

Project Performance Report

Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	3/22/2025 - 3/21/2026
Project Title	Talent Retention for Rural Transformation - Adapt (TRTP-Adapt)
Project Summary	
Database Number	AF00000186
Implementing Entity (IE)	International Fund Agricultural Dev
Type of IE	Multilateral Implementing Entity
Country(ies)	Moldova
Relevant Geographic Points (i.e. cities, villages, bodies of water)	The project has a national coverage and is implemented in the areas controlled by the Government of Moldova (GoM) except the entities registered in Chisinau and Balti
Name of Implementing Entity Focal Point	Khafiz Atymtay

Project Milestones

AFB Approval Date	10/11/2019
IE-AFB Agreement Signature Date	5/6/2020
Start of Project/Programme	3/22/2021
Actual Mid-term Review Date (if applicable)	1/20/2025
Original Completion Date	3/22/2026
Revised Completion Date after approval of extension request (if applicable)	3/21/2027

Were there any approval condition for this Project?

No

List each approval condition, if any, and report on the status of meeting them

Category of condition	
Condition or Requirement	
Current Status	
Planned actions, including a detailed time schedule	

List (only) inception report/ extension request(s)/ MTR that have been prepared for the project and provide date(s) of submission for each

The Inception report was submitted to the AF on 20 May 2021. The MTR report was submitted on 3 April 2025. The restructuring proposal including an extension request to move the completion date to 21 March 2027 was submitted on 11 February 2025 and was approved by the AF on 3 July 2025.

List the Website address (URL) of project

Project Contacts

National/Regional Project Manager/Coordinator	Name	Email	Date
Implementing Entity	Liam Chicca	l.chicca@ifad.org	5/1/2026
Government(s) DA	Sergiu Gherciu	sergiu.gherciu@maia.gov.md	5/1/2026
Executing Agency	Iurie Usurelu	iurie.usurelu@ucipifad.md	5/1/2026

Financial Data

Disbursement of AF grant funds

Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date (\$)	\$4,826,689.00
Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date (\$)	\$4,450,145.00
Project disbursement rate (%)	38.58
Project execution rate (%)	80.37
Add any comments on AF Grant Funds	The cumulative disbursement reported in the PPR includes both actual expenditures incurred to date and advances transferred for upcoming and ongoing project activities, in line with the project's financial management and accounting arrangements. As a result, the disbursement rate is higher than the execution rate, since a portion of the disbursed funds had not yet been fully spent and recorded as eligible expenditure by the reporting cut-off date. The execution rate reflects only actual payments made for incurred expenditures and supported by the required documentation as of the reporting date. The difference between the two rates is mainly due to the timing gap between the transfer of funds and the actual execution of activities, including procurement, contract implementation, delivery of goods and services, verification of outputs, and processing of final payments. Importantly, most of the planned contracts have already been signed, while the remaining procurement processes are ongoing, as also reflected in the work plan and budget for the next reporting period. Therefore, the current difference between disbursement and execution should be understood primarily as a matter of timing rather than a lack of implementation progress. The project expects the gap to narrow during the next reporting period as ongoing contracts are completed, goods and services are delivered, and the corresponding expenditures are documented and recorded.
Investment Income (\$)	\$0.00
Cumulative Investment Income since inception (\$)	\$0.00

Expenditure Data

Output	Amount (\$)
Output 1.1.1 Training expert recruited to design (Climate adaptive) ToT programme and to train trainers.	\$0.00
Output 1.1.2 As part of the Service Provider ToRs 131,454.300 demo plots will be identified and set up with 31,454.30 USD 7,500 grants based on specific criteria.	\$16,273.00
Output 1.1.3 Beneficiaries trained in groups of around 20 on climate resilient techniques and approaches to adapt weather extremes and water efficient irrigation	\$38,054.00
Output 1.2.1 Professionals trained in gender awareness, CA, and CA technical and service provision to smallholder farmers.	\$44,900.00
Output 1.3.1. Knowledge management and climate change awareness raising system established and implemented	\$29,784.28
Output 2.1.1. Annual mobilisation campaign delivered and beneficiaries supported in making grant applications	\$9,710.00
Output 2.2.1. Improved smallholder access to water from rivers and rainwater reservoirs (construction of canals linked to pumping stations on rivers and natural reservoirs or to larger functional secondary pipelines and supply systems and investment in micro- and small-irrigation pumping stations or water harvesting ponds and tertiary canal and pipeline distribution network).	\$1,517,216.66
Output 2.3.1 Households to receive climate smart irrigation and support for pro-poor escrow account banking fees	\$421,545.34
Output 2.3.2. Climate adaptive techniques implemented	\$0.00
Output 3.1.1 National overview of CA adoption to inform policy and the development of a national CA curriculum (recruiting of team of experts and enumerators conducting nationwide survey, producing report of findings and White Paper on recommendations for CA in Moldova)	\$0.00
Output 3.1.2 National Convention on CA	\$0.00
Output 3.1.3 Conservation Agriculture mainstreamed into the national higher-level educational system (translating and printing of textbooks and journals on CA); Two one-year gender-balanced scholarships to study a Masters in Conservation Agriculture	\$8,983.00
Output 3.2.1 Research institute supported with CA machinery for demo plots. These will be subject to proposals and technical review by the CPIU but could include 6-row no-till drill and CA seeder. The research institute will be supported in the demo plots for 5 years, the running costs of which co-financed by the institute that will also be open to University students to use for research purposes. The research institute will be supported with research grants over the course of the 5 years that will also give university students practical exposure to CA. Soil testing capacity is supported for 5 years (equipment and chemicals)	\$129,722.00
IE fee (\$)	\$94,136.00
Execution cost (\$)	\$62,908.76

Planned Expenditure Schedule

Output	Projected Cost (\$)	Estimated Completion Date
Output 1.1.1 Training expert recruited to design (Climate adaptive) ToT programme and to train trainers.	\$0.00	3/21/2027
Output 1.1.2 As part of the Service Provider ToRs 10 demo plots will be identified and set up with USD 7,500 grants based on specific criteria.	\$9,400.00	12/31/2026
Output 1.1.3 Beneficiaries trained in groups of around 20 on climate resilient techniques and approaches to adapt weather extremes and water efficient irrigation	\$19,720.00	12/31/2026

Output 1.2.1 Professionals trained in gender awareness, CA, and CA technical and service provision to smallholder farmers.	\$0.00	3/21/2027
Output 1.3.1. Knowledge management and climate change awareness raising system established and implemented	\$14,350.00	3/21/2027
Output 2.1.1. Annual mobilisation campaign delivered and beneficiaries supported in making grant applications	\$16,940.00	12/31/2026
Output 2.2.1. Improved smallholder access to water from rivers and rainwater reservoirs (construction of canals linked to pumping stations on rivers and natural reservoirs or to larger functional secondary pipelines and supply systems and investment in micro- and small-irrigation pumping stations or water harvesting ponds and tertiary canal and pipeline distribution network).	\$188,783.34	3/21/2027
Output 2.3.1 Households to receive climate smart irrigation and support for pro-poor escrow account banking fees	\$315,000.00	12/31/2026
Output 2.3.2. Climate adaptive techniques implemented	\$1,596,460.00	3/21/2027
Output 3.1.1 National overview of CA adoption to inform policy and the development of a national CA curriculum (recruiting of team of experts and enumerators conducting nationwide survey, producing report of findings and White Paper on recommendations for CA in Moldova)	\$0.00	3/21/2027
Output 3.1.2 National Convention on CA	\$0.00	3/21/2027
Output 3.1.3 Conservation Agriculture mainstreamed into the national higher-level educational system (translating and printing of textbooks and journals on CA); Two one-year gender-balanced scholarships to study a Masters in Conservation Agriculture	\$58,860.00	8/31/2026
Output 3.2.1 Research institute supported with CA machinery for demo plots. These will be subject to proposals and technical review by the CPIU but could include 6-row no-till drill and CA seeder. The research institute will be supported in the demo plots for 5 years, the running costs of which co-financed by the institute that will also be open to University students to use for research purposes. The research institute will be supported with research grants over the course of the 5 years that will also give university students practical exposure to CA. Soil testing capacity is supported for 5 years (equipment and chemicals)	\$150,334.00	12/31/2026
IE fee (\$)	\$0.00	
Execution cost (\$)	\$61,000.00	

Actual co-financing (if the MTR or TE have not been undertaken this reporting period, do not report on actual co-financing)	
Does this Project have Co-Financing ?	No
How much of the total co-financing as committed in the Project Document has actually been realized? (\$)	\$0.00
Estimated cumulative actual co-financing as verified during Mid-term Review (MTR) or Terminal Evaluation (TE). (\$)	\$0.00
Add any comments on actual co-financing in particular any issues related to the realization of in-kind, grant, credits, loans, equity, non-grant instruments and other types of co-financing.	

Risk Assessment

Identified Risks

List all Risks identified in project preparation phase and what steps are being taken to mitigate them

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
Insufficient capacities to appropriately manage the day-today implementation of the project	Low	It was decided that IFAD will participate as an observer in all stages of the recruitment process and the staff of the CPIU will be linked to the project by renewable annual contracts based on a performance evaluation. IFAD is also engaged in regular Implementation Support Missions, supporting the project in activity planning and implementation.
Climatic shock: the main effect of climate change on weather patterns is the increased occurrence of extreme weather events: droughts and flooding in particular. These climatic shocks can have a direct impact on crop production	Moderate	The activities that are implemented by the service provider contracted by CPIU include the measures meant to prepare the farmers to face the climatic shocks, e.g. trainings of farmers (the farmers will be trained to use irrigation equipment and act in case of flood); helping farmers to apply for AF grants for demo plots and irrigation equipment; knowledge sharing and dissemination of best practices related to climate resilience;
Low interest and capacity of smallholder to adopt new climate smart approaches and technologies.	Not Applicable	The risk is no more relevant as the EE, with the help of contracted service providers, managed, via mobilization campaign and numerous training sessions, to raise farmers' interest for new climate smart technologies.
Water is a scarce resource the use of which is heavily regulated. There is a risk that the institutional process of requesting and issuing permits is long and laborious leading to delays in project implementation.	Not Applicable	The Commission for Exceptional Situations modified, in August 2022, the list of documents required to obtain the environmental authorization for the special use of water for the purpose of irrigating agricultural land from reservoirs or ponds. Thus, land owners will not have to present a whole series of documents, but will be limited to some information about the land that will be irrigated and about the reservoir. The period of obtaining the water permit is also reduced from 30 to 20 days. The process is mainstreamed via a "one stop shop" managed by the Environmental Agency, but also involves implication of the Agency for technical Supervision, National Agency for Public Health, Agency "Apele Moldove" (Moldovan Waters) and National Inspectorate for Environmental Protection. These changes there were pushed by the Ministry of Agriculture to which the executing Entity is subordinated. Therefore, now this risk is no more relevant.

Critical Risks Affecting Progress (Not identified at project design)

Are there any critical risks with a 50% or > likelihood of affecting progress of project? No

Identify Risks with a 50% or > likelihood of affecting progress of project

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
-----------------	----------------	------------------------------

Risk Measures

Were there any risk mitigation measures employed during the current reporting period? If so, were risks reduced? If not, why were these risks not reduced?

No measures were needed during the reported period.

ESP Compliance

Section 1: Identified ESP Risk Management

Was the ESP risks identification complete at the time of funding approval? Yes

1.Compliance with the law

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? No

During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)

List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)

List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.

List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.

State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator

Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period

Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)

Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken

2.Access and equity

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal? No

During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)

List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)

List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.

List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.

State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
3.Marginalized and vulnerable Groups	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
4.Human rights	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring	

indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
5. Gender equality and women's empowerment	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
6. Core labour rights	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	

Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
7.Indigenous people	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
8.Involuntary resettlement	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been	

implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
9. Protection of natural habitats	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Low risk. The project is highly unlikely to pose a risk to critical natural habitats. The legislation in force and the governmental controlling agencies do not permit implementing of infrastructure projects that have negative impact on natural habitats.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	For the reporting period: - During the phase of feasibility study each infrastructure project is screened vis-a-vis the environmental protection requirements according to the local legislation. Each particular related risk is identified, assessed and risk mitigation plan is proposed. The infrastructure project's GPS coordinates are indicated in the proposal in order to ensure that the project is not implemented in protected areas. The project has developed an online georeferenced platform with all types of protected areas to avoid presence of project activities in these areas. Ongoing: - Should proposals be received within or near identified protected areas they will need to include: i. an analysis on the nature and the extent of the impact including direct, indirect, cumulative, or secondary impacts; the severity or significance of the impact; and a demonstration that the impact is consistent with management plans and affected area custodians. ii. Describe the location of the critical habitat in relation to the project and why it cannot be avoided, as well as its characteristics and critical value. - The screening panel should assess whether ESP compliance and proposed mitigations measures are sufficient.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1- Number of geo-referenced locations of project activities mapped against natural habitats 2- Reviewing the screening checklist for grants against the map of natural habitats (national cadastre of protected areas)
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Baseline is 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	During the reporting period, the project applied site-level screening for proposed investment locations, including infrastructure, irrigation and other AF-financed activities, to avoid adverse impacts on

	natural habitats and protected areas. As part of this process, the Executing Entity developed and used a GIS-based georeferenced screening platform showing protected natural areas, sensitive habitats and archaeological/cultural heritage sites. The GPS coordinates of proposed investment sites were checked against this platform before approval and implementation. Where a proposed activity could potentially affect a sensitive area, the project applies additional review steps, including verification against national environmental protection requirements, review of the screening checklist, and, where required, environmental permitting or additional technical assessment. This allows the project to exclude activities that would overlap with protected areas or other sensitive sites, or to define additional mitigation measures before implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No significant residual impacts on natural habitats were identified during the reporting period. Based on the GIS-based georeferenced screening of project activity locations, none of the screened and approved activities were found to be located within or close to protected natural areas, sensitive natural habitats, or other environmentally sensitive sites. The activity locations were also reviewed against the applicable national environmental protection requirements. Therefore, residual impacts on natural habitats are assessed as not significant after application of the screening and avoidance measures.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	None
10.Conservation of biological diversity	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Low risk. The ongoing mobilization campaigns will allow to make a definitive assessment, by identifying specific areas of implementation.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	For the reporting period: - During the phase of feasibility study each infrastructure project is screened vis-a-vis the environmental protection requirements according to the local legislation. Each particular related risk is identified, assessed and risk mitigation plan is proposed. The infrastructure project's GPS coordinates are indicated in the proposal in order to ensure that the project is not implemented in protected areas. The project has developed an online georeferenced platform with all types of protected areas to avoid presence of project activities in these areas. Ongoing: - Assessment of

	whether proposed activities are within areas identified as containing threatened flora and fauna species integrated in the proposal selection process. - Screen and assess whether project activities are a potential threat to threatened species. - Should threatened flora and fauna be identified in proposals, carry out the following: i. Describe the elements of known biological diversity importance in the project area, using any relevant sources of information, such as protection status, status on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species and other inventories, recognition as a UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Programme reserve, Ramsar site. ii. Describe why the biological diversity cannot be avoided and what measures will be taken to minimize impacts. - The screening panel should assess whether the proposed mitigation measures are sufficient.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1- Number of geo-referenced locations of project activities mapped against the national hotspots for threatened flora and fauna 2- Reviewing the screening checklist for grants and include the map of national threatened flora and fauna (national cadastre of protected areas)
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Baseline is 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	During the reporting period, the project applied biodiversity-related screening for proposed investment locations, including infrastructure, irrigation and other AF-financed activities. The Executing Entity used the GIS-based georeferenced screening platform developed by the project team to check proposed activity sites against available spatial information on protected areas, sensitive ecosystems, biodiversity hotspots, and areas of potential relevance for threatened flora and fauna. The GPS coordinates of proposed investment sites were reviewed before approval and implementation. Where potential biodiversity risks could arise, the project applies additional review steps, including verification against national environmental requirements, review of the screening checklist, consultation with relevant authorities where required, and additional technical or environmental assessment. This screening process is intended to avoid activities that could negatively affect important biodiversity areas, threatened species or sensitive ecosystems, or to require additional mitigation measures before implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No significant residual impacts on biological diversity were identified during the reporting period. Based on the GIS-based georeferenced screening of project activity locations and the review against applicable national environmental requirements, none of the screened and approved activities were found to be located within or close to areas of known

	importance for threatened flora and fauna, biodiversity hotspots, or other sensitive ecosystems. Therefore, residual impacts on biological diversity are assessed as not significant after application of the screening and avoidance measures.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	None
11.Climate change	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
12.Pollution prevention and resource efficiency	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Possible risk for outcome 2.2: - There is a risk that project activities will add extraction pressures on a limited resource. - There is a risk that water used as a result of the outcome 2.2 tertiary canals (through the TRTP programme) from rivers or rain water reservoirs is not used efficiently.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	For the upcoming reporting period: - In order to ensure that project activities will not add extraction pressure on a limited resource, the officer in charge of environmental safeguards within the CPIU will assess whether the proposed water permit framework in the project proposal is still relevant. - Based on the

	revised guidelines screen grant proposals to ensure that they have the required water permits to ensure grant approval. In order to ensure that water is used efficiently, the project has put in place provisions to access the off-farm irrigation (under outcome 2.2) only with efficient water irrigation technologies.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1- Number of proposals received, duly completed, and with valid water permit 2- The screening checklist for grants include provisions related to the water permits 3 - Number of site verification visits for off-farm applications
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Baseline is 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	During the reporting period, the project applied safeguard measures related to pollution prevention and resource efficiency mainly through the screening and implementation of irrigation infrastructure, on-farm irrigation grants, demonstration plots and climate-adaptive equipment activities. For water-related investments, the CPIU applied water-use compliance checks, including verification of abstraction permits, consistency with river-basin constraints, and basic water-quality parameters. Relevant infrastructure and irrigation activities were also subject to national environmental review and permitting procedures before implementation. The supported irrigation schemes and on-farm irrigation grants promote more efficient water use through improved irrigation infrastructure, small-scale irrigation systems and demonstration plots showing climate-adaptive and water-saving practices. During field visits, IFAD observed that implemented irrigation schemes were contributing to improved water-use efficiency, and no major negative environmental impacts were identified. For civil works, contractors applied good engineering and safe site-management practices to reduce risks related to construction waste, dust, soil disturbance, runoff and localized pollution. For the climate-adaptive equipment grants, the project applies standardized eligible packages, including greenhouses, plastic mulching kits and electric row cultivators. These are intended to support more efficient use of water, soil and farm inputs. The project will continue to reflect good agricultural practices in grant implementation, including responsible water use, fertilizer and pesticide management, waste and plastic handling, and the identification of any higher-risk cases for CPIU review.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No significant residual impacts related to pollution prevention and resource efficiency were identified during the reporting period. Water-related investments were screened against water-use requirements, including abstraction permits and river-

	basin constraints, and field observations did not identify major negative environmental impacts. The supported irrigation investments are expected to improve water-use efficiency and reduce uncontrolled runoff and erosion when operated in line with the approved technical designs and safeguard requirements. Potential residual risks remain limited and relate mainly to the need for continued good operation and maintenance of irrigation systems, responsible use of water, fertilizers and pesticides, and proper handling of plastic mulching materials and other farm-level waste. These risks are considered manageable through continued application of screening, permitting, site supervision, beneficiary guidance and monitoring by the CPIU and service providers and following the project ESMP.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	None
13.Public health	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
14.Physical and cultural heritage	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes

List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Low risk. At project design the project is not able to determine the project areas and conduct a full risk assessment.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	- Inclusion in public tenders that the GPS locations of project activities need to be provided and a mapping of project locations vis-à-vis protected areas. - The project has developed an online georeferenced platform with all types of cultural heritage areas to avoid presence of project activities in these areas. - Screening of proposals and grants for funding to ensure that project activities will not operate in or near protected cultural areas. - Should proposals be received within or near identified cultural areas proposals for screening and review will need to include: i. Provide an inventory of the physical and cultural heritage present in the wider project area that enjoys recognition at community, national, or international levels. Describe the cultural heritage, the location and the results of a risk assessment analyzing the potential for impacting the cultural heritage; and ii. Describe the measures to be taken to ensure that cultural heritage is not impacted, and if it is being accessed by communities, how this access will continue. - The screening panel should assess whether mitigation measures are sufficient.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Not relevant as there is a regulatory mechanism at the state level
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Baseline is 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	CPIU analyzed the existing regulatory framework concerning the possible impact on physical and cultural heritage and came to the following conclusions: The existing process of reviewing the grant application includes a obligatory presentation by the applicant of Authorization for Constructions. In case the construction site can affect physical or cultural heritage (if confirmed by Chief Architect) this Authorization can be issued only after coordination of the construction works with National Archaeological Agency (in case of archaeological sites) or National Council of Historic Monuments (in case of monuments). Therefore, no additional implication of the Executing Agency is needed. Additionally, during the reporting period, the project applied site-level screening to ensure that proposed infrastructure, irrigation and other AF-financed activities do not adversely affect physical or cultural heritage sites. The Executing Entity used the GIS-based georeferenced screening platform developed by the project team, which includes spatial information on archaeological and cultural heritage sites, to check the GPS coordinates of proposed investment locations before approval and implementation.

Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No significant residual impacts on physical or cultural heritage were identified during the reporting period. Based on the GIS-based georeferenced screening of project activity locations, none of the screened and approved activities were found to be located within or close to known archaeological sites, cultural heritage sites, or other areas of physical cultural significance. The activity locations were also subject to the applicable national authorization and clearance procedures. Therefore, residual impacts on physical and cultural heritage are assessed as not significant after application of the screening, avoidance and national clearance measures.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	None
15.Lands and soil conservation	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	

Section 2: Monitoring for unanticipated impacts / corrective actions required

Has monitoring for unanticipated ESP risks been carried out?	Yes
Have unanticipated ESP risks been identified during the reporting period?	No
If unanticipated ESP risks have been identified, describe the safeguard measures that have been taken in response and how an ESMP has been prepared/updated	

Section 3: Categorisation

Is the categorisation according to ESP standards still relevant?	Yes
If No, please describe the changes made at activity, output or outcome level, approved by the Board, that resulted in this change of categorization.	

Section 4: Implementation arrangements

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	During the reporting period, IFAD, as the Implementing Entity, ensured safeguard oversight through one implementation support mission in May 2025 and one supervision mission in November–December 2025. Both missions reviewed the application of environmental and social safeguard measures under the project, including field visits to AF-financed activities such as infrastructure works, irrigation investments and grant-supported activities. IFAD provided implementation guidance to the CPIU on the application of the ESMP, screening requirements, monitoring of unidentified subprojects, and strengthening of safeguard procedures as implementation accelerated, including in relation to revised AF implementation modalities.
Have the implementation arrangements been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	The CPIU under MAFI, as the Executing Entity, is responsible for the day-to-day implementation of safeguard measures. During the reporting period, the CPIU applied the project ESMP, safeguard screening procedures integrated into the PIM, and the grievance redress mechanism. Relevant subprojects, especially infrastructure and irrigation investments, were subject to the applicable national environmental review and permitting requirements, including environmental clearances and water-related authorizations where required. In addition, the CPIU strengthened safeguard implementation through a GIS-based georeferenced screening platform developed by the project team. This system is used to screen proposed project sites against environmentally and socially sensitive areas, including protected areas and cultural heritage sites, in order to avoid overlap with restricted or high-risk locations and identify where additional review or mitigation may be needed. The CPIU also mapped and georeferenced AF-financed sites and unidentified subprojects to support cumulative risk screening and monitoring.
Have the implementation arrangements at the EEs been effective during the reporting period?	Yes

Section 5: Projects/programmes with unidentified sub-projects (USPs). This section needs to be completed only if the project/proramme includes USPs.

Have the arrangements for the process described in the ESMP for ESP compliance for USPs been put in	
---	--

place?	
Is the required capacity for ESMP implementation present and effective with the IE and the EE(s)? Please provide details.	
Have all roles and responsibilities adequately been assigned and positions filled?	
Has the overall ESMP been updated with the findings of the USPs that have been identified in this reporting period?	

Identified USPs in the reporting period	Application of ESMP to the USP	ESP risks identified for the USP	Has an impact assessment been carried out?	Consultation held for risks and impacts identification for USP	Gender disaggregation to identify risks and impacts	Safeguard measures identified for the USP	Monitoring indicator(s) for each impact
---	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	--	--	---	---	---

Section 6: Grievances

Was a grievance mechanism established capable and known to stakeholders to accept grievances and complaints related to environmental and social risks and impacts?	Yes
Were grievances received during the reporting period?	No

List all grievances received during the reporting period regarding environmental and social impacts; gender related matters; or any other matter of project/programme activities	For each grievance, provide information on the grievance redress process	Provide the status/outcome
--	--	----------------------------

Comments

GP Compliance

Section 1: Quality at entry

Was an initial gender assessment conducted during the preparation of the project/programme's first submission as a full proposal? Yes

Does the results framework include gender-responsive indicators broken down at the different levels (objective, outcome, output)? Yes

List the gender-responsive elements that were incorporated in the project/programme results framework

Gender-responsive element	Level	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Rated result for the reporting period
Strengthen the agro-ecological	Objective	No. of smallholder	0	1,500 households (3,450 people,	Good

and social resilience to climate change in the climate vulnerable areas of Moldova, by enhancing water availability, water use efficiency, and promoting adaptive agriculture production systems and technologies for improved livelihoods and food security of rural households;		households benefiting from climate resilient improvements by the end of TRTP-Adapt project No. of people with improved awareness about the impacts of climate change and basic measure that can be taken to adapt.		40% - 1380 women) will benefit from climate resilient improvements. 13,000 households (29,900 people, 40% - ' 11,960 women) will receive improved climate change awareness	
Beneficiaries trained in groups of around 20 on climate resilient techniques and approaches to adapt to weather extremes and water efficient irrigation.	Output	No. of beneficiaries trained by the end of TRTP-Adapt project	0	At least 880 beneficiaries (40% - 352 women) trained on on-farm irrigation techniques Around 2,120 farmers (40% - 848 women 50% - 1,060 youth) trained on climate resilient techniques.	Good
Professionals trained in gender awareness, CA, and CA technical and service provision to smallholder farmers.	Output	No. of professionals trained by the end of TRTP-Adapt project	0	Around 40 professionals including recent university graduates and experienced professionals trained as service providers. (40% - 16 women)	Good
Knowledge management and climate change awareness raising system established and implemented.	Output	Knowledge products produced and disseminated by the end of TRTP-Adapt project	0	Around 10,000 people (40% - 4,000 women) will receive improved climate change awareness through video clips broadcast on the AgroTV channel as well	Good

				as social media (Facebook, Instagram and YouTube). Other outputs include radio programmes and the printed media including posters and leaflets.	
Annual mobilization campaign delivered and beneficiaries supported in making grant applications	Output	No. of smallholders receiving information about the project by the end of TRTP-Adapt project	0	At least 3,000 households (6,900 people, 40% - 1200 women) will benefit from climate resilient improvements	Good
Improved smallholder access to water from rivers and rainwater reservoirs.	Output	No. of beneficiaries benefiting from improved access to water by the end of TRTP-Adapt project	0	Around 150 smallholders (40% -60 women) benefit from water access.	Satisfactory
Households to received climate smart irrigation and support for banking fees for pro-poor escrow account	Output	No. of farmers benefiting from irrigation support and escrow accounts by the end of TRTP-Adapt project	0	At least 135 households (40% -54 women) will benefit from technology that reduces irrigation water consumption, reduces production costs and increases yields and product quality. Up to 135 farmers (40% - 54 women) benefited from escrow account.	Good
Climate adaptive techniques implemented	Output	No. of climate vulnerable smallholders supported to implement climate adaptive training by the end of TRTP-Adapt project	0	Around 1,213 farmers (40% - 485 women) will receive demand-driven equipment to help farms apply training in adapting to increased drought and flooding.	Satisfactory

Conservation Agriculture mainstreamed into the national higher-level educational system.	Output	Number of scholarships supported by the end of TRTP-Adapt project	0	One male and one female beneficiaries supported with scholarships	Satisfactory
Beneficiary applications screened by CPIU for compliance to criteria.	Output	No. of applications received that have successfully been granted water permits.	0	At least 135 smallholders (40% - 54 women 50% - 67 youth) successfully applied for water-efficient irrigation	Good

Section 2: Quality during implementation and at exit

List gender equality and women's empowerment issues encountered during implementation of the project/programme. For each gender equality and women's empowerment issue describe the progress that was made as well as the results.

Gender equality and women's empowerment issues	Rated result for the reporting period	Provide justification of the rating provided
Not applicable (according to the guidance document , this section needs to be completed just in the final PPR)		

Section 3: Implementation arrangements

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP	The IFAD funded TRTP promotes gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) through improving the adaptive capacity of women smallholders and agribusinesses; and offering equal financial opportunities and opportunities to improve productivity, competitiveness and resilience for women and men. TRTP has been designed as a gender transformative and youth sensitive project (40% integration). Since November 2023, the CPIU has a Gender and Social Inclusion Expert overseeing both TRTP and TRTP-Adapt.
Have the implementation arrangements at the IE been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP?	During the reporting period efforts have been focused on the outreach campaigns, with the objective to actively stimulate the business appetite of women and youth. In order to encourage youth and women to start a business. Thus, during the reporting period, 8 events were organized with the participation of 579 people, including: - Roundtable discussions and informational seminars with 249 participants, of which 141 (57%) are women and 120 (49%) are young people; - Career fairs with 510 participants, for which there is no detailed data on gender and age

Have the implementation arrangements at the EE(s) been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
Have any capacity gaps affecting GP compliance been identified during the reporting period and if so, what remediation was implemented?	No

Section 4: Grievances

Was a grievance mechanism established capable and known to stakeholders to accept grievances and complaints related to gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes
Were grievances received during the reporting period?	No

List all grievances received through the grievance mechanism during the reporting period regarding gender-related matters of project/programme activities [6]	For each grievance, provide information on the grievance redress process used	Provide the status/outcome
---	---	----------------------------

Comments

The share of women participating in the trainings dedicated to on-farm irrigation techniques and climate adaptive agriculture increased from 28% to 62% trained in the current reporting period due to implementation of an extensive training campaign dedicated to climate adaptive agriculture focused of women and youth. The cumulative share of woman that benefited from the grants on-farm irrigation equipment rose from 27% in the previous reporting period to 32% by the end of reporting period

Rating

Implementing Entity

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Comments	Rating
Outcome 1.1 Climate resilient training programme established.	Outcome 1	Farmers are trained on efficient irrigation and climate adaptive agricultural techniques.10 Demo plots are established.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
Outcome 1.2 Conservation agriculture (CA) professional service provider capacity built with a focus on smallholders	Outcome 1	A contracted service provider (SP2) will develop and implement a training programme in CA for 40 professionals.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
Outcome 1.3 Knowledge management	Outcome 1	Three service providers are contracted and implement activities related to knowledge management.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
Outcome 2.1 Community	Outcome 2	The SP in charge of	Ontrack		Satisfactory

mobilisation undertaken with a focus on women and youth in the most climate-vulnerable areas		supporting the implementation of TRTP-Adapt interventions is involved in mobilization activity to raise awareness and generate interest in the project and ensure equal access to project activities for the most vulnerable.			
Outcome 2.2 Climate resilient off-farm access to water secured from tertiary canals from rivers and water harvesting ponds	Outcome 2	The applications for climate resilient off-farm access to water secured from tertiary canals from rivers and water harvesting ponds are received, the feasibility studies are developed and construction works started	Ontrack		Satisfactory
Outcome 2.3 Demand-driven and beneficiary co-financed on-farm water conservation management and climate adaptive techniques supported	Outcome 2	The applications for on-farm small irrigation grants are received and on-farms grants are disbursed. The applications for climate adaptive tools grants are received and the procurement of the tools started.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
Outcome 3.1: CA mainstreamed into the national higher-level educational system	Outcome 3	The SP developed CA curriculum and selected and translated CA manuals for universities and colleges. Students are supported with CA master program scholarship.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
Outcome 3.2 Research into CA supported with a focus on smallholders and women	Outcome 3	EE supports a research institute in CA-related research, demo sites, equipment and soil laboratory.	Delayed	While EE managed to support the research institute with the necessary CA machinery (No-Till seeder and Sprayer) and financed some research and knowledge sharing activity, the overall grant absorption and implementation	Marginally Satisfactory

				phase is slow.	
Please provide the Name and Contact information of the person(s) responsible for completing the Rating section					
Name			Email		
Khafiz Atymtay			k.atymtay@ifad.org		
Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.					
The project had a slow start due to needed preparatory work (i.e. implementation staff recruitment, development of ToRs for the selection of service providers, procurement process and the further need to replace one of the two main service providers, need to mid-term restructuring). However, in the reporting period all the activities significantly accelerated and there a good chances that most of the targets will be reached.					

Executing Entity / Project Coordinator					
Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating	
Outcome 1.1 Climate resilient training programme established.	Outcome 1	Farmers are trained on efficient irrigation and climate adaptive agricultural techniques.10 Demo plots are established.	Ontrack		Highly Satisfactory
Outcome 1.2 Conservation agriculture (CA) professional service provider capacity built with a focus on smallholders	Outcome 1	A contracted service provider (SP2) will develop and implement a training programme in CA for 40 professionals.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
Outcome 1.3 Knowledge management	Outcome 1	Three service providers are contracted and implement activities related to knowledge management.	Ontrack		Highly Satisfactory
Outcome 2.1 Community mobilisation undertaken with a focus on women and youth in the most climate-vulnerable areas	Outcome 2	The SP in charge of supporting the implementation of TRTP-Adapt interventions is involved in mobilization activity to raise awareness and generate interest in the project and ensure equal access to project activities for the most vulnerable.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
Outcome 2.2 Climate resilient off-farm access to water secured from tertiary canals from rivers and	Outcome 2	The applications for climate resilient off-farm access to water secured from tertiary	Ontrack		Satisfactory

water harvesting ponds		canals from rivers and water harvesting ponds are received, the feasibility studies are developed and construction works started			
Outcome 2.3 Demand-driven and beneficiary co-financed on-farm water conservation management and climate adaptive techniques supported	Outcome 2	The applications for on-farm small irrigation grants are received and on-farms grants are disbursed. The applications for climate adaptive tools grants are received and the procurement of the tools started.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
Outcome 3.1: CA mainstreamed into the national higher-level educational system	Outcome 3	The SP developed CA curriculum and selected and translated CA manuals for universities and colleges. Students are supported with CA master program scholarship.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
Outcome 3.2 Research into CA supported with a focus on smallholders and women	Outcome 3	EE supports a research institute in CA-related research, demo sites, equipment and soil laboratory.	Delayed	While EE managed to support the research institute with the necessary CA machinery (No-Till seeder and Sprayer) and financed some research and knowledge sharing activity, the overall grant absorption and implementation phase is slow.	Marginally Unsatisfactory

Please provide the Name and Contact information of the person(s) responsible for completing the Rating section

Name	Email	Institution
Alexandru Belschi	alexandru.belschi@ucipifad.md	Senior Climate Change Resilience Consultant at IFAD Consolidated Programme Implementation Unit

Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.

The project had a slow start due to needed preparatory work (i.e. implementation staff recruitment, development of ToRs for the selection of service providers, procurement process and the further need to

replace one of the two main service providers, need to mid-term restructuring). However, in the reporting period all the activities significantly accelerated and there a good chances that most of the targets will be reached.

Other

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
-----------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------	------------------	--------

Please provide the Name and Contact information of the person(s) responsible for completing the Rating section

Name	Email
------	-------

Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.

Overall Rating

Overall rating

Satisfactory

Please justify your rating. Outline the positive and negative progress made by the project since it started. Provide specific recommendations for next steps.

The project's overall implementation progress is rated Satisfactory. During the reporting period, the project started to show visible progress across all components, following the approved restructuring of 3 July 2025, which helped unlock several previously delayed activities and address key implementation bottlenecks. Positive progress includes the acceleration of training for vulnerable farmers, increased interest from smallholder beneficiaries following the adjustment of grant conditions and ceilings, disbursement of grants for irrigation infrastructure and on-farm irrigation equipment, progress under Conservation Agriculture activities, and improved participation of youth and women. The restructuring also adjusted several project indicators that had been overestimated at design stage due to limited statistical information available at that time, making the achievement of project objectives more realistic. At the same time, some implementation risks remain, particularly the need to maintain the current pace of delivery and ensure that grant-funded activities are completed, monitored and documented in a timely manner. The project should continue close follow-up with beneficiaries, accelerate procurement and delivery of remaining equipment, ensure timely verification of grant results, and maintain strong monitoring of participation by vulnerable groups, women and youth. Continued IFAD support and proactive supervision will be important to sustain the recent acceleration, resolve any remaining bottlenecks, and ensure that the project remains on track toward achieving its revised targets.

Project Indicators

List of indicators

Type of Indicator (indicators towards Objectives, Outcomes, etc...)	Indicator	Baseline	Progress Since Inception	Target for Project End
---	-----------	----------	--------------------------	------------------------

Objectives	Ha of smallholder agricultural land made climate resilient	0	440 ha (demo plots & on-farm irrigation grants & beneficiaries of irrigation infrastructure)	7,500 ha of smallholder agricultural land that has benefitted from improved access to water, climate-smart irrigation systems and improved adaptive agricultural techniques
Objectives	No. of smallholder households benefiting from climate resilient improvements	0	132 households (11 demo plots grants & 99 on-farm irrigation grants and 22 beneficiaries of irrigation infrastructure),	1,500 households (3,450 people, 40% - 1380 women, 50% 1,725 youth) will benefit from climate resilient improvements
Objectives	No. of people with improved awareness about the impacts of climate change and basic measure that can be taken to adapt	0	Cca 45,000 of people from rural areas received information about the impact of climate change and basic measures to be implemented in this regard. the figures are mostly based on the mass media coverage used during the awareness and mobilization campaign, so the division by gender/age is not possible.	29,900 people (13,000 households), 40% - 11,960 women, 50% - 14,950 youths, will receive improved climate change awareness
Outputs	Training programme designed	0	3 training programs (on climate adaptive agricultural techniques, on efficient irrigation and on Conservation Agriculture) designed and implemented	Training programme designed and implemented
Outputs	No. of demo plots set up	0	11 demo plots were successfully set up	10 demo plots locations have been successfully identified, screened and implemented
Outputs	Number of beneficiaries trained	0	772 beneficiaries (26% women, 36% youth) were trained trained on on-farm irrigation techniques	At least 880 beneficiaries (40% - 352 women 50% - 440 youth) trained on on farm irrigation

				techniques
Outputs	Number of beneficiaries trained	0	3301 beneficiaries (71% women, 43% youth) were trained on climate resilient techniques	Around 2,120 farmers (40% - 848 women 50% - 1,060 youth) trained on climate resilient techniques
Outputs	Number of professionals trained	0	51 professionals including recent university graduates and experienced professionals trained as service providers (24% - 12 women)	Around 40 professionals including recent university graduates and experienced professionals trained as service providers (40% - 16 women)
Outputs	Knowledge products produced and disseminated	0	Developed manual on efficient irrigation and disseminated to cca 400 participants of on-farm irrigation trainings. Provided training on climate adaptive agriculture to 3301 farmers. From both these activities 62% of beneficiaries were women and 42% youth. Additionally to that, there is a significant audience (that is impossible to track) who received improved climate change awareness through video clips broadcast on the AgroTV channel as well as social media, radio programs and printed media.	Around 10,000 people (40% - 4,000 women, 50% 5,000 youth) will receive improved climate change awareness through video clips broadcast on the AgroTV channel as well as social media (Facebook, Instagram and YouTube). Other outputs include radio programmes and the printed media including posters and leaflets
Outputs	No. of knowledge generating studies / research produced.	0	3 studies produced (Conservation Agriculture Adoption in Moldova study; baseline survey; survey on water treatment equipment impact)	Baseline, studies on effectiveness of outcome 2.3 and impact assessment produced
Outputs	No. of smallholders receiving information about	0	Cca 45,000 of people from rural areas received	At least 6,900 people (3,000 households), 40% - 1200 women,

	the project		information about the impact of climate change and basic measures to be implemented in this regard. The figures are mostly based on the mass media coverage used during the awareness and mobilization campaign, so the division by gender/age is not possible.	50% 1500 youth, will benefit from climate resilient improvements
Outputs	No. of smallholders to receive on-farm water efficient irrigation technology	0	99 of on-farm equipment grants disbursed by the end of the reporting period (32% women, 35% youth)	At least 135 smallholders (40% - 54 women, 50% - 67 youth) will benefit from technology that reduces irrigation water consumption, reduces production costs and increases yields and product quality
Outputs	No. of farmers benefitting from escrow account	0	41 of grant recipients benefited from escrow accounts	Up to 135 farmers (40% – 54 women, 67% - 200 youth) benefitted from escrow account
Outputs	No. of climate vulnerable smallholders supported to implement climate adaptive training	0	By the end of the reporting period the lists of potential beneficiaries (vulnerable farmers) is prepared and the procurement of the equipment is about to launch.	Around 1,213 farmers (40% – 485 women, 50% 606 youth) will receive demand-driven equipment to help farms apply training in adapting to increased drought and flooding
Outputs	Ha with improved access to water	0	One irrigation infrastructure project is completed by the end of the reporting period with the total area of 60.6 hectares. Another 12 infrastructure projects are in the process of implementation at different stages	650 ha. of smallholder land has improved water access
Outputs	No. of beneficiaries	0	By the end of the	Around 150

	benefitting from improved access to water		reporting period 22 beneficiaries benefited from the improved access to water (32% - 7 women, 14% -3 youth)	smallholders (40% - 60 women, 50% 75 youth) benefit from water access
Outputs	A national CA survey conducted and White Paper produced	0	A national CA survey conducted and White Paper produced	A survey is conducted and a White Paper produced making recommendations for the future of CA in Moldova
Outputs	At least one convention on CA is held	0	One convention was held in April 2024	At least one convention is held and consensus reached on a national strategy for CA in Moldova
Outputs	A curriculum on CA is designed and textbooks and journals translated	0	CA curriculum for colleges, universities and master programs are design and now the supporting didactic materials are being developed	A higher-level educational curriculum is designed on CA including translating textbooks and research papers
Outputs	Scholarships supported	0	One grant scholarship was supported	One male and one female scholarships supported
Outputs	A research institute is supported in CA	0	The research instituted was supported in procurement of CA equipment and research activity.	Demo plots, equipment, soil laboratory provided Gender and smallholder-focused research is produced
Outputs	Beneficiary applications screened by CPIU for compliance to criteria.	0	99 of smallholders successfully applied for water-efficient irrigation (32% women, 35% youth)	At least 135 smallholders (40% - 54 women 50% - 67 youth) successfully applied for water-efficient irrigation

Comments

Lessons Learned

Implementation and Adaptive Management		
Describe any changes undertaken to improve results on the ground or any	Challenges & Opportunities	To improve uptake and match market prices, key parameters

changes made to project outputs (i.e. changes to project design)		were revised as follows: (i) on-farm irrigation grant ceiling increased from USD 2,500 to USD 7,500; target recalibrated from 400 to 135 beneficiaries; (ii) climate-resilient equipment grant increased from USD 260 to USD 1,000; target adjusted from 4,600 to 1,213 beneficiaries; (iii) land-size eligibility widened from ≤10 ha to ≤50 ha, while retaining priority scoring for ≤10 ha and for women/youth; and (iv) the off-farm command area indicator was right-sized from 2,000 ha to 650 ha to reflect costs and water-quality constraints.
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts?	Challenges & Opportunities	Yes, the environmental and social safeguard measures are in place and are effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts.
How have gender considerations been taken into consideration during the reporting period? What have been the lessons learned as a consequence of inclusion of such considerations on project performance or impacts? List lessons learned specific to gender, detailing measures and project/programme-specific indicators highlighting the role of women as key actors in climate change adaptation.	Opportunities	Women and/or youth managed farms have priority in ranking for disbursement of grants for small irrigation equipment. Also, the TRTP-project has a special financial product: loan with a portion of grant (not financed from the Adaptation Fund grants source) designed for agricultural enterprises led by youth and/or women. Also in 2025 a grant program for climate adaptive equipment was launched for vulnerable farmers, prioritizing youth and women (although by the end of the reporting period no grants were disbursed, the results of the preparatory work show a significant domination of women and youth among the farmers who enrolled in this program) As one of the lessons we can mention that the project started to promote its products (e.g. grants for efficient irrigation) focusing especially on women and youth. It doesn't mean that the older men smallholders were not accepted,

		but the main message was that this project is intended first of all for women and youth, trying to catch their attention. Also, the project benefited from synergies by collaborating and having common activities with women-focused organizations (like UN Women). Another important factor to highlight is that implementation under Output 2.3.1 was seriously delayed due to the initially inadequate grant ceiling of USD 260. Following the project restructuring, the ceiling was increased to USD 1,000, which enabled the project to launch a comprehensive training programme to prepare a sufficient number of beneficiaries who will subsequently apply for these grants, which ultimately became much more attractive and meaningful for them. The revised expected number of grant recipients is 1,213. This explains the significant intake of new beneficiaries, particularly from the most vulnerable categories. The project has already collected their requests for equipment to be provided under the grants and is planning delivery in 2026, which is expected to further accelerate disbursement.
Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays?	Opportunities	The project experienced numerous delays at the initial stage described in the previous PPR reports. However, because of the mitigation measures implemented in the previous periods, no major delays are observed in the reporting period.
What implementation issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected progress?	Opportunities	No new issues/ lessons since the previous report. The ones identified in the past were resolved by the project restructuring after the mid-term.

Has the project already reached mid term or project completion?(yes/no).

Yes

Climate Resilience Measures

What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing climate adaptation measures that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	On a positive note it's worth mentioning that the farmers' interest for the investments in infrastructure and equipment is growing, mainly because of the higher temperatures registered during the last years and the farmers understand that their chances to become successful more depend on irrigation, however, the project needs to be flexible to stay relevant in a changing country context.
What is the potential for the climate resilience measures undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	

Readiness Interventions (Applicable only to NIEs that received one or more readiness grants)

What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in accessing and implementing climate finance readiness support that would be relevant to the preparation, design and implementation of future concrete adaptation projects/programmes?	N/A
How have the outputs (such as manuals, guidelines, procedures or the experience from providing peer support, etc) from employing readiness grants been used to inform institutional capacity needs, gender issues, and environmental and social aspects in developing and implementing concrete projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	N/A

Concrete Adaptation Interventions

What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing concrete adaptation	(i) Water quality is often the binding constraint; many inner rivers/ponds fail irrigation targeting must prioritize suitable sources or managed reservoirs. (ii) Design capacity and off-farm works are higher than anticipated—early design support and right-sizing are essential. Original eligibility thresholds (≤ 10 ha; low grant ceilings) depressed demand; expanding
---	---

interventions that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes implementing concrete adaptation interventions?	and revising grants to market levels (USD 7,500 on-farm; USD 1,000 equipment) improve (iv) Training-to-grant conversion depends on confirmed access to irrigation-quality water. Simplified online application and reference-price lists reduce transaction costs for farmers.
What is the potential for the concrete adaptation interventions undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	Adopt a ≤50 ha land-size ceiling (aligned with farm structure), while keeping scoring per ≤10 ha, women and youth. Maintain grant caps that reflect market prices—USD 7,500 (on-farm irrigation) and USD 1,000 (climate-resilient equipment)—and keep the simplified online application + reference-price list to avoid multiple quotations. Risk-mitigation: transparent scoring and award lists; per-beneficiary caps; water-permit verification and ESP/IFAD SECAP screening to prevent over-abstraction and environmental harm; targeted outreach to women/youth to avoid exclusion.
Knowledge Management	
How has existing information/data/knowledge been used to inform project development and implementation? What kinds of information/data/knowledge were used?	The project developed a comprehensive practical guide for efficient irrigation and also video materials that are used during the seminars. Also the project developed video spots and materials on climate adaptive agriculture. These products were well-received by the farmers. Also the project developed a couple of digital tools to simplify the process of applications for grants, namely: - Geo referenced map with protected areas (natural areas and archeological sites) - grant application tool - database of agricultural equipment reference price (so the farmers don't need to collect three offers from three different suppliers when they apply for a grant). This significantly simplified and streamlined the application process.
Has the existing information/data/knowledge been made available to relevant stakeholder? If so, what channels of dissemination have been used?	Yes, the project disseminated the practical information through various media sources (radio, platforms, TV, radio, roundtables) which raises the farmers' knowledge and makes them more climate resilient.
Please list any knowledge products generated and include hyperlinks whenever possible (e.g. project videos, project stories, studies and technical reports, case studies, training manuals, handbooks, strategies and plans developed, etc.)	https://arii.ucipifad.md/map https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MUohWiqBn50&t=13 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SZUaJBpzGB0&t=1s https://www.ucipifad.md/storage/files/RfHGgZvmV1zTgBzHHQ2ooUz2Ad4MgIO6X https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qMEOuZTXXlk Numerous success stories of the project beneficiaries can be found here: https://www.ucipifad.md/stories
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	Since the project restructuring after the mid-term and implementation of the climate adaptation training program for farmers the number of farmers trained exceeded the planned target.
Describe any difficulties there have been in accessing or retrieving existing information (data or knowledge) that is relevant to the project. Please provide suggestions for improving access to the relevant data.	No difficulties with the access to the relevant data have been identified.
Has the identification of learning objectives	The numeric outcomes of the learning objectives included number of people trained and people informed about the climate changes and the methods contributing to raising farm

contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	resilience. All the objectives have been reached.
Innovation	
Describe any innovative practices or technologies that figured prominently in this project.	The project has been engaged in testing (in the conditions of the Moldovan soils) the po revolutionary water treatment equipment Max-Grow, that is designed to reduce the salin water and the level of salinization in the soil. Unfortunately, the equipment could not de tangible and confidents results. Another implemented tool was development of online a grants that significantly simplified the application process. IE also developed a geo-refe of protected natural areas and archeological sites that can help to potential grant benefi plan location of their investments.
Complementarity/ Coherence with other climate finance sources	
Has the project been scaled-up from any other climate finance? Or has the project build upon any other climate finance initiative?	Yes
If you answered yes, kindly specify the name of the Fund/Organization.	The project is parallely financed from the source of the IFAD loan, and there is a high synergy in promotion of the both types of the EE support to farmers and the solutions o EE are complementary to each other.

Results Tracker

Goal: Assist developing-country Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in meeting the costs of concrete adaptation projects and programmes in order to implement climate-resilient measures.

Impact: Increased resiliency at the community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change.

Is this the mid-term or terminal project performance report? Midterm

Impact: Increased resiliency at the community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change

Core Indicator: No. of beneficiaries

		Total	% of female beneficiaries	% of Youth beneficiaries
Baseline information	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	0	40	50
Baseline information	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Baseline information	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	20	25
Target performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	3450	40	50

Target performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Target performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	3450	20	25
Performance at mid-term	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	632	27	35
Performance at mid-term	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	1200	54	30
Performance at mid-term	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	1832	40.5	32.5
Performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0	0

Outcome 1: Reduced exposure to climate-related hazards and threats

Indicator 1: Relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to stakeholders on a timely basis

	Number of targeted stakeholders - Total	Number of targeted stakeholders - % of female targeted	Hazards information generated and disseminated	Overall effectiveness
Baseline information	0	40	Drought	2: Partially effective
Target performance at completion	29900	40	Drought	3: Moderately effective
Performance at mid-term	41000	54	Drought	3: Moderately effective
Performance at completion				

Output 1.1 Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated

Indicator 1.1: No. of projects/programmes that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments

	No. of projects/programme that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments	Sector	Scale	Status
Baseline information				

Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Output 1.2 Targeted population groups covered by adequate risk reduction systems

Core Indicator 1.2: No. of Early Warning Systems

	No. of adopted Early Warning Systems	Category targeted	Hazard	Geographical coverage	Number of municipalities
Baseline information	0	1: Risk knowledge	Drought	National	
Target performance at completion	1	1: Risk knowledge	Drought	National	
Performance at mid-term	1	1: Risk knowledge	Drought	National	
Performance at completion					

Outcome 2: Strengthened institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate-induced socioeconomic and environmental losses

Indicator 2: Capacity of staff to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events from targeted institutions increased

	Number of staff targeted - Total	Number of staff targeted - % of female targeted	Sector	Capacity level
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Output 2.1 Strengthened capacity of national and sub-national centres and networks to respond rapidly to extreme weather events

Indicator 2.1.1: No. of staff trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events

	Total staff trained	% of female staff trained	Type
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Indicator 2.1.2: No. of targeted institutions with increased capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability risks

	Type	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Output 2.2. Increased readiness and capacity of national and sub-national entities to directly access and program adaptation finance

Indicator 2.2.1: No. of targeted institutions benefitting from the direct access and enhanced direct access modality

	Number of beneficiaries	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Outcome 3: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes

Indicator 3.1: Increase in application of appropriate adaptation responses

	Percentage of targeted population applying adaptation measures	Sector
Baseline information		
Target performance at completion		
Performance at mid-term		
Performance at completion		

Output 3.1: Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities

Indicator 3.1.1: Percentage of targeted population awareness of predicted adverse impacts of climate change, and of appropriate responses

	No. of targeted beneficiaries	% of female participants targeted	Level of awareness
Baseline information	0	40	4: Mostly aware

Target performance at completion	29900	40	4: Mostly aware
Performance at mid-term	41000	54	4: Mostly aware
Performance at completion			

Output 3.2: Stenghtened capacity of national and subnational stakeholders and entities to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning

Indicator 3.2.1: No. of technical committees/associations formed to ensure transfer of knowledge

	No. of technical committees/associations	% of women represented in committes/associations	Level of awareness
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Indicator 3.2.2: No. of tools and guidelines developed (thematic, sectoral, institutional) and shared with relevant stakeholders

	No. of tools and guidelines	Type	Scale
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Outcome 4: Increased adaptive capacity within relevant development sector services and infrastructure assets

Indicator 4.1: Increased responsiveness of development sector services to evolving needs from changing and variable climate

	Project/programme sector	Geographical scale	Response level
Baseline information	Agriculture	National	2: Partially responsive (Lacks most elements)
Target performance at completion	Agriculture	National	4: Mostly responsive (Most defined elements)
Performance at mid-term	Agriculture	National	4: Mostly responsive (Most defined elements)
Performance at completion			

Core Indicator 4.2: Assets produced, developed, improved or strengthened

	Sector	Targeted asset	Changes in asset (quantitative or qualitative)
Baseline information	Agriculture	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	1: Not improved
Target performance at completion	Agriculture	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	4: Mostly Improved
Performance at mid-term	Agriculture	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	3: Moderately improved
Performance at completion			

Indicator 4.1.1: Vulnerable development sector services and infrastructure assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability

Indicator 4.1.1: No. and type of development sector services to respond to new conditions resulting from climate variability and change

	Number of services	Type	Sector
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Outcome 5: Increased ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress

Indicator 5: Ecosystem services and natural resource assets maintained or improved under climate change and variability-induced stress

	Natural resource improvement level	Sector	Type
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Output 5: Vulnerable ecosystem services and natural resource assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability

Core Indicator 5.1: Natural Assets protected or rehabilitated

	Natural asset or Ecosystem (type)	Total number of natural assets or ecosystems protected/rehabilitated	Unit	Effectiveness of protection/rehabilitation
Baseline information				
Target performance				

at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Outcome 6: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas

Indicator 6.1: Increase in households and communities having more secure access to livelihood assets

	No. of targeted households	% of female headed households	Improvement level
Baseline information	0	40	1: No improvement
Target performance at completion	135	40	4: High improvement
Performance at mid-term	47	26	4: High improvement
Performance at completion			

Indicator 6.2: Increase in targeted population's sustained climate-resilient alternative livelihoods

	No. of targeted households	% of female headed households	% increase in income level vis-à-vis baseline	Alternate Source
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Output 6 Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability

Indicator 6.1.1: No. and type of adaptation assets created or strengthened in support of individual or community livelihood strategies

	Number of Assets	Type of Assets	Sector	Adaptation strategy
Baseline information	0	Physical capital	Agriculture	Irrigation system
Target performance at completion	135	Physical capital	Agriculture	Irrigation system
Performance at mid-term	47	Physical capital	Agriculture	Irrigation system
Performance at completion				

Core Indicator 6.1.2: Increased income, or avoided decrease in income

	Number of households (total number in the project area)	Income source	Income level (USD)
--	---	---------------	--------------------

Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Outcome 7: Improved policies and regulations that promote and enforce resilience measures

Indicator 7: Climate change priorities are integrated into national development strategy

	Integration level
Baseline information	
Target performance at completion	
Performance at mid-term	
Performance at completion	

Output 7: Improved integration of climate-resilience strategies into country development plans

Indicator 7.1: No. of policies introduced or adjusted to address climate change risks

	No. of Policies introduced or adjusted	Sector	Scale	Type
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Indicator 7.2: No. of targeted development strategies with incorporated climate change priorities enforced

	No. of Development strategies	Regulation	Effectiveness
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Outcome 8: Support the development and diffusion of innovative adaptation practices, tools and technologies

Indicator 8: Innovative adaptation practices are rolled out, scaled up, encouraged and/or accelerated at regional, national and/or subnational level

	Sector of innovative	Geographic Scale	Type
--	----------------------	------------------	------

	practice		
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Output 8: Viable innovations are rolled out, saled up, encourages and/or accelerated

Indicator 8.1: No. of innovative adaptation practices, tools and technologies accelerated, scaled-up and/or replicated

	No. of innovative practices/ tools technologies	Sector	Status	Effectiveness
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Indicator 8.2: No. of key findings on effective, efficient adaptation practices, products and technologies generated

	No. of key findings generated	Type	Effectiveness
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			