8,319 | 8,319 | - | 8,319 | 8,319 | - | | 11.97 | 11.97 | | | | |
| DAE | Strengthening Nutritional Status of Farming Community | 100,000 | 33,000 | 67,000 | 100,000 | 33,000 | 67,000 | | 143.88 | 47.48 | | | | |
| | | 674,225 | 336,092 | 287,444 | 359,092 | 134,547 | 218,045 | - | 516.68 | 193.59 | | | 217.33 | |
| Sub Programme 10.2: Support community based efforts of homestead gardening, rearing small livestock, aquaculture and awareness building for improved nutrition | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BRDB | Women's Empowerment & Nutrition Improvement | 1,600 | 1,600 | - | 1,600 | 1,600 | - | | 2.30 | 2.30 | | | | |
| DLS | Sheep Breed Development in the South & Northern Region for Food Security and Nutrition | 11,000 | 1,000 | 10,000 | 11,000 | 1,000 | 10,000 | | 15.83 | 1.44 | | | 14.39 | |
| | | 12,600 | 2,600 | 10,000 | 12,600 | 2,600 | 10,000 | - | 18.13 | 3.74 | | | 14.39 | |
| Sub Programme 10.3: Link long term with immediate treatment of acute malnutrition, in particular through therapeutic and supplementary feeding | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MoH&FW | Ensuring Food Security of the 6-24 months Old Children through Nutrition Education and Home Counselling | 300 | 300 | - | 300 | 300 | - | | 0.43 | 0.43 | | | | |
| MoH&FW | Maternal Nutrition through Education and Micronutrient Supplementation during Pregnancy | 1,500 | 1,500 | - | 1,500 | 1,500 | - | | 2.16 | 2.16 | | | | |
| | | 1,800 | 1,800 | - | 1,800 | 1,800 | - | | 2.59 | 2.59 | | | | |
| Funds required (GAP) for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | | | | | | |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 10 | | | | 745,184 | 276,094 | 456,091 | | 537.40 | 199.92 | | | 231.72 | |
| Programme 11: Orient food and nutrition program through data | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 11.1: Undertake updated & comprehensive national survey of food consumption & food composition | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TBD | Undertake updated & comprehensive national survey of food consumption & food composition | 4500 | 700 | 3800 | 4,500 | 700 | 3,800 | | 6.47 | 1.01 | | | 5.47 | |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total USD | total USD | total USD |
|--|--|------------------------|-------|--------|---|-----------|----------|-----|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA |
| | | 4500 | 700 | 3800 | 4500 | 700 | 3800 | 0 | 6.47 | 1.01 | 5.47 |
| Sub Programme 11.2: Undertake study of dietary diversification and supplementation needs and develop advocacy, awareness and educational materials to facilitate behavioural change in eating habits and practices | | | | | | | | | | | |
| INFSDU | Establishment of National Food Composition Tables | 2,085 | 2,085 | - | 2,085 | 2,085 | - | - | 3.00 | 3.00 | - |
| MoHFW | Planning, Monitoring and Research (DGHS) | 1,930 | - | 1,930 | 386 | - | 386 | - | 0.56 | - | 0.56 |
| IPHN | Establishment and implementation of food based dietary guidelines | 2,085 | 2,085 | - | 2,085 | 2,085 | - | - | 3.00 | 3.00 | - |
| Food Directorate | Establishment of national nutrition norms and desirable dietary pattern | 695 | 695 | - | 695 | 695 | - | - | 1.00 | 1.00 | - |
| Food Directorate | Studies on validation of dietary diversity and nutrient adequacy for household food security | 2,085 | 2,085 | - | 2,085 | 2,085 | - | - | 3.00 | 3.00 | - |
| | | 8,880 | 6,950 | 1,930 | 7,336 | 6,950 | 386 | - | 10.56 | 10.00 | 0.56 |
| Sub Programme 11.3: Strengthen national capacities in surveying and analysis to facilitate evidence based decisions | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BBS | National Nutrition Survey | 2,085 | 2,085 | - | 2,085 | 2,085 | - | - | 3.00 | 3.00 | - |
| BBS | Harmonization of Agricultural Production Statistics | 278 | - | 278 | 278 | - | 278 | FAO | 0.40 | - | 0.40 |
| MoH&FW | Food and Nutrition Surveillance Project | 1,000 | 1,000 | - | 1,000 | 1,000 | - | - | 1.44 | 1.44 | - |
| | | 3,363 | 3,085 | 278 | 3,363 | 3,085 | 278 | - | 4.84 | 4.44 | 0.40 |
| Funds required (GAP) for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | | | |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 11 | | | | 15,199.00 | 10,735.00 | 4,464.00 | | 21.87 | 15.45 | 6.42 |
| Programme 12: Food Safety and Quality Improvement | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Programme 12.1: Improve surveillance system of food borne illnesses | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TBD | Programmes aiming to Improve surveillance system of foodborne illnesses | 8500 | | 8500 | 4,250 | - | 4,250 | | 6.12 | - | 6.12 |
| | | 8500 | 0 | 8500 | 4,250 | 0 | 4,250 | 0 | 6.12 | - | 6.12 |
| Sub Project 12.2: Develop and enhance capacities of laboratories and systems for food quality assurance and safety and control of food | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DLS | Establishment of quarantine stations for controlling emergencies diseases | 85,800 | 7,800 | 78,000 | 42,900 | 3,900 | 39,000 | | 61.73 | 5.61 | 56.12 |
| IPH | Support to laboratories and systems for food quality assurance | 869 | - | 869 | 869 | - | 869 | | 1.25 | - | 1.25 |

| GOB Agency | Project Title | Project Cost (lakh TK) | | | Fund Required between 2010-15 (lakh TK) | | | | total USD | M | total USD | M | total USD | M |
|--|--|------------------------|--------|---------|---|--------|---------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|-----------|------|
| | | Total | GoB | PA | Total | GoB | PA | DP | Total | GOB | PA | | | |
| DGHS | Regional project to enhance food safety laboratory capacities | | | | 3,892 | - | 3,892 | ADB | 5.60 | - | 5.60 | | | |
| BARC | Safe Food Production and Protection of Environment through minimizing Hazardous Chemical Uses | 5,000 | 500 | 4,500 | 5,000 | 500 | 4,500 | | 7.19 | 0.72 | 6.47 | | | |
| Food Directorate | Strengthening and upgrading of Food Testing Facilities of Directorate General of Food | 643 | - | 643 | 643 | - | 643 | | 0.93 | - | 0.93 | | | |
| Food Directorate | Strengthening and upgrading of Food Testing Laboratory | 1,390 | - | 1,390 | 1,390 | - | 1,390 | | 2.00 | - | 2.00 | | | |
| DLS | Food Analysis and Quality Assurance System Development Project | 22,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 | 22,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 | | 31.65 | 2.88 | 28.78 | | | |
| MoH&FW | Education Programme on Food Safety and Quality Improvement | 500 | 500 | - | 500 | 500 | - | | 0.72 | 0.72 | - | | | |
| DOF | Development of fisheries and aquaculture food safety and quality management system in Bangladesh | 35,000 | 3,500 | 31,500 | 35,000 | 3,500 | 31,500 | | 50.36 | 5.04 | 45.32 | | | |
| | | 151,202 | 14,300 | 136,902 | 112,194 | 10,400 | 101,794 | - | 161.43 | 14.96 | 146.47 | | | |
| Sub Project 12.3: Support the development of a modern food control management system | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TBD | Programmes aiming to Support the development of a modern food control management system | | | | | | | | | | | | | 8.00 |
| | | - | - | - | 6,950 | 1,390 | 5,560 | TBD | 10.00 | 2.00 | 8.00 | | | |
| | | | | | Funds required (GAP) for the period 2010-2015 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Total | GOB | PA | | | | | | | |
| | SUB TOTAL PROGRAMME 12 | | | | 123,394 | 11,790 | 111,604 | | 177.55 | 16.96 | 160.58 | | | |
| | Total Additional Requirement for CIP | | | | | | | | 5,060.89 | 2,568.79 | 2,221.80 | | | |


ANNEX 5: GUIDING NOTE ON CIP MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Approach to CIP Monitoring

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) processes are critical in supporting the achievement of CIP expected Results. The effective implementation of M&E actions provides opportunities to: a) Engage CIP stakeholders and beneficiaries to increase ownership of results and motivation to sustain them; b) Demonstrate achievement of development results, how they benefit the targeted people; c) Support a more effective implementation of development initiatives through decision making based on data evidence; d) Highlight gaps for advocating resource mobilization.

In accordance with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, the CIP Monitoring System is built on existing national M&E capacities and adopts the Results Based Management (RBM) approach. RBM can be defined as a broad management strategy aimed at achieving demonstrable development results and improved performance. RBM stands on the interconnection of the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation processes, where M&E findings and learning are used to improve the existing plans or to guide new Planning.

The implementation of the CIP Monitoring System promotes strong linkages among the CIP Planning and M&E processes, generating critical learning. In particular, CIP Programmes and investment operations are regularly assessed, discussed and reviewed based on updated information and lessons learned generated by M&E actions. This ongoing process of doing, learning and improving defines the CIP/RBM Life-Cycle shown in the model to the right¹.



CIP Monitoring and Evaluation² are complementary but different processes. Monitoring can be defined as the process by which CIP stakeholders (GoB, DP, CSOs, other) obtain regular feedback on the progress being made towards the achievement of the development results and targets reflected into the CIP Results Framework. Differently, CIP Evaluations are rigorous and independent assessments aimed to determine the relevance and impact of the strategies and initiatives implemented.

CIP M&E actions focus on **three key dimensions**:

- i. Progress towards expected **Outcomes/Impacts**
- ii. Progress towards expected **Outputs (aggregate outputs and sub-outputs)**
- iii. CIP Investment Project Performance (financial execution) and Donor commitments in contributing to the CIP Programmes financing (**Inputs**).

¹ CIP/RBM Life-Cycle: once the CIP expected/Impacts and outputs are identified and the implementation of investment operations starts, predefined M&E activities are conducted. Findings and learning from M&E are finally used to improve the existing CIP programmes.


² CIP Evaluations consist in Mid Term Programme Reviews prioritized and managed by the CIP National Committee.

Additionally, the effectiveness of the **coordination** among the actors involved in CIP financing and implementation, which is a necessary condition for achieving CIP results as planned, represents a cross-cutting dimension to be monitored and assessed.

Key questions addressed by CIP M&E are the following ones:

- Are inputs being mobilized as planned?
- Are the CIP inputs being produced as planned?
- Do the delivered inputs continue to be relevant for the achievement of Programme Outputs (both aggregate and outputs and sub outputs)?
- Are CIP Programmes relevant for contributing to NFP goals and outcomes/impacts?
- What are the main challenges, risks and opportunities?
- Are the priority investment areas still relevant?
- What are the financing gaps?
- What decisions need to be taken for improving CIP effectiveness?

CIP Monitoring is conducted at the Outcome/Impact, Output and Input levels of the CIP results chain. Monitoring is a “bottom-up” exercise focused on the analysis of CIP investment projects contribution to the achievement of expected Outputs and Outcomes/Impacts, as measured through the proxy indicators provided in the CIP Results Framework. CIP monitoring starts from the input level of the results chain (CIP investment projects), as shown in the model below.



CIP individual Project performance information is consolidated at CIP Programme level, according to the classification provided in the CIP “project tree¹”. CIP progress reporting on a yearly basis will aim at gauging progress towards Outcome/Impact, Output and Input levels.

CIP Monitoring is complemented by Mid Term Programme Reviews (Evaluations) providing an independent assessment on CIP Programmes, strategies and policies. The information generated through the CIP Programme Mid Term Reviews contributes to learning and knowledge on CIP effectiveness and allows identifying the unintended results and consequences of the implemented investment initiatives.

CIP M&E activities are planned and implemented through the institutional arrangements identified by the GoB. The following sections of this guiding note describe the three pillars on which the CIP Monitoring System stands, namely:

1) CIP Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

¹ The CIP Project Tree matrix defines the linkages between CIP investment projects and the CIP Focus Investment Area (or Subprogramme with their respective sub-outputs) and, consequently, between projects and CIP Programmes (aggregate outputs). The aggregation of individual project performances, according to the Project Tree classification, is a proxy for assessing CIP Programme Performance. The Project Tree results from the CIP planning process and it is regularly reviewed according to the CIP monitoring cycle.

- 2) Institutional settings for CIP Monitoring
- 3) CIP Monitoring Tools

CIP Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

The CIP M&E Plan is the key reference for conducting monitoring and evaluation activities systematically during the CIP Life-Cycle. The M&E Plan defines:

- What is to be monitored and evaluated
- Who is responsible for monitoring and evaluation activities
- When monitoring and evaluation activities take place (timing)
- How monitoring and evaluation are carried out (methods/tools/focus)

The CIP M&E Plan is provided in the matrix below.

| CIP M&E PLAN | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|
| Monitoring dimension | CIP Result | M&E Action | Focus | Responsibilities | Timing |
| i) and ii) | Outcome s/Impacts and Outputs | CIP/PoA Annual Monitoring Report: CIP Outcome/ Impact and Output Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> Progress towards CIP expected Outcome/Impacts, measured as a % of achievement of RF Targets through the provided Indicators and Baselines. <input type="checkbox"/> Progress towards CIP expected Programme Outputs, measured as a % of variation of RF Indicators from the provided Baselines. | <p>The CIP monitoring is consolidated with the NFP PoA annual monitoring process.</p> <p>This CIP Outcome/Impact & Output section of the CIP/NFP PoA Monitoring Report is generated by the TTs with the technical support from the FPMU.</p> | The CIP/PoA Annual Monitoring Report is produced on a yearly basis between December and January, during the CIP life cycle. |
| iii) | Inputs | CIP/PoA Annual Monitoring Report: CIP investment projects' budget execution | <input type="checkbox"/> Reports on CIP investment projects' budget execution performance, including details of DP's disbursement. <input type="checkbox"/> CIP new project activation | <p>The FPMU generates CIP annual Inputs reports based on ADP project progress reporting. Project information is consolidated by Programme according to the CIP Project Tree classification.</p> <p>The IMED provides ADP project financial execution information with details of DP spending, while the Planning Commission and line Ministries provide information about new project approvals.</p> | |
| | | CIP/PoA Annual Monitoring Report: CIP GoB allocations and DP commitments | <input type="checkbox"/> GOB CIP allocations <input type="checkbox"/> Donors pledges and commitments | The FPMU produces the section on GoB allocations with DP commitments with information from the ADP book (from the Planning Commission) for the former and ERD for the latter. | |
| i), ii) and iii) | Outcome s/Impacts , Outputs and Inputs | CIP Annual Review Meetings | <input type="checkbox"/> Meetings conducted at different levels to analyze CIP M&E findings and lessons learned. <input type="checkbox"/> These meetings focus on the identification of actions for improvement and sustainability to be implemented. | The CIP annual review meetings are conducted at TT, FPWG and NC levels. | |
| i) and ii | Outcome s/Impacts and Outputs | Mid Term CIP Programme Reviews | <input type="checkbox"/> Independent assessments to determine the extent to which CIP Programme Outputs have been achieved and the relevance and impact of the strategies and initiatives implemented | Independent Mid Term Programme Reviews are prioritized and managed by the CIP National Committee (NC). The FPMU provides secretarial support to the NC in managing these reviews. | Independent Mid Term Programme Reviews are conducted during the third year of CIP implementation. |

CIP Performance in the three key M&E dimensions is assessed combining different methods and reporting tools¹. The CIP Results Framework is the key reference for monitoring the first two dimensions: progress against CIP expected Outcomes/Impacts and Outputs is assessed through the criteria provided by the Results Framework proxy indicators. With regards to the Input dimension, for on-going CIP investment projects financial execution performance, monitoring is carried out through the information recorded in the national ADP planning and monitoring mechanisms and aggregated by the FPMU by CIP Programme according to the CIP Project Tree classification. For new project activation, the Planning Commission and line Ministries provide the necessary data. The information obtained for the Input dimension is crosschecked with CIP outputs and outcomes/impacts progress reports, and represents a proxy indicator to assess the relevance of CIP investment projects.

M&E Findings are analysed and discussed in **CIP Annual Review Meetings**, conducted at the Food Planning Monitoring Committee (FPMC), the CIP National Committee and Thematic Team level, for informing decisions on improvements and advocating for financial commitments. Development Partners and nongovernmental actors participate in CIP Annual Review Meetings.

Institutional settings for CIP Monitoring

CIP Monitoring is anchored to the NFP PoA Monitoring process and the national ADP planning and monitoring mechanism. The GoB identified the key institutions responsible for monitoring CIP implementation. These include the following bodies:

- The **Food Planning and Monitoring Committee (FPMC)**, which is a cabinet level committee responsible for guiding the development and implementation of the NFP.
- **The CIP National Committee** has the overall mandate to provide strategic guidance in CIP Planning, Implementation and Monitoring. A **Technical Committee (TC)** headed by the Secretary of the Food Division, responsible for conducting technical review, prioritization and follow up on CIP implementation, supports the National Committee. Both Committees are composed of representatives of relevant Government agencies, DP and other non-governmental actors.
- The **Food Policy Working Group (FPWG)** and its supporting four **Thematic Teams (TTs)** are responsible for monitoring CIP Outcomes/Impacts and Outputs achievement.
- The **Food Planning Monitoring Unit (FPMU)** provides secretarial support to the CIP National and Technical Committees, and technical and operational support to the FPWG and the Thematic Teams. It is responsible for generating the Annual NFP PoA/CIP monitoring reports.
- The **IMED** plays a critical role within the FPWG in providing monitoring information of ADP investment projects in the CIP project tree. The participation of the Finance Division in the CIP monitoring process facilitates consistency with the Medium Term Budgetary Framework.
- The **ERD**, member of the FPWG, has the key role of monitoring the financial commitments of Development Partners to the CIP.
- The **Local Consultative Group on Agriculture, Rural Development and Food Security (LCG ARDFS)**. The LCG is the venue for the dialogue between GoB and DPs, contributing to

¹ Outcome/Impact and Output progress is monitored through official statistical information generated by national institutions and international organization. ADP/CIP project financial information is used as a proxy to monitor CIP input delivery progress. CIP Programmes are assessed through independent Mid Term CIP Programme Reviews. The mentioned sources provide different pieces of information which are combined and cross-checked for supporting learning and CIP effectiveness.

improving development initiatives effectiveness and monitoring international aid resources and DP financed programmes. LCG ARDFS members participate in the CIP Annual Review meetings.


The CIP Monitoring System promotes convergence and coordination among the mentioned bodies. The Thematic Teams are critical for coordinating Programme implementation and related M&E actions.

The **CIP Annual Review Meetings** facilitate the dialogue among partners, supporting mutual understanding and consensus on decisions making. The FPMU play a critical role in implementing the CIP Monitoring System as it provides technical and operational support in generating the CIP M&E reports and to facilitate CIP Annual Reviews, according to the model to the right¹.

CIP M&E Tools

The CIP M&E Plan determines the mix of tools to be used for conducting monitoring at Impact, Outcome and Output levels, ensuring a balance between: data generation and analysis; validation of results; participation. The CIP M&E is operated through the following tools:

- a. CIP Annual Outcome/Impact and Output Progress Reports.** The CIP performance towards Outcomes/ Impacts and Outputs is annually assessed based on the proxy indicators provided in the Result Framework (RF). Progress towards Impacts is expressed as a percentage of achievement of RF targets under the provided proxy indicators. Progress towards CIP Outputs is measured as a variation from baselines under the provided proxy indicators. The Annual Outcome/ Impact and Output Progress Reports are owned by the CIP Thematic Teams and generated through the technical support of the FPMU. These reports contribute to the monitoring of the first and second CIP key monitoring dimension.



¹ Key findings from monitoring reports are analysed and discussed within the TTs and the FPWG for further discussion within the CIP National Committee and the Food Planning Monitoring Committee. CIP monitoring findings are disseminated and lessons learned are incorporated into the following phases of CIP Programme implementation, through the coordination and guidance provided by the National Committee.

- b. **CIP Annual Input Review (AIR):**
- Reviews of financial execution performance of CIP investment projects, and on the activation of new CIP investment operations are generated on an annual basis. The AIRs promote a self-assessment conducted by the TTs for evaluating the performance of Programmes and projects in terms of their contributions towards the intended Outputs. The AIRs provide an annual update on CIP project financial execution. Details of the DPs' contributions are also provided. The information is aggregated by CIP Programme according to the CIP Project Tree classification. The FPMU generates CIP Annual Input Review by extracting project information from the national ADP planning and monitoring system. The IMED provides ADP project financial execution information and the Planning Commission and line Ministries inform on new CIP relevant project activation.
 - Annual review of DP Commitments. This is generated under the responsibility of the FPMU. DPs' financial contribution to ADP/CIP programmes is monitored by elaborating information extracted from the national ADP planning and monitoring system. The ERD facilitates to the FPMU information on non-ADP programmes and projects activated and financed by DPs. Relevant reports from the LCG ARDFS and Country Partnership Framework, as available, may be used to complement the information.
- c. **CIP Annual Review Meetings.** Conducted at TTs, FPWG and National Committee levels, the Annual Review Meetings are key venues to discuss M&E findings among CIP stakeholders and make recommendations for improvement. The discussions generated give special emphasis on lessons learned and planning for sustainability (Programme exit strategies).
- d. **Mid Term Programme Reviews.** Independent assessments and *ad hoc* studies focused on CIP programmes. The CIP National Committee is responsible for managing these activities. In particular, the National Committee is responsible for prioritizing, defining the focus, methods of analysis, timing and the management arrangements for conducting such assessments. The FPMU provides secretarial technical and operational support to the National Committee in managing the independent Mid Term Programme Reviews.

Challenges and Opportunities in implementing CIP M&E

Achieving the effective implementation of the CIP Monitoring system presents a series of challenges and opportunities. CIP M&E actions can be effectively implemented if the preconditions below are satisfied:

1. **Adequate M&E resources are critical for achieving CIP results.** Inadequate allocation of financial and human resources affect the effectiveness of the M&E processes. Regarding **human resources**, it is important to secure the availability of skilled personnel dedicated to the CIP M&E functions. The role and responsibilities of the M&E teams involved in CIP Monitoring (the FPMU, the Thematic Teams and the FPWG) have to be endorsed at the highest level, while their technical and operational capacities have to be strengthened. This will support coordination and sustainability of M&E actions. The main responsibilities of CIP M&E teams include:
 - a. Meeting regularly with key partners and stakeholders to assess progress towards achieving CIP results
 - b. Identifying lessons or good practices
 - c. Ensuring the quality of monitoring and evaluation work
 - d. Assessing the relevance of the M&E framework on a regular basis

Key CIP GoB stakeholders and DPs play a critical role for mobilizing the required resources for strengthening the existing M&E capacities and for securing financing of CIP Mid Term Programme Reviews.

2. The **engagement of stakeholders in CIP M&E** is critical. CIP stakeholders are the best positioned to establish whether the planned results and investment operations continue to remain relevant and to ensure that CIP initiatives deliver as planned. Stakeholder participation in CIP M&E facilitates effective communication to increase coordination, engagement, mobilize additional resources to fill resource gaps. Stakeholder participation throughout the different phases of the CIP life-cycle ensures ownership, learning and sustainability of results.
3. Programme monitoring is a collective responsibility among CIP implementing entities, which poses significant **Coordination Challenges**. Thus, strengthening the capacity to coordinate is critical. Ensuring synergy and coordination among partners working towards common results supports:
 - a. Strategic focus and use of limited resources,
 - b. Enhanced synergy and coordination among key actors
 - c. Accountability and informed decision making
 - d. Avoiding duplication of efforts
 - e. Identification of gaps

Annual Review Meetings will promote partnerships to achieve common results and make linkages to national development goals.

4. Updates of the CIP during its implementation need to be documented and justified. The effective implementation of the CIP Monitoring System provides evidence to base such changes and supports informed strategic decisions. Thus, the M&E exercise **provides guidance for adjusting project implementation**: based on the results of the monitoring, the National Committee may decide to revise the CIP and improve it further, in line with the existing process.
5. **The Evaluation process has to be considered as an integral part of CIP management**. The planned independent Mid Term Programme Reviews provide critical feedback for improving programming, policies and strategies. While monitoring provides real-time information on the implementation of CIP Programmes and investment projects, the Programme Reviews consist on critical in-depth assessments. Monitoring has to be combined with independent evaluations to ensure continuous enhancement of CIP effectiveness. **Financial resources for conducting Mid Term CIP Programme Reviews have to be secured**, as part of Programme 7 of the CIP.
6. **CIP Input monitoring**. CIP Outputs are achieved through the generation of project inputs. CIP project budget execution performance is the key proxy for assessing CIP capacity to deliver inputs. There is a critical responsibility at CIP project level with regards to reporting on the generation of inputs through a set of activities, and proper use of resources allocated. The CIP Monitoring system is based on the aggregation of subsidiary individual projects M&E frameworks and systems.



**Government of the People's Republic of
Bangladesh**

**BANGLADESH Country
Investment Plan**

**A Road Map towards investment in agriculture,
food security and nutrition**

**Food Division
Ministry of Food and Disaster Management
Dhaka, 14 June 2010**

**Declaration by the Government and LCG on Agriculture, Rural
Development and Food Security (LCG-ARDFS)**

The BCIP is conceived as directly resulting from the Plan of Action of the National Food Policy (PoA/NFP). The preparation of the **BANGLADESH Country Investment Plan: A Road Map Towards Investment in Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition** (BCIP) itself started in early 2010 and involved wide consultations with key ministries, private sector, NGOs and Development partners. Six thematic papers prepared with the technical assistance of International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and Bangladesh Institute for Development Studies (BIDS) served as the background documents for the BCIP. FAO offered technical support in the formulation of the BCIP.

The technical papers along with the Draft BCIP were presented at the **Bangladesh Food Security Investment Forum** held at the Pan Pacific Sonargaon Hotel, Dhaka, on 26-27 May 2010. The deliberations at the Forum, the inter-ministerial consultation meetings that followed and the comments from partner Ministries/Divisions were incorporated to finalize BCIP and the same was endorsed at the Inter-Ministerial/Inter-Agency meeting finally held at the Ministry of Food and Disaster Management on 13th June 2010. The BCIP is considered as a living document to be regularly revised as a result of (i) further consultations with stakeholders including development partners; (ii) changing circumstances; (iii) feed back from monitoring and evaluation activities.

This document is endorsed by the Local Consultative Group on Agriculture, Rural Development and Food Security (LCG-ARDFS) and the Government of Bangladesh.

Dated, Dhaka, 14 June 2010



Khandoker Atiar Rohman
Joint Secretary
Food Division
Ministry of Food and Disaster Management



Ad Spijkers
FAO Representative in Bangladesh
and
Chair, LCG-ARDFS



Dr Muhammad Abdur Razzaque, MP
Minister
Ministry of Food and Disaster Management



Abul Maal Abdul Muhith
Minister
Ministry of Finance

