**MTR**

**Bhutan NAPA III project title: Enhancing Sustainability and Climate Resilience of Forest and Agricultural Landscape and Community Livelihoods**

**Brief Progress Report for GEF-7 Core Indicators**

# Core Indicator 1: Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (hectares)

1.1 Terrestrial protected areas newly created: NA (not applicable in this Project)

1.2 Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total Ha (expected at PIF) | Total Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement) | Total Ha (achieved at MTR) | Total Ha (achieved at TE) |
| n/a | 1,325,800 | 1,325,800 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Protected Area | WDPA ID | IUCN Category | Total Ha (expected at PIF) | Total Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement) | Total Ha (achieved at MTR) | Total Ha (achieved at TE) |
| Jigme Singye Wangchuck National Park |  |  | n/a |  | 1,149,400 |  |
| Phrumsangla National Park  |  |  | n/a |  |  |
| Jigme Khesar Strict Nature Reserve  |  |  | n/a |  |  |
| Biological Corridor 1 |  |  | n/a |  | 176,400 |  |
| Biological Corridor 2 |  |  | n/a |  |  |
| Biological Corridor 4 |  |  | n/a |  |  |
| Biological Corridor 8 |  |  | n/a |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Protected Area | METT Score at PIF | METT Score at CEO Endorsement | METT Score at MTR | METT Score at TE |
| JSWNP | n/a | 66 | 72 |  |
| PNP  | n/a | 73 | 74 |  |
| JKSNR  | n/a | 62 | 69 |  |
| BC1 | n/a | 35 | 50 |  |
| BC2 | n/a | 26 | 42 |  |
| BC4 | n/a | 32 | 48 |  |
| BC8 | n/a | 20 | 43 |  |

The new Management Plans, Zonation reports and new research coupled with additional staff from Dzongkhag and BFL funding has led to an overall satisfactory rating of METT scores of the three selected Parks. COVID has however posed some challenges as it has led to the engagement of foresters as frontline staff to support a national initiative against COVID-19 pandemic with a reduction in recurrent budgets for PAs/BCs management.

In the case of BCs, there is progress, but scores are relatively low. It is mainly due to lack of strong management plans (not approved yet), limited staff and uncertainty about budgets that leads to increasing threat. BCs still lack a baseline to understand the functionality of the corridors.

To facilitate the improvement of management effectiveness of Parks and the BCs, the Project provided capacity building (mainly training and exposure visits) to about 90 officials (70 male and 20 females). It has also supported high-speed internet connections. Patrolling support was provided with some equipment[[1]](#footnote-1). Drafting and field-testing of national-level biodiversity monitoring protocol prepared that helps to gather crucial information of plant and animal species.

#  Core Indicator 4: Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity: NA

4.2 Area of landscape that meet national or international third-party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations

4.3 Areas of landscapes under sustainable land management in production system

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ha (expected at PIF) | Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (achieved at MTR) | Ha (achieved at TE) |
|  | 112.5 ha (baseline)MTR target 1000 ha | 1,632 ha |  |

1632 ha of agricultural land was brought under SLM across 12 districts and 38 gewogs/blocks benefiting 9,747 population (4,796 women and 4,951 men). This intervention has been very popular among the beneficiaries as it helped farmers to get good harvest and increase family income.

4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided: NA

# Core Indicator 6: Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent)

6.1 Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the sector of Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| GHG emission type | Ha (expected at PIF) | Metric tons CO2-eq (baseline at PIF) | Ha (expected at CEO ER) | Metric tons CO2-eq (baseline at CEO ER) | Ha (achieved at MTR) | Metric tons CO2-eq (above baseline at MTR) | Ha (achieved at TE) | Metric tons CO2-eq (above baseline at TE) |
| Lifetime direct project GHG emissions mitigated | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 4,134,000 | 0 |  |  |
| Lifetime direct post-project emissions mitigated | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |
| Lifetime indirect GHG emissions mitigated | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 832 | 0 |  |  |

No assessment on carbon sink from forests carried out.

# Core Indicator 11. Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Women / Men / Total | Total number (expected at PIF) | Total number (expected at CEO Endorsement) | Total number (achieved at MTR) | Total number (achieved at TE) |
| Women | n/a | n/a | 48,183 |  |
| Men | n/a | n/a | . 54,212 |  |
| Total | n/a | n/a | 102,395 |  |

The MTR target was 19,350 women and 20,650 men benefited (total beneficiaries =40,000). By MTR time, the Project directly benefited 102,395 beneficiaries

(48,183 female and 54,212 male) from various project interventions.

1. 70 camera traps and accessories, 17 dirt bikes for mobility, 180 SMART data logger, 2 rafts and accessories, 26 hypsometers, 26 Clinometer, 35 wedge prisms, 35 compasses, 35 metric diameter tape, 30 four men tents, 35 measuring tapes to territorial forest divisions and parks to enhance the capacity of monitoring [↑](#footnote-ref-1)