



IFRAP
Integrated
Flood Resilience &
Adaptation Project



Ministry of Planning
Development &
Special Initiatives



INTEGRATED FLOOD RESILIENCE & ADAPTATION PROJECT

BASELINE ASSESSMENT REPORT **COMPONENT-IV**

MONITORING & EVALUATION (M&E) CONSULTANT

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	1
2. Introduction and Background	3
2.1 Component-IV Scope and Institutional Arrangements	3
2.2 Scope of Component-IV	3
2.3 Institutional Arrangements.....	4
2.4 Boundaries of Responsibility	5
2.5 Implications for Baseline Assessment	5
3. Methodology for Establishing the Baseline – Component-IV	6
3.1 Baseline Approach	6
3.2 Sources of Baseline Information.....	6
3.3 Indicator-Anchored Baseline Logic	7
3.4 Distinction between Baseline, Monitoring, and Endline.....	7
3.5 Scope and Limitations	7
4. Baseline Conditions – Governance and Project Management Systems	8
4.1 Project Governance Structure at Baseline	8
4.2 Coordination and Oversight Mechanisms	8
4.3 Fiduciary and Compliance Arrangements.....	8
4.4 Decision-Making and Reporting Processes	9
4.5 Baseline Summary	9
5. Baseline Conditions – Strategic Planning and Knowledge Instruments.....	10
5.1 Planning Context at Baseline	10
5.2 River Basin–Level Planning at Baseline	10
5.3 Knowledge Generation and Use.....	10
5.4 Baseline Summary	11
6. Baseline Conditions – Citizen Engagement and Accountability.....	12
6.1 Citizen Engagement Context at Baseline	12
6.2 Accountability and Feedback Mechanisms.....	12
6.3 Inclusion and Participation Considerations	12
6.4 Baseline Summary	13
7. Baseline Conditions – Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning.....	14
7.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Framework at Baseline	14
7.2 Data Management and Reporting Processes	14
7.3 Learning and Adaptive Management.....	14
7.4 Baseline Summary	15
8. Discussion in Relation to the Results-Based Monitoring Framework (Component-IV)	16
8.1 Relationship between Component-IV and PDO Indicators.....	16
8.2 Alignment with Intermediate Results Indicator IRI-2	16
8.3 Alignment with Intermediate Results Indicator IRI-4	17
8.4 Alignment with Intermediate Results Indicator IRI-6	17

8.5	Baseline Contribution of Component-IV to Project Results	17
8.6	Summary.....	17

List of Acronyms

Acronym	Full Form
FPMU	Federal Project Management Unit
IFRAP	Integrated Flood Resilience and Adaptation Project
IRI	Intermediate Results Indicator
JV	Joint Venture
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PDO	Project Development Objective
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
RBMF	Results-Based Monitoring Framework
TA	Technical Assistance
TOR	Terms of Reference
WB	World Bank

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section presents the baseline assessment for Component-IV (Project Management, Technical Assistance, and Institutional Strengthening) of the Integrated Flood Resilience and Adaptation Project (IFRAP). Component-IV serves as the enabling backbone of the project, supporting effective coordination, governance, planning, monitoring, and accountability across all components. It does not directly implement physical works or deliver services to beneficiaries; rather, it establishes the institutional and system-level conditions required for successful project execution and results-based management.

The baseline assessment for Component-IV adopts a qualitative, reference-based methodology, consistent with World Bank good practice for enabling and coordination components. The assessment focuses on the existence, maturity, and readiness of governance structures, planning instruments, citizen engagement mechanisms, and monitoring systems at the commencement of IFRAP. No household surveys, beneficiary assessments, or performance evaluations were undertaken as part of this baseline.

Baseline findings indicate that, at project start, IFRAP has an approved institutional architecture defining federal and provincial roles, with the Federal Project Management Unit (FPMU) designated as the central coordination and oversight entity. While governance and fiduciary responsibilities are clearly articulated, IFRAP-specific coordination processes, reporting systems, and decision-making mechanisms are at an early stage of operationalization and are expected to be strengthened through Component-IV interventions during implementation.

In terms of strategic planning, baseline conditions reflect the absence of IFRAP-financed river basin planning studies and limited availability of integrated, basin-level analytical tools to inform flood resilience investments. Planning practices at baseline are fragmented and sector-specific, underscoring the need for structured planning instruments supported under Component-IV.

Baseline assessment of citizen engagement and accountability indicates that no IFRAP-specific citizens' engagement strategy is in place at project commencement. Engagement practices are fragmented across components and implementing entities, and a unified framework to guide inclusive consultation, feedback, and accountability has not yet been developed.

With respect to monitoring, evaluation, and learning, IFRAP has an approved Results-Based Monitoring Framework at baseline; however, project-wide monitoring systems, data management processes, and learning mechanisms are not yet fully operationalized. Component-IV is expected to translate the results framework into functioning systems that support evidence-based decision-making and adaptive management.

In relation to the Results-Based Monitoring Framework, Component-IV does not directly contribute to Project Development Objective indicators. Its contribution is captured through Intermediate Results Indicators, including:

- A. IRI-2:** Community flood resilience plans prepared,
- B. IRI-4:** River basin planning studies developed, and
- C. IRI-6:** Citizens' engagement strategy developed and rolled out.

Baseline reference conditions for these indicators are defined by the absence of IFRAP-specific plans, studies, and strategies at project start, providing a clear and defensible benchmark for measuring progress during implementation.

Overall, this baseline establishes the institutional and system-level starting point for Component-IV and provides a coherent reference framework for tracking progress in strengthening governance, planning, citizen engagement, and monitoring systems under IFRAP.

2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Integrated Flood Resilience and Adaptation Project (IFRAP) adopt a multi-component design to address the structural, institutional, and systemic drivers of flood vulnerability. While several components focus on physical investments and service delivery at community and sectoral levels, the project also includes a dedicated enabling component (**Component-IV**) to ensure that implementation across all components is effectively coordinated, governed, monitored, and accountable.

Component-IV plays a central role in supporting the overall performance of IFRAP by providing project management, institutional strengthening, strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation, and citizen engagement functions. These functions are essential for translating investments under other components into sustainable and measurable resilience outcomes. In line with World Bank good practice, Component-IV does not directly execute physical activities or deliver services to beneficiaries; instead, it establishes the institutional and governance architecture required for effective project implementation.

The component is implemented through the Federal Project Management Unit (FPMU), representing the Federal Ministry of Planning and Special Initiatives and serving as the primary coordination and oversight mechanism for IFRAP. The FPMU acts as the central interface between federal institutions, provincial Project Implementation Units (PIUs), and the World Bank, ensuring alignment with project objectives, fiduciary requirements, and results-based monitoring commitments.

Component-IV also supports the development of strategic instruments and frameworks (such as planning studies and engagement strategies) that guide and strengthen interventions across other components. These instruments are not standalone outputs; rather, they provide the analytical, consultative, and governance foundations necessary for informed decision-making, inclusive participation, and adaptive project management.

This baseline assessment for Component-IV establishes the pre-intervention institutional and system-level conditions at the commencement of IFRAP. It focuses on the existence, maturity, and readiness of governance structures, planning instruments, engagement mechanisms, and monitoring systems relevant to Component-IV's mandate. The baseline does not assess performance or effectiveness, nor does it measure population-level outcomes, which will be addressed through implementation-stage monitoring and endline evaluation.

By documenting these baseline conditions, the assessment provides a clear reference point for tracking progress under Component-IV and for understanding how enabling systems evolve over the course of project implementation to support IFRAP's broader flood resilience objectives.

2.1 Component-IV Scope and Institutional Arrangements

Component-IV of IFRAP is designed as an enabling and cross-cutting component that supports the effective implementation of all project components through strengthened institutional arrangements, coordination mechanisms, and governance systems. Unlike investment-focused components, Component-IV does not deliver physical infrastructure or direct services to communities. Its scope is defined by oversight, facilitation, standard-setting, and accountability functions that ensure coherence, efficiency, and results-orientation across the project.

2.2 Scope of Component-IV

The scope of Component-IV encompasses five interrelated functional areas:

A. Project Management and Coordination

Component-IV supports overall project coordination, ensuring alignment among federal and provincial stakeholders, timely decision-making, and adherence to agreed implementation arrangements. This includes coordination with provincial Project Implementation Units (PIUs), sector departments, and other implementing partners involved in Components I, II, and III.

B. Institutional Strengthening and Oversight

The component provides the institutional backbone for fiduciary management, compliance with World Bank requirements, and adherence to agreed environmental, social, and governance commitments. These functions are essential for maintaining implementation quality and accountability but do not involve direct execution of field activities.

C. Strategic and Planning Instruments

Component-IV supports the preparation of analytical and planning tools (such as river basin planning studies and community-level planning frameworks) that inform investment prioritization and resilience-building efforts under other components. These instruments provide strategic direction rather than stand-alone interventions.

D. Citizen Engagement and Accountability

The component is responsible for establishing structured mechanisms to engage citizens, communities, and stakeholders, ensuring transparency, inclusion, and feedback throughout the project lifecycle. This includes the development of a project-wide citizens' engagement strategy and associated mechanisms.

E. Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL)

Component-IV anchors the project's results-based monitoring system, including oversight of M&E frameworks, reporting processes, and learning mechanisms. These functions support adaptive management and evidence-based decision-making across all components.

2.3 Institutional Arrangements

Component-IV is implemented through the Federal Project Management Unit (FPMU), operating under the Federal Ministry of Planning and Special Initiatives. The FPMU serves as the central coordinating and oversight entity for IFRAP and is responsible for ensuring consistency with national policies, project objectives, and World Bank requirements.

Key institutional relationships include:

A. Federal–Provincial Interface:

The FPMU coordinates with provincial PIUs and line departments responsible for executing activities under Components I, II, and III. This coordination role facilitates information flow, harmonization of approaches, and consolidation of reporting.

B. Interface with the World Bank:

The FPMU acts as the primary focal point for engagement with the World Bank, including reporting, supervision missions, and compliance with fiduciary, safeguards, and results-based monitoring requirements.

C. Internal Coordination Functions:

Within the project architecture, Component-IV provides standardized processes, guidance, and frameworks that support consistent implementation across components, while respecting the execution mandates of sectoral and provincial entities.

2.4 Boundaries of Responsibility

It is important to clarify the boundaries of Component-IV's mandate to avoid overlap or misattribution:

- Component-IV does not implement physical works, construct infrastructure, or deliver services directly to beneficiaries.
- It does not replace the operational responsibilities of PIUs or sector departments.
- Its role is to enable, coordinate, and oversee, ensuring that execution by other components is effective, accountable, and aligned with IFRAP's results framework.

These boundaries are fundamental to interpreting baseline conditions and to assessing progress under Component-IV during implementation.

2.5 Implications for Baseline Assessment

Given its enabling nature, the baseline for Component-IV focuses on:

- the existence and maturity of institutional arrangements;
- the availability of governance, planning, and engagement frameworks; and
- readiness of monitoring and coordination systems at project commencement.

Baseline assessment under this component therefore emphasizes institutional readiness rather than operational performance, providing the reference point against which progress under Component-IV indicators will be measured.

3. METHODOLOGY FOR ESTABLISHING THE BASELINE – COMPONENT-IV

Component-IV of IFRAP focuses on project management, institutional strengthening, strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation, and citizen engagement. Given the nature of these functions, the baseline for Component-IV is not designed to measure physical outputs, service delivery, or population-level outcomes. Instead, it establishes institutional and system-level reference conditions at the commencement of the project.

Accordingly, the baseline for Component-IV has been developed using a qualitative, reference-based methodology, consistent with World Bank good practice for enabling and coordination components in multi-sector investment projects.

3.1 Baseline Approach

The primary objective of the Component-IV baseline is to document the existence, maturity, and readiness of governance structures, coordination mechanisms, planning instruments, citizen engagement arrangements, and monitoring systems relevant to IFRAP at project start.

The baseline approach is characterized by:

- a focus on institutional arrangements and frameworks, rather than implementation performance;
- reliance on documented project design and institutional mandates, rather than primary data collection; and
- clear differentiation between baseline reference conditions, implementation-stage monitoring, and endline assessment.

This approach reflects the enabling role of Component-IV and avoids conflating baseline assessment with operational evaluation.

3.2 Sources of Baseline Information

Baseline conditions for Component-IV have been established using the following sources:

- **Project Design Documents:**

The Project Appraisal Document (PAD), revised Project Paper, and the revised Results-Based Monitoring Framework were reviewed to define the scope, objectives, and indicators associated with Component-IV.

- **Institutional Mandates and Project Arrangements:**

Baseline understanding of governance and coordination arrangements is derived from approved project implementation structures, including the mandate of the Federal Project Management Unit (FPMU) and its relationship with provincial PIUs and implementing agencies.

- **Project Preparation and Inception Processes:**

Information generated during project preparation, inception discussions, and early coordination processes informs the baseline description of system readiness and institutional setup at project start.

No household surveys, beneficiary assessments, or performance audits were conducted as part of the Component-IV baseline.

3.3 Indicator-Anchored Baseline Logic

The Component-IV baseline is explicitly aligned with the Intermediate Results Indicators (IRIs) assigned to this component, namely:

- **IRI-2:** Community Flood Resilience Plans prepared
- **IRI-4:** River basin planning studies developed
- **IRI-6:** Citizens' engagement strategy developed and rolled out

For each of these indicators, baseline conditions are defined in terms of existence or non-existence of IFRAP-specific frameworks, plans, or studies at the start of the project. The baseline does not assess quality, effectiveness, or coverage, as these dimensions are expected to evolve during implementation and will be addressed through regular monitoring and endline evaluation.

3.4 Distinction between Baseline, Monitoring, and Endline

To ensure methodological clarity, the following distinctions apply:

A. Baseline:

Establishes reference conditions related to institutional readiness, framework availability, and system setup under Component-IV.

B. Regular Monitoring:

Will track the development, adoption, and rollout of plans, strategies, studies, and systems supported under Component-IV, including verification of indicator achievement.

C. Endline Assessment:

Will assess progress relative to baseline conditions and document the completion and operational status of Component-IV deliverables in relation to the Results-Based Monitoring Framework.

This staged approach ensures that baseline assessment remains descriptive and reference-oriented, while allowing monitoring and endline processes to capture progress and outcomes.

3.5 Scope and Limitations

The Component-IV baseline is intentionally limited to institutional and process-level conditions. It does not attempt to quantify benefits, measure citizen satisfaction, or assess impacts on resilience or service delivery. Such outcomes are addressed at the project level through consolidated monitoring and evaluation across all components.

By maintaining this scope, the baseline provides a clear and defensible starting point for assessing progress under Component-IV without overstating the role or mandate of the FPMU.

4. BASELINE CONDITIONS – GOVERNANCE AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

Governance and project management systems form the institutional foundation for the effective implementation of IFRAP. Under Component-IV, these systems are intended to provide coordination, oversight, fiduciary assurance, and accountability across all project components and implementing entities. This section documents the baseline governance and project management conditions at the commencement of IFRAP.

4.1 Project Governance Structure at Baseline

At project start, IFRAP is structured around a federal–provincial implementation model, with responsibilities distributed across federal institutions, provincial Project Implementation Units (PIUs), and sectoral departments. The Federal Project Management Unit (FPMU), operating under the Federal Ministry of Planning and Special Initiatives, is designated as the central coordination and oversight body for the project.

Baseline governance arrangements include:

- an approved institutional setup defining federal and provincial roles;
- designated PIUs responsible for execution of component-specific activities; and
- a central coordination mechanism through the FPMU to consolidate oversight, reporting, and engagement with the World Bank.

These arrangements establish the formal governance framework for IFRAP but are at an early stage of operational maturity at baseline.

4.2 Coordination and Oversight Mechanisms

At baseline, coordination mechanisms between the FPMU and provincial PIUs are defined through project documentation and agreed implementation arrangements. However, IFRAP-specific coordination processes (such as standardized reporting cycles, consolidated progress reviews, and integrated decision-making forums) are in the process of being established.

Baseline conditions are characterized by:

- reliance on initial coordination arrangements emerging from project preparation;
- evolving inter-agency communication channels; and
- the need for structured mechanisms to support consistent oversight across components.

These conditions reflect the normal transition from project approval to active implementation and define the starting point for governance strengthening under Component-IV.

4.3 Fiduciary and Compliance Arrangements

Fiduciary management and compliance with World Bank requirements are core responsibilities supported under Component-IV. At baseline:

- fiduciary responsibilities and compliance requirements are clearly articulated in project agreements and implementation manuals;
- roles related to financial management, procurement, and safeguards oversight are defined within the project architecture; and

- IFRAP-specific fiduciary systems and workflows are in the process of being operationalized.

The baseline does not assess the performance or effectiveness of fiduciary systems but rather establishes that institutional responsibilities and compliance frameworks are in place, with further strengthening expected during implementation.

4.4 Decision-Making and Reporting Processes

At project commencement, decision-making and reporting processes are guided by agreed institutional arrangements and World Bank reporting requirements. However, standardized IFRAP-specific processes for routine reporting, issue escalation, and performance review are still under development.

Baseline characteristics include:

- initial reporting formats and timelines under discussion;
- evolving mechanisms for consolidating information from multiple components and provinces; and
- dependence on Component-IV interventions to formalize and streamline decision-making and reporting structures.

These conditions provide the reference point for subsequent strengthening of governance systems under the component.

4.5 Baseline Summary

In summary, baseline governance and project management systems under Component-IV are defined by:

- an established federal–provincial governance framework with clearly assigned roles;
- designated coordination and oversight responsibilities vested in the FPMU;
- defined fiduciary and compliance mandates aligned with World Bank requirements; and
- emerging, but not yet fully operationalized, coordination and reporting mechanisms.

These baseline conditions reflect the institutional starting environment at the outset of IFRAP and provide the reference against which progress in governance and project management systems will be tracked during implementation under Component-IV.

5. BASELINE CONDITIONS – STRATEGIC PLANNING AND KNOWLEDGE INSTRUMENTS

Strategic planning and analytical instruments are critical for guiding flood resilience investments and ensuring that interventions are informed by risk-based, integrated, and forward-looking analysis. Under IFRAP, Component-IV supports the development of such instruments to strengthen decision-making across components and to improve alignment between investments, risk profiles, and long-term resilience objectives.

This section documents the baseline status of strategic planning and knowledge instruments relevant to flood resilience at the commencement of the project.

5.1 Planning Context at Baseline

At baseline, flood resilience planning in Pakistan is undertaken through a range of sectoral, provincial, and project-specific initiatives. While these efforts provide valuable insights, they are often fragmented, limited in geographic scope, or focused on individual sectors or administrative boundaries.

Baseline conditions are characterized by:

- absence of integrated planning tools that link upstream and downstream flood risks across river basins;
- limited availability of standardized analytical instruments to inform prioritization of resilience investments; and
- reliance on project-specific or sector-specific studies rather than coordinated basin-wide planning.

These conditions underscore the need for structured planning instruments that can support coherent and risk-informed decision-making under IFRAP.

5.2 River Basin–Level Planning at Baseline

River basin–level planning is recognized as a key approach for addressing flood risks that transcend administrative boundaries. However, at the start of IFRAP:

- no river basin planning studies financed under IFRAP have been completed or are operational;
- existing studies, where available, are not aligned with the specific objectives, geographic focus, or implementation needs of IFRAP; and
- basin-level analysis has not yet been systematically integrated into the project's investment planning processes.

As a result, baseline conditions reflect the absence of IFRAP-specific river basin planning studies, establishing the reference point for subsequent analytical work supported under Component-IV.

5.3 Knowledge Generation and Use

At baseline, knowledge generation related to flood resilience is largely driven by individual projects, sectoral agencies, or development partners, with limited mechanisms for consolidation and systematic use within a single project framework.

Baseline characteristics include:

- lack of a centralized approach for synthesizing planning and analytical outputs relevant to IFRAP;
- limited use of standardized methodologies for resilience-oriented planning across components; and
- dependence on Component-IV interventions to formalize knowledge generation, documentation, and dissemination processes.

These baseline conditions define the starting point for strengthening planning coherence and evidence-based decision-making through Component-IV.

5.4 Baseline Summary

In summary, baseline conditions for strategic planning and knowledge instruments under Component-IV are defined by:

- fragmented planning practices and limited integration across spatial and sectoral boundaries;
- absence of IFRAP-financed river basin planning studies at project start; and
- need for standardized analytical tools to inform investment prioritization and resilience strategies.

These conditions establish the reference framework for tracking progress in the development and application of strategic planning instruments under Component-IV during implementation.

6. BASELINE CONDITIONS – CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Citizen engagement and accountability are integral to the effectiveness, transparency, and sustainability of flood resilience interventions. Under IFRAP, Component-IV is responsible for establishing structured mechanisms that enable meaningful engagement with citizens and stakeholders and for ensuring that feedback informs project implementation and oversight.

This section documents the baseline conditions for citizen engagement and accountability systems at the commencement of the project.

6.1 Citizen Engagement Context at Baseline

At baseline, citizen engagement related to flood resilience initiatives in Pakistan is undertaken through a variety of ad hoc and sector-specific approaches. While communities are often consulted during project preparation or implementation, these engagements are typically fragmented, uneven across regions, and not guided by a unified project-wide framework.

Baseline conditions are characterized by:

- absence of a standardized, IFRAP-specific citizen engagement strategy;
- variability in engagement practices across provinces, components, and implementing entities; and
- limited formalization of consultation, feedback, and disclosure processes within a single project framework.

These conditions reflect the starting environment in which Component-IV interventions are designed to strengthen citizen engagement.

6.2 Accountability and Feedback Mechanisms

Accountability mechanisms relevant to citizen engagement (such as grievance redress and feedback channels) exist in various forms across government institutions and projects. However, at the start of IFRAP:

- no consolidated, project-wide citizen engagement and accountability framework is operational;
- feedback mechanisms are not yet systematically linked to project decision-making and monitoring processes; and
- roles and responsibilities for managing citizen feedback under IFRAP are in the process of being defined.

The baseline does not assess the effectiveness of existing mechanisms but establishes that a unified and structured approach has not yet been developed under the project.

6.3 Inclusion and Participation Considerations

At baseline, engagement approaches do not yet systematically incorporate standardized provisions to ensure inclusive participation of different population groups, including women and youth, across all project components. While inclusion may be addressed within specific activities or local contexts, a project-wide strategy to guide inclusive engagement has not been established.

This baseline condition highlights the need for a structured citizen engagement strategy that explicitly addresses inclusion, transparency, and responsiveness across IFRAP interventions.

6.4 Baseline Summary

In summary, baseline conditions for citizen engagement and accountability under Component-IV are defined by:

- absence of an IFRAP-specific citizen engagement strategy at project start;
- fragmented engagement and feedback practices across components and implementing entities; and
- need for a structured, inclusive, and project-wide approach to citizen engagement and accountability.

These baseline conditions establish the reference point for tracking progress toward the development and rollout of a citizens' engagement strategy under Component-IV.

7. BASELINE CONDITIONS – MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND LEARNING

Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) functions are central to ensuring results-based management, accountability, and adaptive decision-making under IFRAP. Component-IV provides the institutional anchor for these functions, supporting the development and oversight of project-wide monitoring systems, reporting processes, and learning mechanisms.

This section documents the baseline conditions for MEL systems and processes at the commencement of IFRAP.

7.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Framework at Baseline

At project start, IFRAP has an approved Results-Based Monitoring Framework that defines Project Development Objectives, Intermediate Results Indicators, and reporting requirements. The framework establishes the conceptual basis for tracking progress and outcomes across all components.

Baseline conditions are characterized by:

- availability of an agreed results framework defining indicators and targets;
- absence of fully operationalized, component-wide monitoring systems at project start; and
- reliance on Component-IV interventions to translate the framework into functioning monitoring tools and processes.

The baseline does not assess the adequacy or effectiveness of the framework itself but rather establishes that results definitions exist while operational systems are still under development.

7.2 Data Management and Reporting Processes

At baseline, data management and reporting processes for IFRAP are in an early stage of establishment. While reporting requirements are defined through project agreements and World Bank supervision protocols, standardized project-wide processes for data consolidation, validation, and reporting are not yet fully operational.

Baseline characteristics include:

- evolving arrangements for collecting and consolidating data from multiple components and provinces;
- absence of fully integrated digital systems to support real-time or routine reporting; and
- dependence on Component-IV to formalize reporting workflows, responsibilities, and quality assurance mechanisms.

These conditions reflect the transition from project approval to active implementation.

7.3 Learning and Adaptive Management

Learning and adaptive management are recognized as essential elements of effective project implementation, particularly in complex and multi-component resilience projects such as IFRAP. At baseline:

- learning mechanisms are not yet systematically embedded within project management processes;
- use of monitoring data for adaptive decision-making is expected to evolve during implementation; and

- structured feedback loops linking monitoring findings to management actions have not yet been formalized.

The baseline therefore establishes the **absence of institutionalized learning mechanisms** specific to IFRAP at project start.

7.4 Baseline Summary

In summary, baseline conditions for monitoring, evaluation, and learning under Component-IV are defined by:

- an approved results framework providing the conceptual basis for monitoring;
- non-operational or partially established data management and reporting systems at project start; and
- absence of formalized learning and adaptive management mechanisms.

These baseline conditions provide the reference point for assessing progress in strengthening MEL systems and processes under Component-IV during project implementation.

8. DISCUSSION IN RELATION TO THE RESULTS-BASED MONITORING FRAMEWORK (COMPONENT-IV)

This section discusses the baseline conditions established for Component-IV in relation to the Revised Results-Based Monitoring Framework (RBMF) of IFRAP. Component-IV is an enabling component and, as such, is not directly associated with Project Development Objective (PDO) indicators. Instead, its contribution is reflected through a set of Intermediate Results Indicators (IRIs) that capture the establishment of planning, engagement, and coordination instruments essential for effective project implementation.

The baseline discussion focuses on defining reference conditions for these IRIs at the commencement of the project and clarifying the role of Component-IV in enabling progress across IFRAP.

8.1 Relationship between Component-IV and PDO Indicators

Component-IV does not directly own or report against PDO-level indicators. Its role is to enable and support the achievement of PDOs through strengthened governance, planning, citizen engagement, and monitoring systems. Improvements in these areas facilitate effective implementation of investment components and contribute indirectly to resilience outcomes measured at the project level.

Accordingly, the baseline for Component-IV does not establish values for PDO indicators, nor does it attempt to attribute population-level outcomes to Component-IV activities.

8.2 Alignment with Intermediate Results Indicator IRI-2

IRI-2: Community Flood Resilience Plans Prepared

IRI-2 measures the preparation of community flood resilience plans that include key interventions to improve flood resilience at the community level and are developed through consultation with communities.

Baseline Reference Condition

At baseline, no community flood resilience plans have been prepared under IFRAP. While community-level planning activities may exist in other programs or projects, there is no standardized framework, guidance, or coordinated process under IFRAP for the preparation of such plans at project start.

Role of Component-IV

Under Component-IV, the role related to IRI-2 is to facilitate and standardize the planning process by:

- supporting the development of planning frameworks and consultation protocols;
- ensuring alignment with project objectives and safeguards; and
- coordinating inputs across components and implementing entities.

Baseline conditions therefore establish a reference value of zero plans prepared under IFRAP, against which progress will be measured during implementation.

8.3 Alignment with Intermediate Results Indicator IRI-4

IRI-4: River Basin Planning Studies Developed

IRI-4 tracks the development of river basin planning studies to inform flood resilience interventions.

Baseline Reference Condition

At project commencement, no river basin planning studies financed under IFRAP have been completed or are operational. Existing studies, where available, are not aligned with IFRAP's specific geographic focus, analytical requirements, or implementation needs.

Role of Component-IV

Component-IV supports IRI-4 through the provision of technical assistance and oversight for the preparation of river basin planning studies. These studies are intended to inform strategic decision-making across components rather than serve as stand-alone outputs.

The baseline condition for IRI-4 is therefore defined as no IFRAP-supported studies developed, providing a clear reference point for subsequent progress.

8.4 Alignment with Intermediate Results Indicator IRI-6

IRI-6: Citizens' Engagement Strategy Developed and Rolled Out

IRI-6 measures the development and rollout of a citizens' engagement strategy under IFRAP.

Baseline Reference Condition

At baseline, no IFRAP-specific citizens' engagement strategy has been developed or rolled out. Engagement practices are fragmented and vary across components and implementing entities, without a unified project-wide framework.

Role of Component-IV

Component-IV is responsible for the development and rollout of a structured citizens' engagement strategy, including mechanisms for consultation, feedback, inclusion, and accountability. The baseline condition for IRI-6 is therefore defined as "**not developed**", establishing the reference against which implementation progress will be tracked.

8.5 Baseline Contribution of Component-IV to Project Results

While Component-IV does not directly deliver physical outputs or services, the baseline conditions documented for IRI-2, IRI-4, and IRI-6 highlight the importance of enabling systems at project start. By establishing governance, planning, engagement, and monitoring frameworks, Component-IV provides the institutional foundation necessary for other components to achieve their intended outcomes.

The baseline therefore confirms that Component-IV's contribution to IFRAP is enabling and catalytic, with measurable progress captured through Intermediate Results Indicators rather than PDO-level targets.

8.6 Summary

In summary, the Component-IV baseline establishes that:

- Component-IV does not directly report against PDO indicators;
- baseline values for IRI-2, IRI-4, and IRI-6 are defined by the absence of IFRAP-specific plans, studies, and strategies at project start; and

- progress under Component-IV will be measured through the development and rollout of enabling instruments that support effective implementation across IFRAP.

These baseline reference conditions provide a clear and defensible foundation for results-based monitoring of Component-IV throughout the project lifecycle.