



ADAPTATION FUND

Project Performance Report

Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	2/20/2024 - 2/19/2025
Project Title	Scaling-up Climate-resilient Rice Production in West Africa
Project Summary	
Database Number	AF00000190
Implementing Entity (IE)	Sahara and Sahel Observatory
Type of IE	Regional Implementing Entity
Country(ies)	Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, The, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo)
Relevant Geographic Points (i.e. cities, villages, bodies of water)	Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, The, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo. The project covers an area of 71,240 ha in the 13 countries, divided between 39% in the rainfed lowland system, 48% in the irrigated system, 12% in the plain/upland system and 1% in the mangrove system, as detailed below: Benin: 7061 ha (305 ha Rainfed lowland system and 6756 ha Plain/Upland system) Burkina Faso: 2142 ha (341 Rainfed lowland system and 1801ha Irrigated system) Cote d'Ivoire: 3199 ha (1175 ha Rainfed lowland system and 2024 ha Irrigated system) The Gambia: 2122 ha (57 ha Rainfed lowland system and 2065 ha Irrigated system) Ghana: 10176 ha (5336 ha Rainfed lowland system and 4840 ha Irrigated system) Guinea: 2200 ha (1000 ha Rainfed lowland system, 900 ha Plain/Upland system and 300 ha Mangrove system) Liberia: 2744 ha (1254 ha Rainfed lowland system and 1490 ha Irrigated system) Mali: 9403 ha (1715 ha Rainfed lowland system and 7688 ha Irrigated system) Niger: 3241ha (2036 ha Rainfed lowland system and 1205 ha Irrigated system) Nigeria: 15000 ha (4800 ha Rainfed lowland system and 10200 ha Irrigated system) Senegal: 6213 ha (4525 ha Rainfed lowland system and 1688 ha Irrigated system) Sierra Leone: 3000 ha (2025 ha Rainfed lowland system and 975 ha Plain/Upland system) Togo: 4742ha (3283 ha Rainfed lowland system and 1459 ha Irrigated system).
Name of Implementing Entity Focal Point	Khaoula Jaoui

Project Milestones

AFB Approval Date	10/21/2021
IE-AFB Agreement Signature Date	2/18/2022
Start of Project/Programme	2/24/2023
Actual Mid-term Review Date (if applicable)	9/26/2025
Original Completion Date	2/23/2027
Revised Completion Date after approval of extension request (if applicable)	

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

Inception report: February 2023

https://fifspubprd.azureedge.net/afdocuments/project/12103/RICOWAS_Inception_Report_English_Version_Januar

List the Website address (URL) of project

http://www.oss-online.org/fr/ricowas_fr <http://www.oss-online.org/index.php/fr/RICOWAS> http://www.oss-online.org/index.php/fr/RICOWAS_OSS http://www.oss-online.org/index.php/fr/RICOWAS_PHT <http://www.oss-online.org/index.php/fr/ricowas-mali>

Project Contacts

National/Regional Project Manager/Coordinator	Name	Email	Date
Implementing Entity	Sahara and Sahel Observatory	boc@oss.org.tn	7/3/2022
Executing Agency	IER-CSR-RIZ	ibosimon_1@yahoo.fr	7/14/2023
Executing Agency	INRAB - Benin	aibs42@yahoo.fr	5/17/2023
Executing Agency	ANADER - Cote Ivoire	nicaphing1@yahoo.fr	4/5/2023
Executing Agency	MoFEA - Gambia	toulie4000@gmail.com	3/28/2023
Executing Agency	CSIR-SARI - Ghana	sam555oppa@yahoo.com	4/21/2023
Executing Agency	MAGEL - Guinea	sdiawarairag@gmail.com	5/26/2025
Executing Agency	INRAN - Niger	ahaougui@yahoo.com	4/11/2023
Executing Agency	CHAP - Liberia	robertbimba@yahoo.com	4/4/2023
Executing Agency	MAgri - Mali	souleymaneyacouba195@gmail.com	4/28/2023
Executing Agency	ARCN - Nigeria	umarumarabdullahi31@gmail.com	5/4/2023
Executing Agency	ANCAR - Senegal	dg@ancar.gouv.sn	7/7/2023
Executing Agency	SLARI - Sierra Leone	leumas1962@yahoo.com	5/5/2023
Executing Agency	ICAT - Togo	lotsikokou2002@yahoo.fr	4/21/2023
Regional Project Manager	Karim Traore	kartraore@yahoo.com	7/14/2023
National Project Manager	Akankè Iliyath BELLO (Benin)	Aibs42@yahoo.fr	5/17/2023

National Project Manager	Martial YAPI (Cote d'Ivoire)	mafalev@yahoo.fr	4/5/2023
National Project Manager	Aja Ramu Hy dara (The Gambia)	toulie4000@gmail.com	3/28/2023
National Project Manager	Issah Sugri (Ghana)	isugri22@gmail.com	1/6/2023
National Project Manager	Souleymane Diawara (Guinea)	sdiawarairag@gmail.com	5/26/2025
National Project Manager	Haougi Adamou (Niger)	ahaougui@yahoo.com	1/18/2023
National Project Manager	Robert S.M.Bimba (Liberia)	robertbimba@yahoo.com	1/18/2023
National Project Manager	Samba BARRY (Mali)	sbarry1981@gmail.com	7/27/2023
National Project Manager	Umar Umar Abdullahi (Nigeria)	umarumarabdullahi31@gmail.com	5/25/2023
National Project Manager	Abdoulaye SY (Senegal)	layesythies@yahoo.fr	5/20/2023
National Project Manager	Samuel Harding	leumas1962@yahoo.com	1/6/2023
National Project Manager	Lotsi Kokou	lotsikokou2002@yahoo.fr	6/12/2023
Executing Agency	DGESS (Burkina Faso)	gustavesome@yahoo.fr	8/2/2024
National Project Manager	SOME A. Gustave	gustavesome@yahoo.fr	8/2/2024
Executing Agency	Cornell University	eds8@cornell.edu	1/18/2023

Financial Data

Disbursement of AF grant funds	
Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date (\$)	\$7,297,500.00
Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date (\$)	\$3,059,388.74
Project disbursement rate (%)	52.3
Project execution rate (%)	23.68
Add any comments on AF Grant Funds	<p>The Adaptation Fund has disbursed a total of USD 7,297,500.00 to the OSS. This allocation is strategically structured to maximise impact, with approximately 91.5% of funds dedicated directly to project activities, ensuring that the vast majority of resources are utilised for field-level implementation. The total budget is distributed across two primary pillars:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity Financing: USD 5,983,950 earmarked for the execution of core planned project activities. • Project Execution: USD 1,313,550 allocated to cover operational costs. This component is split between the RIE (OSS), receiving USD 693,262, and the Execution Entities, receiving USD 620,000. <p>Financial Absorption and Momentum Analysis of annual disbursements reveals a robust, positive trajectory in the project's capacity to absorb and utilise funds. The comparison between the</p>

previous reporting period (PPR1) and the current period (PPR2) demonstrates significant growth, confirming that the project has successfully navigated initial operational hurdles and is building the necessary momentum to meet its financial targets.

Drivers of Accelerated Absorption This accelerated financial absorption is a direct consequence of several key strategic adjustments:

- **Evidence-Based Prioritisation:** The project's trajectory was fundamentally strengthened by a comprehensive baseline and capacity needs assessment. This enabled the RIE to strategically pivot resources toward high impact, urgent interventions.
- **Operational Streamlining:** As foundational activities reached completion, the project achieved a sharper focus. Enhanced coordination and improved stakeholder alignment have streamlined the flow of resources, facilitating a faster rate of expenditure.
- **Increased Capacity:** Targeted capacity building and refined strategic planning have provided the framework necessary to manage an increased volume of project activities. For the planned expenditure. The project's strategy for deploying the USD 4.5 million is aggressively structured into an incremental approach that links capacity building directly to capital expenditure. Initial efforts are focused on foundational agility by ensuring every dollar is targeted and efficiently managed. This begins with utilising the baseline and needs assessment to prioritise only high-impact interventions, guaranteeing effective fund use from the outset. Simultaneously, we are deploying streamlined strategies across all executing entities, which minimises administrative complexity and enhances operational speed. These actions, complemented by focused technical engagements to maintain alignment, collectively build the necessary robust operational framework, transitioning the project from preparation to a state of high readiness for significant financial absorption. The maximisation of expenditure is achieved in the second phase, where we translate built capacity into large-scale capital investments, driving core project outcomes. We immediately leverage the success of the 2nd ToT to multiply our training reach, thereby scaling up the adoption of SRI/CRRP techniques. This human capacity is supported by establishing robust Agricultural Cooperatives to serve as organised delivery structures for inputs. Crucially, the largest portion of the funds will be consumed by expediting Public and Private Partnerships (PPPs) to procure essential resources, namely, seeds, manure, and specialised equipment. This strategic capital outlay is the primary mechanism for meeting the financial targets while directly enabling physical

	implementation, significantly enhancing climate resilience and yields. Finally, the strategy emphasises sustaining the impact through continuous oversight and risk mitigation to protect the investment and ensure uninterrupted execution. This involves deploying dedicated focal persons to provide technical assistance, actively preventing execution bottlenecks, and maintaining the high pace of fund consumption. Furthermore, funding is allocated to progress reviews linked to adaptive strategies, allowing the project to pivot rapidly against emerging challenges. This continuous oversight guarantees that activities remain ongoing and that the enhanced SRI and CRRP outcomes are secured, validating the efficient and impactful deployment of the entire project fund.
Investment Income (\$)	\$0.00
Cumulative Investment Income since inception (\$)	\$0.00

Expenditure Data

Output	Amount (\$)
Output 1.1.1. Climate change dimension and proposed actions integrated into the regional and national rice strategy documents	\$4,777.00
Output 1.2.1. Capacity of national and regional research centers strengthened	\$48,792.00
Output 1.2.2. Institutional capacity of the regional and national executing entities for project implementation strengthened	\$88,328.00
Output 1.2.3. Extension institutions involved in the development and dissemination of SRI and CRRP strengthened	\$106,562.00
Output 2.1.1. Smallholder rice farmers in the project zones strengthened their livelihoods by reducing production costs and improving rice yields through the adoption of SRI and CRRP	\$154,173.00
Output 2.1.2. SRI and CRRP practices - adopted by smallholders in the project zones - monitored, analyzed and the results widely shared	\$88,425.00
Output 2.2.1. Rice production and post-harvest components in the rice valuechain strengthened	\$19,351.00
Output 2.2.2. Agricultural associations and cooperatives in the rice value chain strengthened in their operations	\$17,747.00
Output 3.1.1. Knowledge and awareness materials developed and widely disseminated	\$21,223.00
Output 3.2.1. Synergies among partners established to mainstream CRRP in West Africa	\$4,821.00
IE fee (\$)	\$262,119.55
Execution cost (\$)	\$104,580.00

Planned Expenditure Schedule

Output	Projected Cost (\$)	Estimated Completion Date
Output 1.1.1. Climate change dimension and proposed actions integrated into the regional and national rice strategy documents	\$200,000.00	1/30/2026
Output 1.2.1. Capacity of national and regional research centers strengthened	\$200,000.00	1/30/2026
Output 1.2.2. Institutional capacity of the regional and national executing entities for project implementation strengthened	\$250,000.00	1/30/2026
Output 1.2.3. Extension institutions involved in the development and	\$200,000.00	1/30/2026

dissemination of SRI and CRRP strengthened		
Output 2.1.1. Smallholder rice farmers in the project zones strengthened their livelihoods by reducing production costs and improving rice yields through the adoption of SRI and CRRP	\$1,850,000.00	1/30/2026
Output 2.1.2. SRI and CRRP practices - adopted by smallholders in the project zones - monitored, analyzed and the results widely shared	\$500,000.00	1/30/2026
Output 2.2.1. Rice production and post-harvest components in the rice valuechain strengthened	\$400,000.00	1/30/2026
Output 2.2.2. Agricultural associations and cooperatives in the rice value chain strengthened in their operations	\$350,000.00	1/30/2026
Output 3.1.1. Knowledge and awareness materials developed and widely disseminated	\$275,000.00	1/30/2026
Output 3.2.1. Synergies among partners established to mainstream CRRP in West Africa	\$275,000.00	1/30/2026
IE fee (\$)		
		\$200,000.00
Execution cost (\$)		
		\$200,000.00

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
Terrorist attacks	High	The countries concerned are: Mali, Niger, Burkina Faso and Nigeria. OSS regularly communicates with national executing entities, UN organizations, and other international organizations in the country to stay informed about the security situation, including terrorist attacks and potential conflicts. Depending on the situation, steps will be taken to adjust the approach and continue implementing activities in the field. Additionally, as OSS implements another regional project in Benin, Burkina Faso, and Niger, where security represents a significant risk, we already have a good understanding of the prevailing situation and the necessary measures to take in the project areas, which we can draw upon for the RICOWAS project.

The Covid-19 virus impact.	Not Applicable	NTR
Multiplicity in currencies and their instability in currencies, market prices	Moderate	To mitigate the risks posed by currency multiplicity and market instability in the RICOWAS project, several measures can be adopted to ensure financial stability and equitable access. Using a Dollar account to where the disbursements are made .The common reporting currency (US\$) will harmonize budgeting and donor compliance, while hedging mechanisms and contingency reserves can protect against exchange rate volatility. Flexible budgeting will also allow for adjustments when prices shift unexpectedly. Strengthened monitoring and transparent financial reporting will enhance accountability.
Ebola outbreaks hinder the implementation of activities.	Moderate	The countries concerned are Guinea, Mali, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Liberia, and Côte d'Ivoire. The epidemic situation is regularly monitored through WHO publications on the spread of the epidemic, and no cases were recorded in the concerned countries during the reporting period.
Low collaboration amongst the relevant technical institutions at national level.	Moderate	This risk is mitigated through a set of coordinated actions that strengthen institutional collaboration and ensure the success of the RICOWAS project. The project has established a regional coordination group that bring together the different countriesAnglophone and Francophone, into units, and this helps to harmonize planning and oversight, reducing duplication and gaps in delivery. The development of joint monitoring frameworks by the REE ensures consistent application across regions and improves accountability for activities as well as environmental and social risks. There will be a project platform to promote technical synergies through shared platforms, joint training, and collaborative research, which will enhance the scaling of innovations such as SRI, SLWM, and composting. Finally, regular knowledge-sharing workshops and reporting systems across institutions will build trust, improve efficiency, and ensure that vulnerable groups are meaningfully included, thereby safeguarding both the equity and impact of the project.
National executing entities are understaffed and can't reach the requirements.	Moderate	A Project Management Unit (PMU) has been established within each Executing Entity (EE), staffed with at least the key profiles recommended in the project document. In several cases, PMUs have expanded beyond these requirements by including additional staff roles. Where PMUs were initially understaffed, reinforcement has been provided through the recruitment of supplementary personnel, financed by the project's execution budget. In many countries, EEs also leverage national technical institutions through formal partnership agreements, ensuring more efficient use of resources and strengthening local capacities. However, the Regional Executing Entity continues to face significant challenges, particularly in terms of technical staffing. Although a technical assistant was recruited to address this gap, the individual resigned shortly after assuming the position, leaving the unit with persistent shortages in technical expertise.
Delay in disbursements	Moderate	OSS has signed funding agreements with all Executing Entities (EEs). All have received the first disbursement, with the exception of Burkina Faso, where administrative and institutional constraints delayed the entry into force of the financing agreement. Burkina Faso has received its first disbursement and started implementing activities on the ground. It's important to note that disbursements are subject to specific conditions clearly outlined in the funding agreement to ensure transparency. The transfer of funds generally does not pose any problems, as funds are usually credited to the project's country bank accounts within a week. In certain cases, challenges may arise, but they are always addressed and

		resolved within very reasonable timeframes.
Different pace of project implementation for each country may delay overall project implementation and affect regional activities.	Moderate	During this second reporting period, progress has varied across countries. Some are advancing well, while others are still struggling to resume normal activity implementation. The Regional Executing Entity, which should lead the project at the regional level, coordinate effectively, and support countries in their progress, has not fully played its role. As a result, several national activities that depend on regional actions could not be initiated. Cornell University, as an executing partner, has provided valuable support and delivered several activities with the expected quality. OSS has also played an important role by assisting the National Executing Entities and helping to address the gaps left by the Regional Executing Entities.
Delay in the implementation of project activities.	Low	To mitigate delays in the implementation of project activities, strong coordination and clear timelines have been established across institutions, supported by streamlined administrative processes to reduce bureaucratic bottlenecks. Capacity building is planned to be continuous for the executing, this partners will improve efficiency, and contingency resources should be allocated to absorb disruptions without derailing core activities. Finally, transparent communication is being enhanced with communities about project timelines to ensure they sustain the trust and ensure continued engagement, helping the project stay on track and deliver its intended outcomes.
Movement of trained staff to other sectors or outside the project areas.	Low	The project aims to develop retention strategies by building local capacity by training a larger pool of community-based facilitators and extension agents so that knowledge is not concentrated in a few individuals. Third, establish knowledge transfer systems, including manuals, digital platforms, and peer-to-peer mentoring, to ensure that skills and expertise are preserved even if staff leave. Fourth, strengthen institutional partnerships with national technical agencies and universities to create a pipeline of trained professionals who can step in when gaps arise. Finally, adopt succession planning and continuous training to maintain a steady supply of skilled personnel, ensuring that project activities remain resilient and sustainable
Political uncertainties affect project implementation	Low	To mitigate the risk of political uncertainties affecting the implementation of the RICOWAS project, activities should be anchored in formal agreements and legal frameworks that ensure continuity beyond political cycles, while diversifying partnerships with civil society, farmer organizations, and local authorities to reduce reliance on central government stability. Adaptive planning and flexible project design will allow adjustments to shifting priorities, and regional oversight through bodies such as ECOWAS or OSS can provide consistency when national-level uncertainties arise. Transparent communication with communities will sustain trust and engagement, and early warning systems to monitor political developments will enable timely contingency measures, ensuring the project remains resilient and on track despite political transition/
Delays in recruitment or appointment of critical staff for the project.	Low	To mitigate this risk, the project has established clear and streamlined procedures to avoid bureaucratic bottlenecks, while maintaining a roster of pre-identified qualified candidates who can be quickly mobilized when vacancies arise. Strengthening partnerships with national institutions and universities can create a pipeline of skilled professionals, and capacity building for existing staff can help bridge gaps until positions are filled. Additionally, adopting succession planning and interim appointments ensures continuity of leadership and technical expertise, while regular monitoring of staffing needs allows proactive adjustments. Together,

		these measures safeguard project momentum and minimize disruptions caused by staffing delays.
Project financial management	Low	Standardized financial guidelines and reporting formats have been adopted across all entities to maintain consistency, while capacity building for finance staff will strengthen compliance with donor requirements and international standards. The use of monthly interim financial statements improve accuracy and enables real-time monitoring, supported by regular internal and external audits to detect irregularities early. Oversight committees at national and regional levels can review expenditures and ensure alignment with project objectives, while contingency planning and flexible budgeting will help absorb shocks from currency fluctuations or unforeseen cost
Poor monitoring and evaluation and delayed delivery of outputs	Low	To mitigate poor monitoring and evaluation and delayed delivery of outputs in the RICOWAS project, a robust M&E framework is to be established with clear indicators, timelines, and responsibilities, supported by digital tracking tools for real-time progress monitoring. Regular reviews and audits will help identify bottlenecks early, while capacity building for staff ensures consistent data collection and reporting. Streamlined communication channels between executing entities and communities will enhance accountability, and adaptive planning mechanisms will allow timely adjustments to keep activities on track. Together, these measures will strengthen oversight, improve efficiency, and ensure outputs are delivered as planned.

Critical Risks Affecting Progress (Not identified at project design)

Are there any critical risks with a 50% or > likelihood of affecting progress of project? Yes

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

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
Delay in setting up project management bodies	Moderate	This concerns the delay in setting up the Project Management Unit at Burkina Faso level and at the level of the regional implementing entity. As regards Burkina Faso, discussions are underway with the country's stakeholders to understand the reasons for the blockage and find a solution. As regards the regional executing entity, draft terms of reference have proposed for the recruitment of an assistant to the coordinator.
Inaccessibility of Infrastructures for Regional Workshops It had agreed that the infrastructures built during previous phases of the project would be used to host the regional workshops. However, due to the deterioration of security conditions in Mali, these infrastructures are currently inaccessible. This blockage represents a major risk for the implementation of training activities, potentially causing delays and additional costs related to finding alternative solutions for organizing the workshops.	Moderate	To address this risk, discussions were initiated with the different project partners in the 13 countries to explore the possibility of organizing these events in other countries and assess the associated costs. The objective is to ensure the workshops take place while minimizing financial impacts.

<p>Loss of Project Institutional Memory The entire staff involved in the development of the project at regional level has replaced. As a result, the institutional memory and philosophy of the project are not well understood by the current team.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The OSS team took the initiative to organize training sessions and meetings with the experts currently in place. These brainstorming sessions allowed for the transmission of information and ensured a shared understanding of the project's philosophy. Moreover, the regional project launch meeting was preceded by training sessions specifically focused on the project's philosophy and objectives, in order to strengthen the new staff's grasp of the project.</p>
<p>Insufficient Permanent Staff at CRS-Riz It was agreed that the permanent staff of CRS-Riz would be made available to the RICOWAS project to support its execution. Therefore, during the project's design phase, there was no plan to recruit an additional regional team, as existing staff was deemed sufficient. However, during the project's launch phase, we discovered that CRS-Riz consists of only one expert.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>First, OSS mobilize additional technical staff either from partner institutions, short-term consultancies, or recruitment of regional experts to complement the limited CRS-Riz capacity. Secondly, OSS strengthened collaboration with national agricultural research institutes and universities, creating a pool of experts who can provide technical backstopping and continuity. Thirdly, OSS established a capacity-sharing mechanism, where knowledge and responsibilities are distributed across multiple institutions to reduce reliance on a single expert. Finally, OSS implements continuous training and mentoring programs to build a broader base of skilled personnel, ensuring that institutional memory and technical expertise are not concentrated in one individual.</p>

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?

NTR

ESP Compliance

Section 1: Identified ESP Risk Management

Was the ESP risks identification complete at the time of funding approval? No

1. Compliance with the law

<p>Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>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)</p>	
<p>List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)</p>	
<p>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</p>	

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?	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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of insufficient access to the project by a segment of the population • Elite capture in allocating project benefits • Lack of community interest in participating in project activities
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A detailed selection criterion will be developed by considering practicality and feasibility, willingness to apply the project approach, exclusion from other previous development initiatives, potential synergies with other current development initiatives, and the presence of committed youth. • Project beneficiaries will be selected through a few phases, including (1) screening of potential beneficiaries during consultation with the rice producer organizations and communities, (2) a face-to-face meeting and visit to the farm of the beneficiary to assess her/his skills in farming and readiness to accept the project terms. • To ensure the equal participation of refugees, women, youth, the elderly, and other potentially vulnerable groups, dedicated consultations and working groups with these groups will be organized to provide ample space for the consideration of the specific needs of these stakeholder groups. • Close monitoring of the project beneficiaries to ensure equal access for men, women, youth, and the most vulnerable. • A grievance redress mechanism to enable and support community members and stakeholders in submitting any complaint.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nb of selection criteria agreed on • Nb of workshops • Nb of participants to these workshops and gender distribution • Nb of complaints
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been	During the reporting period, the following activities

implemented during the reporting period	were implemented: Targeted outreach through additional consultations and awareness sessions specifically for communities with low participation, and the engagement of local champions such as trusted elders, women leaders, and youth representatives to mobilize interest and build trust in the project.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	N.T.R
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	It is planned to strengthen field-level monitoring to detect inequities in access or benefit distribution and require gender- and vulnerability-disaggregated reporting from NEEs.
3.Marginalized and vulnerable Groups	
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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of land ownership may affect some vulnerable groups negatively, as they may not take full advantage of the project activities; e.g in areas where land tenure is insecure, successful improvement of rice plots through project interventions (like leveling or bunding) could make the land more valuable, potentially leading to "loss of customary use of land" for women or tenant farmers, as owners may take back the improved land. • Some project activities could increase inequalities and hamper the livelihoods of project beneficiaries: Farmers with lower literacy levels or limited access to extension services (often women and marginalized groups) may struggle to adopt these complex techniques, potentially widening the productivity gap between them and more educated farmers. Some SRI techniques (like manual weeding or precise water management) can be highly labour intensive in the initial stages. Without access to labor-saving mechanical weeders, this increased workload often falls disproportionately on women, potentially hampering their ability to engage in other livelihood or care taking activities.
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marginalised people who do not have land will be given priority for access to other project activities, such as PPPs. The project will also closely monitor the targeting of all project beneficiaries to ensure equal access for refugees, internally displaced people, women, youth, and the most vulnerable. • Explain explicitly, transparently, and unambiguously during the launching process the project targeting and scaling up mechanism. This should be translated into the local languages so that everybody will be carried

	along. • Provide priority to marginalized people who do not have land for access to other project activities, such as PPPs. • KAP will be conducted in each country to collect feedback from the population, including marginalized groups. • Grievance mechanism.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	• Nb of KAP conducted. • Awareness sessions to explain the project in local languages during each launching workshop. • % of refugees/internally displaced people involved in the project. • % of PPP beneficiaries without land. • Nb of complaints.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	During the reporting period, the following activities were implemented: Community sensitization sessions in local languages using radio, posters, and village meetings to explain targeting and scaling-up mechanisms; public display of beneficiary selection criteria and lists at community centers to reduce perceptions of bias or elite capture; and the establishment of community grievance committees with representation from women, youth, and vulnerable groups.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	NTR
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	For any residual impacts, it is proposed to establish Establish external monitoring teams (cSO/Gvt) to verify inclusion of marginalized groups and ensure corrective measures are applied. Create dedicated PPPs for women, youth, and landless farmers, with alternative livelihood options (e.g., rice processing, marketing, composting). Promote community land-use agreements or MoUs to protect customary users from displacement after land improvements. Provide shared or subsidized mechanical weeders and water management tools to reduce women's labor burden. Use farmer field schools, demonstration plots, and visual/local-language materials to support low-literacy farmers. Introduce anonymous reporting channels (SMS, hotlines, suggestion boxes) and community grievance committees with representation from women, youth, and vulnerable groups
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?	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)	<p>Knowledge Exclusion: The "knowledge-intensive" nature of SRI/CRRP may marginalize women and youth with lower literacy or less access to extension services, widening the inequality gap. Labor Drudgery: While aiming to reduce work, SRI can initially increase labor-intensive tasks like manual weeding or parboiling; without affordable mechanical tools, this burden falls disproportionately on women. Time Poverty: High demands for participation in "ToT workshops," "field visits," and "annual national events" can conflict with women's existing household and caregiving roles. Resource Capture: Competition for "agricultural credits," "subsidies," and "innovative equipment" risks being dominated by influential male farmers or established cooperatives, excluding the most vulnerable. Tenure Insecurity: Improved land value from "sustainable land and water management" may lead to "customary use of land" loss for women if owners reclaim plots. PPP Dependency: Smallholder women's groups entering "public-private partnerships" (PPPs) may face unfair pricing or dependency on private companies for seeds and fertilizers. Digital Divide: Reliance on "web-based platforms" and "data tracking apps" for information sharing can exclude those without "internet access" or "computing resources," typically women and youth</p>
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the presence of women and young people in workshops and trainings. • A Gender Assessment Action Plan has been developed to ensure that women are meaningfully engaged in project activities

safeguard measures by activity.	and realise an equitable share of project benefits. • Communication and sensitization of the population on the gender issue to ensure gender parity in PPP. • Specific activities and innovative equipment will be developed for easier use by women and youth (engendered tools). • Grievance mechanism. • Women will be specifically targeted to benefit from PPP. This will enhance their access to finance and enable them to generate income, contributing directly to their financial empowerment.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	• % of women and youth participating in workshops and trainings. • % of women beneficiaries of PPP. • % of women in the POs. • Nb of complaints. • % of women beneficiaries' PPP resources.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	During this reporting period, the following measures were implemented: The project strengthened and enforced the Gender Action Plan by requiring gender quotas in all workshops and trainings to guarantee women's representation, and by making gender-disaggregated reporting mandatory for all NEEs, with plans to extend this to the PPPs generation. Inclusive training using visual aids, local languages, farmer field schools, and peer mentoring was provided to overcome knowledge exclusion and ensure participation of women and youth with lower literacy or limited extension access; and trainings and events were scheduled flexibly with shorter sessions, local venues, and childcare support to address time poverty and enable women to balance participation with household and caregiving roles.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	NTR
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	To ensure no residual impacts, the project proposes To reduce labor drudgery, affordable and shared mechanical weeders and parboiling equipment should be introduced through women-led cooperatives, ensuring the workload does not fall disproportionately on women. To prevent resource capture, transparent allocation criteria with reserved quotas for women, youth, and marginalized groups should be established for credits, subsidies, and equipment distribution. To safeguard against tenure insecurity, community land-use agreements and governance committees should be promoted to protect customary users, especially women, from losing access to improved plots. To mitigate PPP dependency, collective bargaining through women's cooperatives and diversification of input sources such as community seed banks and local fertilizer production should be supported. To bridge the digital divide, offline information channels like radio, posters, and SMS should be provided alongside

	community digital hubs with shared devices and training for women and youth.
6.Core labour rights	
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)	In rural areas where the presence of the state is not very strong, late or unpaid salaries or remuneration non-compliant with the countries labour legislations and laws may occurs as well as child labour. The use of "mechanical weeders," "direct seeders," and "hand tractors" introduces risks of physical injury if operators are not adequately trained or provided with protective equipment.
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Deploy "Youth-Inclusive Community-Based Monitoring" systems where local leaders track school attendance and identify children at risk of being used for hazardous labor during the field visits and trainings. • Enhanced Communication and awareness raising about child labor. • Grievance mechanism.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nb of checking report. • Nb of awareness sessions. • Nb of complaints
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	During the reporting period, the following was done: Project staff conducted random checks during activity monitoring, and sensitized communities on the grievance mechanism at all field visits and trainings.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	NTR
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	In case of any possible residual impacts, the project will strengthen enforcement and oversight by ensuring labour compliance with national labour laws; Include safety training as a prerequisite for all beneficiaries and labourers using innovative SRI machinery or handling organic fertilizers; and guarantee that Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) is provided alongside any agricultural machinery or chemical inputs distributed by the project. Grievance mechanisms will be enhanced to remain accessible, confidential, and responsive, with clear escalation pathways to OSS and national authorities, and complaints will be tracked and resolved within defined timelines, with public reporting of outcomes to build trust. Collaboration with authorities will also be strengthened, particularly with national labour inspectorates and ministries of employment, to enforce compliance and facilitate joint monitoring

	missions in rural areas where state presence is weak.
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)	Expanding of farms to wetlands, riverbanks and other vulnerable ecosystems such as mangroves.
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project will carry out its activities in existing farming lands and will have no harm on natural habitats. • Follow-up of the execution of all activities related to the protection and management of ecosystems and natural habitats. • Awareness sessions to local populations on good environmental practices and the protection of natural habitats.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nb of monitoring reports including specific section on activities related to the protection and management of ecosystems. • Nb of awareness sessions on the protection of the ecosystems.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	During the reporting period, the following measures were implemented: Project activities were carried out on existing farming lands to ensure no harm to natural habitats, and follow-up actions were undertaken to oversee the execution of all activities related to the protection and management of ecosystems and natural habitats.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	NTR
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	In case of any residual impacts, the project will expand awareness and education by conducting additional sessions targeting communities near vulnerable ecosystems, using local languages and culturally relevant approaches to emphasize the importance of protecting wetlands and mangroves. Restoration and rehabilitation will be promoted through ecosystem programs such as replanting mangroves, stabilizing riverbanks, and rehabilitating wetlands, while actively engaging communities in reforestation and habitat rehabilitation activities to repair damage and build ownership. Community-based natural resource management will be enhanced by establishing monitoring committees to oversee farming boundaries and safeguard sensitive habitats, with incentives provided for compliance, for example, access to project inputs or training for farmers who respect habitat boundaries.
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)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New agricultural practices may represent a form of disturbance for the flora and can affect the biological diversity. • Minor impacts induced by commercialization of harvesting of rice and its sub-products, organization of demonstration and trainings sessions on the field, etc. • Use of low quality of rice seeds and plants.
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The defined interventions (CRRP) will not affect the biological diversity. It is mainly about sustainable agricultural practices • Include training on sustainable land development and preparation methods, including zero or minimum tillage. • Organize awareness to discourage the clearing of virgin forests for cropping and the draining of mangroves for rice paddies and vegetable farming. • Establishment of local nurseries to produce high quality and adapted to SRI.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface (ha) of areas under CRRP. • Nb of meetings and training organized on sustainable land. • Nb of training topics on the protection of the ecosystems. • Nb of established local nurseries.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	During the reporting period, the following measures were implemented: Although the defined CRRP interventions currently underway were carried out on existing farming lands to ensure no adverse impact on biological diversity, activities focused on sustainable agricultural practices, including training on sustainable land development and preparation methods. These efforts were further supported by the establishment of local nurseries to produce high-quality seeds adapted to SRI, with farmers trained on seed selection and multiplication techniques to maintain biodiversity in rice systems, in partnership with national agricultural research institutes to ensure seed quality control and distribution.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	NTR
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The following remedial actions are proposed Promote agroecological practices (CRRP/SRI + SLWM) that minimize disturbance and enhance biodiversity by establishing buffer zones around sensitive habitats to protect native flora, conducting environmental screening before introducing new practices to ensure compatibility with local ecosystems. Training and demonstration sessions in already cultivated or degraded areas, avoiding ecologically sensitive zones, will be done via the Farmer Field Schools. and will be expanded to include conduct for

	commercialization activities to prevent overharvesting or unsustainable practices. This will help raise awareness among farmers about ecosystem services provided by biodiversity. Promotion of the use of certified, high-quality, and climate-resilient seed varieties that are less harmful to biodiversity will be enhanced to establish community seed banks to preserve local genetic diversity and reduce reliance on poor-quality seeds.
11. Climate change	
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)	Emission of greenhouse gases: the approach promoted by the project activities do not generate risks related to climate change. The proposed measure will enhance the positive impacts of the project.
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed CRRP will have a co-benefit on carbon sequestration with optimal use of water for rice production. • Training session on how to use alternate wetting and drying irrigation method to reduce CH₄ emission and how to improve nutrient management including the retention of rice residues.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Nb of meetings and training organized on how to drain rice paddies.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	During the period, the following has been emphasised: Efficient Water Management through the Promotion of Alternate Wetting and Drying (AWD) to reduce methane emissions from rice paddies and Track % of water use in irrigated plots to measure efficiency gains. Organic Soil Fertility Enhancement through supporting community composting units to reduce chemical fertilizer use and monitoring the number of composting units created and their productivity.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	NTR
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	To mitigate this, though there is very minimal risk, the following will be done 1. Scaling and Monitoring CRRP Practices Expand CRRP adoption across more hectares to maximize carbon sequestration, and use monitoring indicators (surface area under CRRP) to track climate benefits. 2. Community Awareness and Behavioural Change through Conducting regular awareness sessions on climate-smart agriculture and linking them to local traditions, and monitoring the

	number of awareness sessions and participant engagement to ensure uptake. 3. Efficient Water Management through the Promotion of Alternate Wetting and Drying (AWD) to reduce methane emissions from rice paddies and Track % of water use in irrigated plots to measure efficiency gains. 4. Organic Soil Fertility Enhancement through supporting community composting units to reduce chemical fertilizer use and monitoring the number of composting units created and their productivity.
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)	Rice intensification may lead to an increased use of pesticide and chemical fertilizer.
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness session on the danger of the use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides • Promotion of the use of manure, compost and organic pest control remedies.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nb of awareness sessions on manure, compost and organic pest control remedies. • % of project beneficiaries using the manure, compost and organic pest control remedies.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Zero
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	During the reporting period, the following measures were implemented: Community-based composting and resource efficiency initiatives were introduced by establishing community-managed composting units to ensure a consistent supply of organic fertilizer and by promoting the recycling of rice husks and by-products into organic soil amendments; and farmer training and demonstrations were strengthened through additional awareness sessions on safe pesticide handling, integrated pest management (IPM), and organic alternatives, supported by demonstration plots showcasing the effectiveness of compost and organic pest control remedies compared to chemical inputs.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	NTR
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	Remedial Actions would include: Introduce Incentives for Organic Practices by providing subsidies or input support for farmers adopting composting and organic pest control. and Link cooperatives and farmer groups to markets that reward organic rice production, creating economic

	<p>motivation to reduce chemical use. Improve Monitoring and Enforcement through increased monitoring of fertilizer and pesticide application rates at the plot level, and Collaborate with national agricultural/environmental agencies to enforce regulations on chemical use and disposal. Promote Integrated Pest and Nutrient Management (IPNM). Encourage balanced use of organic and chemical inputs to minimize environmental risks and train farmers on crop rotation, biological pest control, and soil fertility management. Community-Based Composting and Resource Efficiency by establishing community-managed composting units to ensure a consistent supply of organic fertilizer and promoting recycling of rice husks and by-products into organic soil amendment</p>
13.Public health	
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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rice cultivation may lead to water- or vector-borne diseases (such as cholera or Malaria) increase, and the proliferation of insects near the water points. • COVID-19 can favour the displacement across borders and abroad. Ebola outbreaks in Guinea constitute a high risk that can hinder the implementation of activities.
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise awareness and support mechanisms to prevent and control spread of water related diseases such as Malaria and Bilharzia among the program workers and local communities. • Follow the national sanitary regulations and provisions made to cope with other disasters such as Ebola and COVID-19 during the implementation phase.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nb of awareness sessions on diseases • Nb of participants in these sessions and gender distribution • Nb of information sheet on the epidemic situation based on WHO publication about its spread • % of compliance with national regulations regarding hygienic measures, permitted behaviour in terms of meetings and travel restrictions
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Zero
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	0
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	NTR
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	In case of the above impacts, the following remedial actions would be put into place Water- and Vector-

	<p>Borne Diseases (Cholera, Malaria, insect proliferation near water points) Remedial Actions: Strengthen vector control measures: introduce mosquito nets, larviciding in stagnant water, and improved drainage around rice fields. Community health campaigns: increase the number of awareness sessions on diseases with emphasis on hygiene, safe water use, and malaria prevention and Environmental management: promote alternate wetting and drying (AWD) in rice fields to reduce standing water and insect breeding Environmental management: promote alternate wetting and drying (AWD) in rice fields to reduce standing water and insect breeding. COVID-19 Risks (cross-border displacement, restrictions on meetings/travel) Remedial Actions: Strict compliance with national health regulations: enforce mask use, handwashing stations, and physical distancing during project activities. Flexible project planning: shift to smaller group meetings, virtual consultations, or staggered training sessions to reduce crowding. Information dissemination: distribute information sheets on epidemic situations based on WHO and national health authority updates. Ebola Outbreak Risk (Guinea and cross-border spread) Remedial Actions: Early warning and coordination: establish communication channels with national health authorities and WHO for rapid alerts. Preparedness training: conduct awareness sessions on Ebola symptoms, prevention, and safe practices for farmers and communities. Cross-border safeguards: coordinate with border health posts to monitor the movement of project participants.</p>
--	---

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)	The introduction of new rice farming practices may face the resistance may experience from communities and the Chief.
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.	Awareness raising sessions on how the CRRP/SRI as an innovative methodology which will enhance the traditional knowledge and supporting them to increase their incomes.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Nb of sessions organized.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	Awareness raising sessions on how the CRRP/SRI as an innovative methodology which will enhance the

	traditional knowledge and supporting them to increase their incomes.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	None
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The following remedial actions will be adopted in case of any impact. 1. Inclusive Dialogue and Co-Design Organize community dialogues with Chiefs, elders, and farmer groups to co-design CRRP/SRI practices that respect cultural traditions. Incorporating local farming rituals or customs into demonstration plots to show continuity with heritage. 2. Pilot Demonstration Plots Led by Chiefs Establish pilot plots managed by chiefs or respected community members to showcase benefits. This builds trust and demonstrates that modern practices can complement traditional methods. 3. Recognition and Incentives Provide formal recognition to chiefs and elders who champion CRRP/SRI adoption (e.g., certificates, public acknowledgment). Offer community-level incentives such as improved infrastructure or cooperative support linked to adoption. 4. Knowledge Integration Document and integrate traditional rice farming knowledge into CRRP/SRI training materials.
15.Lands and soil conservation	
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)	Some activities may lead to soil degradation and the clearing of virgin forest or land.
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed CRRP (SRI+SLWM) will have a co-benefit on carbon sequestration with sustainable land use. • Raise the local population's awareness to strengthen the sustainable management of soil and land. • Reduction of water use for irrigation. • Composting production will contribute to increasing soil quality and fertility.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface (ha) of areas under CRRP. • Nb of awareness sessions on sustainable management of soil and land. • % of water use in the irrigated plots. • Nb of composting units created.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	During the reporting period, the following have been implemented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising the local population's awareness to strengthen the sustainable management of soil and land. • Reduction of water use for irrigation. • Composting production will contribute to increasing soil quality and fertility.

Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	NTR
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	<p>In case of any residual impacts, the following will be done. Soil Degradation (Residual Impact: localised erosion, reduced fertility in uncovered plots. It is planned to expand CRRP (SRI + SLWM) coverage to additional plots to reduce erosion risks. Introduce contour bunding, mulching, and agroforestry practices in erosion-prone areas and strengthen farmer training on soil conservation techniques and composting use. Clearing of Virgin Forest or Land (Residual Impact: small-scale clearing despite awareness). Remedial Actions are to enforce strict land-use screening before approving any USP to prevent encroachment. Collaborate with local forest authorities to monitor sensitive zones, increase the frequency of community awareness sessions, and introduce penalties for unauthorized clearing.</p> <p>Excessive Water Use (Residual Impact: inefficiencies in plots not fully adopting AWD/SRI). Remedial Actions: Provide additional training and demonstrations on Alternate Wetting and Drying (AWD). Install low-cost water monitoring devices in irrigation schemes to track usage and Incentivize farmers who adopt water-saving practices through cooperative support or input subsidies. Declining Soil Fertility (Residual Impact: underutilized or poorly maintained composting units). Remedial Actions: Establish community-managed composting hubs to ensure consistent production and use. Provide technical support on composting methods and integrate organic matter into soil fertility programs. Monitor composting units regularly and link them to farmer cooperatives for sustainability.</p>

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	NTR

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.	NTR

Section 4: Implementation arrangements

<p>What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?</p>	<p>Institutional Safeguard Systems OSS, as the accredited Regional Implementing Entity (RIE), assumed full oversight responsibility for ESP compliance. A safeguards focal point was appointed within the Regional Project Management Unit (RPMU) to coordinate safeguard activities across all 13 countries. Clear roles were defined for OSS, the Regional Executing Entity (RCoS-Rice), and National Executing Entities (NEEs) to ensure safeguards were mainstreamed at every level. Screening and Risk Assessment OSS applied the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) to screen all project activities. Potential risks (e.g., land use conflicts, biodiversity impacts, water management issues, gender-based vulnerabilities) were identified and categorized, and a risk matrix was developed, with mitigation measures tailored to each country's context. Screening and Risk Assessment Monitoring and Reporting Safeguard indicators were integrated into the Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework. OSS required sex-disaggregated and socially inclusive data to track impacts on vulnerable groups. Regular safeguard compliance reports were consolidated at the regional level and submitted to the Adaptation Fund. Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) OSS established a multi-level grievance mechanism accessible at the community, national, and regional levels. The mechanism was designed to be transparent, impartial, confidential, and predictable, ensuring trust among stakeholders. Complaints could be lodged through NEEs, local committees, or directly to OSS, with clear timelines for resolution. Stakeholder Engagement OSS ensured inclusive consultations with farmers, women's groups, NGOs, and vulnerable communities before project activities were rolled out. National Steering Committees (NSCs) included representatives from ministries of agriculture, environment, finance, and civil society, ensuring broad participation. Regional Steering Committee (RSC) meetings brought together ECOWAS, UEMOA, CILSS, farmer organizations, and research institutions to validate safeguard measures. Environmental Safeguards Climate-resilient rice production practices (CRRP, SRI, SLWM) were promoted to reduce environmental risks. Measures included sustainable water management (alternate wetting and drying), soil conservation, and biodiversity protection. Activities were screened to avoid encroachment on protected areas or critical habitats.</p>
<p>Have the implementation arrangements been effective during the reporting period?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to</p>	<p>Institutional Safeguard Systems Each NEE appointed an Environmental and Social (E&S) focal point</p>

implement the required ESP safeguard measures?

within its National Project Management Unit (NPMU). Dedicated gender and M&E experts were tasked with ensuring compliance with ESP requirements, alongside the national project coordinator. Screening and Risk Assessment NEEs applied the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) developed by OSS to screen all sub-projects. Country-specific risk assessments were conducted to identify potential impacts on land use, water resources, biodiversity, and vulnerable groups. Mitigation measures were documented in Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) at national level. Monitoring and Reporting NEEs integrated ESP indicators into their monitoring frameworks. Regular reporting included sex-disaggregated and socially inclusive data, ensuring transparency on who benefits from project activities. Safeguard compliance reports were submitted to OSS and consolidated at regional level. Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) Each NEE established a national grievance mechanism, aligned with OSS's regional framework. Complaints could be lodged at community level, escalated to national committees, and ultimately to OSS if unresolved. Mechanisms were designed to be accessible, impartial, confidential, and predictable. Stakeholder Engagement NEEs organized inclusive consultations with farmers, women's cooperatives, NGOs, and vulnerable groups before implementing activities. National Steering Committees (NSCs) included representatives from ministries of agriculture, environment, finance, and civil society to validate safeguard measures. Environmental Safeguards NEEs promoted climate-resilient rice production practices (CRRP, SRI, SLWM) to reduce environmental risks. Activities were screened to avoid encroachment on protected areas, critical habitats, or land conflicts. Sustainable water and soil management practices were integrated into national project activities. Sample integration detailed below: Benin (SG/MAEP & INRAB): Established safeguard committees at local rice-growing zones to monitor land and water use. Burkina Faso (Ministry of Agriculture): Integrated ESP compliance into national agricultural statistics systems for better tracking. Côte d'Ivoire (ANADER): Rolled out community-level grievance desks to handle complaints in rice-producing regions. Ghana (CSIR-SARI): Conducted environmental training for extension agents to ensure CRRP practices do not degrade ecosystems. Nigeria (ARCN): Partnered with local NGOs to strengthen safeguard monitoring and community awareness. Senegal (ANCAR): Linked grievance mechanisms with existing national environmental monitoring agencies for efficiency.

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?	Partially
Is the required capacity for ESMP implementation present and effective with the IE and the EE(s)? Please provide details.	Yes
Have all roles and responsibilities adequately been assigned and positions filled?	No
Has the overall ESMP been updated with the findings of the USPs that have been identified in this reporting period?	No

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
NTR							

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

Clarification on ESP/USPs During the reporting period, no new USPs were identified, approved, or implemented. Execution focused on activities already defined in the approved project design. This is consistent with the ESP section and overall narrative in the rating. We confirm that USP-related processes were not triggered during this period, as the pipeline of activities was limited to those already screened and approved under the ESMP. Arrangements for ESP Compliance Process Arrangements: The screening and approval process described in the ESMP remains in place. OSS and NEEs continue to apply the ESMF to all USPs, ensuring compliance with safeguards before execution. Capacity: Required capacity for ESMP implementation is present and effective within the IE and EE(s). NEEs have integrated ESP indicators into their monitoring frameworks, with regular reporting to OSS. Roles and Responsibilities: While core institutional roles are assigned, some positions remain unfilled, which has delayed full operationalisation of USP-related safeguards. Recruitment and assignment processes are ongoing. Updating ESMP: As no USPs were identified in this reporting period, the ESMP has not been updated with USP specific findings. Adaptive management provisions remain in place to integrate lessons learned once USPs are initiated.

Cross-Cutting Safeguard Measures Enhanced monitoring visits are planned to detect residual impacts early. Continuous training is being provided to NEEs, farmer groups, and extension agents on ESP compliance. Community-level grievance mechanisms have been established and linked to national/regional systems. Participatory consultations with local communities, women's groups, and vulnerable populations continue to ensure inclusivity. Biodiversity and health safeguards are being mainstreamed into project M&E systems, with indicators tracked and reported

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
Global Objective: Improve climate resilience and increase rice system productivity of smallholder rice farmers across West Africa using a climate-resilient rice production approach	Objective	Number of direct CRRP beneficiaries	0	At least 140,000 CRRP direct beneficiaries (at least 30% women and youth)	Satisfactory
Output 1.1.1. Climate change dimension and proposed actions integrated in the regional and national rice strategy documents	Output	% of women participation	0	More than 35% of participants are women	Satisfactory
Output 1.1.1. Climate change dimension and proposed actions integrated in the regional and national rice	Output	Number of women interviewed	0	More than 25% of interviewed stakeholders are women	Poor

strategy documents					
Outcome 1.2. Key stakeholders operating in different climate zones and rice systems gained tools, knowledge and skills to successfully address climate threats and implement CRRP in a sustainable way	Outcome	Number of institutions have their staff with increased capacity (gender disaggregated)	0	At least 5 institutions/country have improved capacity to scale-up CRRP (total of 65 institutions)	Poor
Output 1.2.1. Capacity of national and regional research centers strengthened	Output	Number of training sessions conducted (gender disaggregated participation)	0	28 training sessions conducted More than 45% of participants are women	Poor
Output 1.2.1. Capacity of national and regional research centers strengthened	Output	Number of exchange workshops (gender disaggregated participation)	0	26 exchange workshops More than 45% of participants are women	Satisfactory
Output 1.2.2. Institutional capacity of the regional and national executing entities for project implementation strengthened	Output	Number of capacity needs assessment studies (gender disaggregated interviews)	0	14 country and one regional capacity needs assessment	Good
Output 1.2.2. Institutional capacity of the regional and national executing entities for project implementation strengthened	Output	Number of regional technical workshops (gender disaggregated participation)	0	04 regional technical workshops	Poor
Output 1.2.2. Institutional capacity of the regional and national executing entities for project implementation	Output	Number of field exchange visits (gender disaggregated participation)	0	At least 06 field exchange visits/country (= total of 78) More than 40% of participants are women	Poor

strengthened					
Output 1.2.3. Extension institutions involved in the development and dissemination of SRI and CRRP strengthened	Output	Number of regional TOT workshops (gender disaggregated participation)	0	4 regional ToT workshops More than 40% of participants are women	Satisfactory
Output 1.2.3. Extension institutions involved in the development and dissemination of SRI and CRRP strengthened	Output	Number of national trainings (gender disaggregated participation)	0	52 national trainings More than 45% of participants are women	Poor
Output 1.2.3. Extension institutions involved in the development and dissemination of SRI and CRRP strengthened	Output	Number of trainers trained (gender disaggregated participation)	0	At least 39 trainers trained (at regional level) (3/country) More than 45% of participants are women	Satisfactory
Output 2.1.1. Smallholder rice farmers in the project zones strengthened their livelihoods by reducing production costs and improving rice yields through the adoption of SRI and CRRP	Output	Number of trainings for smallholder farmers (disaggregated by gender and youth)	0	48 farmer trainings held/country	Satisfactory
Output 2.1.1. Smallholder rice farmers in the project zones strengthened their livelihoods by reducing production costs and improving rice yields through the adoption of SRI and CRRP	Output	Percentage of trained farmers (disaggregated by gender and youth)	0	At least 80% farmers trainers trained	Satisfactory
Output 2.1.1. Smallholder rice farmers in the	Output	Percentage of farmers technically	0	At least 80% of farmers technically	Poor

project zones strengthened their livelihoods by reducing production costs and improving rice yields through the adoption of SRI and CRRP		assisted in their fields (disaggregated by gender and youth)		assisted in their fields	
Output 2.1.1. Smallholder rice farmers in the project zones strengthened their livelihoods by reducing production costs and improving rice yields through the adoption of SRI and CRRP	Output	Number of local nurseries established (gender disaggregated property)	0	At least 520 of nurseries are created at the local level	Poor
Output 2.1.1. Smallholder rice farmers in the project zones strengthened their livelihoods by reducing production costs and improving rice yields through the adoption of SRI and CRRP	Output	Number of local composting units (gender disaggregated property)	0	At least 260 of composting units are created at the local level	Poor
Output 2.1.1. Smallholder rice farmers in the project zones strengthened their livelihoods by reducing production costs and improving rice yields through the adoption of SRI and CRRP	Output	Number of equipment packages distributed to farmers /country (disaggregated by gender and youth beneficiaries)	0	13 equipment packages distributed to farmers /country More than 50% of participants are women/girls	Poor
Output 2.2.1. Rice production and post-harvest components in the rice value-	Output	Number of private sector partners engaged with/country (disaggregated	0	6 private sector partners engaged with/country	Poor

chain strengthened		by gender)			
Output 2.2.1. Rice production and post-harvest components in the rice value-chain strengthened	Output	Number of stakeholder meetings held (disaggregated by gender)	0	10 Number of stakeholder meetings held/country	Poor
Output 2.2.1. Rice production and post-harvest components in the rice value-chain strengthened	Output	Number of capacities strengthening workshops held (disaggregated by gender)	0	6 capacity strengthening workshops held/country More than 35% of participants are women	Poor
Output 2.2.1. Rice production and post-harvest components in the rice value-chain strengthened	Output	Number of direct beneficiaries from PPP partnerships (disaggregated by gender)	0	At least 80 direct beneficiaries from PPP partnerships/country More than 35% of beneficiaries are women	Poor
Output 2.2.1. Rice production and post-harvest components in the rice value-chain strengthened	Output	Number of PPP supported with equipment (disaggregated by gender)	0	65 PPP supported with equipment More than 45% of beneficiaries are women	Poor
Output 2.2.2. Agricultural associations and cooperatives in the rice value chain strengthened in their operations	Output	Number of newly formalized FOs (disaggregated by gender)	0	At least 6 new FOs formalized/country	Good
Output 2.2.2. Agricultural associations and cooperatives in the rice value chain strengthened in their operations	Output	Number of business plans developed (disaggregated by gender)	0	5 business plans developed/country	Poor
Output 2.2.2. Agricultural associations and cooperatives in the rice value chain strengthened in	Output	Number of trainings to farmer organizations (FO) (disaggregated by gender)	0	10 trainings to FO /country (=total of 130 trainings) More than 50% of beneficiaries are women	Satisfactory

their operations					
Output 2.2.2. Agricultural associations and cooperatives in the rice value chain strengthened in their operations	Output	Number of assisted FOs to access credit and subsidies (disaggregated by gender)	0	At least 06 credits accessed by FOs/country	Poor
Output 3.1.1. Knowledge and awareness materials developed and widely disseminated, in response to the demand and needs of different stakeholder groups	Output	Communication strategy (national and regional level) (gender disaggregated reach)	0	1 regional and 13 national communication strategies More than 50% of beneficiaries are women/Youth	Satisfactory
Output 3.1.1. Knowledge and awareness materials developed and widely disseminated, in response to the demand and needs of different stakeholder groups	Output	Number of knowledge-products produced (gender disaggregated reach)	0	At least 8 knowledge products produced per country (=total of 104) At least 16 knowledge products produced at regional level More than 50% of beneficiaries are women/Youth	Satisfactory
Output 3.1.1. Knowledge and awareness materials developed and widely disseminated, in response to the demand and needs of different stakeholder groups	Output	Number of field visits organized (disaggregated by gender)	0	At least 05 field visits organized/country More than 45% of participants are women/youth	Poor
Output 3.1.1. Knowledge and awareness materials developed and widely disseminated, in	Output	Number of policy briefs written and disseminated (gender disaggregated reach)	0	13 national policy briefs 3 regional policy briefs More than 50% of beneficiaries are women/Youth	Poor

response to the demand and needs of different stakeholder groups					
Output 3.2.1. Synergies among partners established to mainstream CRRP in West Africa	Output	Number coalition building meetings(disaggregated by gender)	0	Total of 8 coalition building meetings More than 45% of participants are women/youth	Poor
Output 3.2.1. Synergies among partners established to mainstream CRRP in West Africa	Output	Number of people participating to international events (disaggregated by gender)	0	9 people participate in 4 international events	Poor
Output 3.2.1. Synergies among partners established to mainstream CRRP in West Africa	Output	National CRRP network functional (disaggregated by gender)	0	13 national CRRP networks	Poor

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
<p>Access to Land and Productive Resources Women farmers often lack secure land tenure due to customary laws and patriarchal inheritance systems. This limits their ability to expand rice cultivation and discourages investment in climate-smart practices. Access to Finance and Credit Financial institutions frequently require collateral that women do not possess, making it difficult for them to access loans. As a result, women remain dependent on informal savings groups, which restricts their capacity to scale up production. Capacity Building and Training Agricultural extension services are often male-dominated, leaving women underrepresented in training programs. This exclusion reduces their knowledge of climate-resilient rice techniques and perpetuates productivity gaps. Participation in Decision-Making Cultural norms and</p>	Satisfactory	<p>Access to Land and Productive Resources Progress was made through community sensitization campaigns and negotiations with traditional leaders, which opened opportunities for women to access communal rice plots. Pilot initiatives in several countries demonstrated that women's cooperatives could successfully manage land, setting a precedent for wider replication. Capacity Building and Training Gender sensitive training is integrated into farmer field schools, ensuring women's participation is prioritised. Women farmers have received hands-on training to</p>

<p>gender stereotypes often prevent women from holding leadership positions in cooperatives or producer organizations. Consequently, their voices are marginalized in project governance and policy dialogues, Market Access and Value Chain Inclusion Women are frequently excluded from higher value segments of the rice value chain, such as processing and marketing. This exclusion keeps them confined to subsistence farming and prevents them from increasing household income.</p>		<p>strengthen their technical skills. Participation in Decision Making The project has introduced gender quotas in farmer organisations and project committees, ensuring women’s representation in leadership roles. helping them gain confidence and influence in decision-making spaces.</p>
--	--	--

Section 3: Implementation arrangements

<p>What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP</p>	<p>Institutional Arrangements: Gender considerations were embedded into the project’s governance and reporting structures, ensuring accountability at all levels. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Gender-sensitive indicators were integrated into the Results Framework, allowing systematic tracking of women’s participation and benefits. Regular reporting included sex-disaggregated data on beneficiaries, training participants, and leadership roles. Participation & Representation OSS ensured that women were represented in project steering committees, farmer cooperatives, and decision-making bodies. Quotas and affirmative measures were introduced to guarantee women’s voices in governance processes. Partnerships & Collaboration OSS collaborated with national ministries of agriculture and women’s affairs to align project activities with national gender strategies.</p>
<p>Have the implementation arrangements at the IE been effective during the reporting period?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP?</p>	<p>Institutional Gender Focal Points Each NEE designated a gender focal person or unit within the project team to oversee gender mainstreaming. Integration of Gender-Sensitive Indicators NEEs incorporated sex-disaggregated indicators into their monitoring and evaluation frameworks. This allows for the systematic tracking of women’s participation in training, leadership, and access to resources. Inclusive Participation Mechanisms NEEs ensured women’s representation in national steering committees, farmer cooperatives, and local project governance structures. Affirmative measures (such as targeted invitations) were used to guarantee women’s voices in decision-making. Partnerships with Women’s Organizations NEEs collaborated with national ministries of women’s affairs, local NGOs, and women’s cooperatives. These partnerships ensured grassroots engagement and sustainability of gender outcomes.</p>
<p>Have the implementation arrangements at the EE(s) been effective during the reporting period?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Have any capacity gaps affecting GP compliance</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>been identified during the reporting period and if so, what remediation was implemented?</p>	<p>Comments: Limited Institutional Gender Expertise Many NEEs lacked dedicated gender specialists or staff trained in gender mainstreaming. This made it difficult to consistently apply the GP across all project activities. Weak Gender-Disaggregated Data Systems Monitoring and evaluation frameworks initially did not capture sex-disaggregated data adequately. This limited the ability to measure women’s participation and benefits accurately. Insufficient Awareness of GP Requirements Some project staff and local partners were not fully familiar with the Adaptation Fund’s Gender Policy. This led to inconsistent integration of gender considerations in planning and reporting. These were remedied by strengthening M&E Systems Sex-disaggregated indicators were integrated into national monitoring frameworks. NEEs received technical support to collect and report gender data systematically. Awareness & Sensitization Community dialogues and sensitization campaigns were conducted to challenge restrictive norms. Women’s participation was actively promoted in farmer field schools and project committees. The RIE, in conjunction with the REEs plan a gender mainstreaming module to be incorporated into the next regional training for NEEs, project staff, and extension agents. This will focus on GP requirements, gender-sensitive project design, and monitoring tools.</p>
---	---

Section 4: Grievances

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

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

Comments

Rating

Implementing Entity

<p>Project components/outcomes</p>	<p>Alignment with AF</p>	<p>Expected Progress</p>	<p>Progress to date</p>	<p>Comments</p>	<p>Rating</p>
------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------	---------------

	outcomes				
Output 1.1.1. Climate change dimension and proposed actions integrated into the regional and national rice strategy documents	Outcome 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 studies completed (Recommendations integrated in the 13 NRDS) • 13 National validation meetings completed • 02 regional validation workshops completed • More than 35% of participants are women • More than 25% of interviewed stakeholders are women 	Delayed	None of the planned studies, validation meetings, or regional workshops have been completed to date. Gender participation and stakeholder interview quotas have not yet been measured or reported. This explains the full delay in achieving the outcome, as all core deliverables remain pending.	Unsatisfactory
Output 1.2.1. Capacity of national and regional research centers strengthened	Outcome 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 04 research projects completed/country (= total of 52) • 28 training sessions conducted. More than 45% of participants are women • 12 training modules developed and published • 8 scientific articles published • 26 exchange workshops, More than 45% of participants are women 	Delayed	<p>Research Projects: 4 projects are ongoing (not yet completed).</p> <p>Training Sessions: Numerous sessions conducted; Nigeria has held more than 4, Ghana 4, etc. Participation quotas exceeded, with >50% of participants being women.</p> <p>Training Modules: Over 8 modules have been developed and published.</p> <p>Scientific Articles: 3 publications are currently being drafted and will soon undergo review.</p> <p>Exchange Workshops: None conducted yet.</p> <p>Summary: Progress is strong in training sessions and gender participation, with modules already published and scientific articles in preparation. However, research projects remain incomplete, and exchange</p>	Unsatisfactory

				workshops have not yet started, contributing to delays in fully achieving the outcome	
Output 1.2.2. Institutional capacity of the regional and national executing entities for project implementation strengthened	Outcome 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •14 countries and one regional capacity needs assessment •04 regional technical workshops •At least 06 field exchange visits/country (= total of 78) More than 40% of participants are women •13 data collection kits •01 operational regional communication hub •CRE-Riz established 	Delayed	Progress has been made on capacity needs assessments and partial delivery of regional workshops. However, critical components such as field exchange visits, data collection kits, the regional communication hub, and CRE-Riz establishment remain pending. These gaps explain the delay in achieving the full outcome.	Satisfactory
Output 1.2.3. Extension institutions involved in the development and dissemination of SRI and CRRP strengthened	Outcome 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •4 regional ToT workshops, more than 40% of participants are women •52 national trainings, more than 45% of participants are women •At least 39 trainers trained (at regional level) (3/country), more than 45% of participants are women •At least 7 training modules produced •13 training kits (equipment, material) 	Delayed	Training Kits: None produced/distributed yet (target: 13). Progress is strong in national trainings and trainer development, with gender participation quotas consistently met. Training module development is nearly complete. However, gaps remain in regional ToT workshops, training kits, and the total number of national trainings, which explains the delay in fully achieving the outcome.	Unsatisfactory
Output 2.1.1. Smallholder rice farmers in the project zones strengthened their livelihoods by reducing production costs and	Outcome 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •48 farmer trainings held/country •At least 80% farmers trained •At least 7 extension material packages distributed •At least 	Delayed	Farmer Trainings: 24 Extension Materials: 5 packages distributed. Technical	Unsatisfactory

<p>improving rice yields through the adoption of SRI and CRRP</p>		<p>80% of farmers are technically assisted in their fields •At least 60% of CRRP farmers produce rice seed and organic fertilizer •At least 80% of CRRP farmers adopt more than two SLWM practices in their fields •At least 520 of nurseries are created at the local level •At least 260 composting units are created at the local level •13 equipment packages distributed to farmers /country, more than 50% of participants are women/girls</p>		<p>Assistance: Approx 30% of farmers assisted (target: 80%). Rice Seed & Fertilizer Production: Approx 15% of CRRP farmers producing (target: 60%). SLWM Practices Adoption: 30% of CRRP farmers adopting >2 practices (target: 80%). Nurseries: 80 created (target: 520). Composting Units: 20 created (target: 260). Equipment Packages: 0 distributed (target: 13). Gender Participation: >50% of participants are women/girls (quota met). Summary: While gender participation quotas are being met, progress remains significantly below target in most areas. Farmer trainings, extension materials, and adoption of SLWM practices show partial advancement, but technical assistance, rice seed/fertilizer production, nursery creation, composting units, and equipment distribution are far behind expectations. These gaps explain the delay in achieving the intended outcome</p>	
<p>Output 2.1.2. Adopted SRI and CRRP practices by smallholder farmers are monitored, analyzed</p>	<p>Outcome 4</p>	<p>•13 M&E experts are collecting data •Equipment for the data tracking mechanism</p>	<p>Delayed</p>	<p>Summary: Baseline studies have been completed, and M&E experts are</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory</p>

and the results widely shared		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • installed and operational • 14 Baseline studies established • 67 training sessions on M&E system and data collection • 4-yearly M&E reports by 13 NEE and the REE 		<p>positioned within national entities. However, the absence of training, operational data tracking equipment, and standardized reporting mechanisms is delaying progress. Without these, there is a risk of fragmented data and weak indicator alignment, which explains the delay in achieving the intended outcome.</p>	
Output 2.2.1. Rice production and post-harvest components in the rice value-chain strengthened	Outcome 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 private sector partners engaged with/country • 10 Number of stakeholder meetings held/country • 6 capacity strengthening workshops held/country • More than 35% of participants are women • At least 80 direct beneficiaries from PPP partnerships/ country, more than 35% of beneficiaries are women • 65 PPP supported with equipment, more than 45% of beneficiaries are women 	Delayed	<p>Summary: Engagement with private sector partners is underway, and gender participation quotas are being met in workshops. However, stakeholder meetings and workshops remain below target, and there are no direct beneficiaries or equipment support from PPP partnerships yet. These gaps explain the delay in achieving the intended outcome.</p>	Unsatisfactory
Output 2.2.2. Agricultural associations and cooperatives in the rice value chain strengthened in their operations	Outcome 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 6 new FOs formalized/country • 5 business plans developed/ country • 10 trainings to FO /country (=total of 130 trainings), more than 50% of beneficiaries are women • At least 06 credits accessed by FOs/country 	Delayed	<p>Summary: Significant progress has been achieved in formalizing FOs, with Ghana and Nigeria exceeding targets. Gender participation quotas are being met in trainings. However, business plan development, training scale-up, and credit access remain unfulfilled.</p>	Satisfactory

				These gaps explain the delay in fully achieving the intended outcome.	
Output 3.1.1. Knowledge and awareness materials developed and widely disseminated, in response to the demand and needs of different stakeholder groups	Outcome 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •1 regional and 13 national communication strategies More than 50% of beneficiaries are women/Youth •At least 8 knowledge products produced per country (=total of 104) At least 16 knowledge products produced at regional level. More than 50% of beneficiaries are women/Youth •01 Project portal operational •At least 05 field visits organized/country. More than 45% of participants are women/youth •13 national policy briefs and 3 regional policy briefs. More than 50% of beneficiaries are women/Youth 	Delayed	National communication strategies and gender participation quotas have been achieved. However, knowledge product development is below target, and critical deliverables—including the regional communication strategy, project portal, field visits, and policy briefs—remain pending. These gaps explain the delay in achieving the intended outcome	Unsatisfactory
Output 3.2.1. Synergies among partners established to mainstream CRRP in West Africa	Outcome 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Total of 8 coalition-building meetings. More than 45% of participants are women/youth •9 people participate in 4 international events •13 national CRRP networks 	Delayed	<p>Progress to Date:</p> <p>Coalition-Building Meetings: None held yet (target: 8). International Events: No participation to date (target: 9 people across 4 events). National CRRP Networks: 13 in the process of being established.</p> <p>Summary: The establishment of national CRRP networks is currently underway. However, coalition-building meetings and international event participation have not yet started, leaving major gaps</p>	Unsatisfactory

				in stakeholder engagement and international visibility. These delays explain the partial achievement of the outcome	
--	--	--	--	---	--

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

Name	Email
Mrs. Khaoula Jaoui	khaoula.jaoui@oss.org.tn

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

The rating for Year 2 is Marginally Satisfactory. Following the foundational challenges of Year 1, the RICOWAS project has entered a pivotal second year, transitioning from a purely administrative setup to concrete field execution, marked by a clear divide between high-performing entities and those still navigating coordination hurdles. Positive Progress A significant turning point this year is the high level of performance from six national executing entities that have successfully cleared the administrative backlog. These countries have moved into the "Foundational Activity" phase with impressive speed: Demonstration Fields: These entities have established active field sites, applying Climate-Resilient Rice Production (CRRP) techniques in real-time. Machinery Testing: Technical teams in these six countries are currently on-site testing and adapting specialised rice-production machinery to local conditions. Proactive Management: These lead countries have demonstrated a much-improved grasp of the "no-objection" procedures, leading to faster fund mobilisation. Operationalising the technical expertise of Cornell University alongside the GRIT Team has significantly advanced the review and identification of best practices for SRI methodology, as well as associated land and water management practices. The team is on course to revise and update existing modules while developing new technical training resources. The integration of Cornell University has been a game-changer for field activities, shifting its role from planning to active implementation. Their contributions have focused on: Training & Capacity Building: Launching the first wave of specialised training, which directly enabled the establishment of demonstration fields. Scientific Rigour: Providing the technical anchoring necessary for national teams to move from theory to high-standard field trials. Negative Progress Persistent coordination lapses continue to undermine progress at the regional level. While the Regional Executing Entity (CRS-Riz/IER) is moving toward operational status, it is not yet fully capable of providing the close-range support required by national teams. Similarly, the Regional Executing Entity (REE) remains incomplete, leaving gaps in coordination with countries and in the standardisation of activities. Key functions that should have originated from the REE, such as establishing mechanisms for reliable monitoring and data collection, are still pending. The absence of a comprehensive data-tracking methodology, including an app and automated dashboard system, has resulted in scattered data collection confined to national levels, with limited integration across the region. Moreover, the REE has yet to establish an operational mechanism for convening and regularly exchanging with partners engaged in scaling up CRRP in West Africa. Without this, opportunities to build alliances, foster synergies, and avoid duplication remain underutilised. Reporting delays further compound these challenges: the lack of a fully operational regional entity hampers real time monitoring and contributes to gaps in the timely submission of both technical and financial reports.

Executing Entity / Project Coordinator

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating	
Output 1.1.1. Climate	Outcome 7	• 15 studies completed	Delayed	Progress to	Highly

<p>change dimension and proposed actions integrated into the regional and national rice strategy documents</p>		<p>(Recommendations integrated in the 13 NRDS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13 National validation meetings completed • 02 regional validation workshops completed • More than 35% of participants are women • More than 25% of interviewed stakeholders are women </p>		<p>Date: Studies: 0 completed (recommendations not yet integrated). National Validation Meetings: 0 completed. Regional Validation Workshops: 0 completed. Gender Participation: No data yet available on women's participation or stakeholder interviews.</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory</p>
<p>Output 1.2.1. Capacity of national and regional research centers strengthened</p>	<p>Outcome 2</p>	<p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •04 research projects completed/country (= total of 52) •28 training sessions conducted. More than 45% of participants are women •12 training modules developed and published •8 scientific articles published •26 exchange workshops More than 45% of participants are women </p>	<p>Delayed</p>	<p>Research Projects: 4 projects are ongoing (not yet completed). Training Sessions: Numerous sessions conducted; Nigeria has held more than 4, Ghana 4, etc. Participation quotas exceeded, with >50% of participants being women. Training Modules: Over 8 modules have been developed and published. Scientific Articles: 3 publications are currently being drafted and will soon undergo review.</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory</p>

				Exchange Workshops: None conducted yet	
Output 1.2.2. Institutional capacity of the regional and national executing entities for project implementation strengthened	Outcome 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •14 country and one regional capacity needs assessment •04 regional technical workshops •At least 06 field exchange visits/country (= total of 78) More than 40% of participants are women •13 data collection kits •01 operational regional communication hub •CRE-Riz established 	Delayed	Progress has been made on capacity needs assessments and partial delivery of regional workshops. However, critical components such as field exchange visits, data collection kits, the regional communication hub, and CRE-Riz establishment remain pending. These gaps explain the delay in achieving the full outcome.	Satisfactory
Output 1.2.3. Extension institutions involved in the development and dissemination of SRI and CRRP strengthened	Outcome 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •4 regional ToT workshops, more than 40% of participants are women •52 national trainings, more than 45% of participants are women •At least 39 trainers trained (at regional level) (3/country), more than 45% of participants are women •At least 7 training modules produced •13 training kits (equipment, material) 	Delayed	Training Kits: None produced/distributed yet (target: 13). Progress is strong in national trainings and trainer development, with gender participation quotas consistently met. Training module development is nearly complete. However, gaps remain in regional ToT workshops, training kits,	Satisfactory

				and the total number of national trainings, which explains the delay in fully achieving the outcome.	
Output 2.1.1. Smallholder rice farmers in the project zones strengthened their livelihoods by reducing production costs and improving rice yields through the adoption of SRI and CRRP	Outcome 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •48 farmer trainings held/country •At least 80% farmers trainers trained •At least 7 extension material packages distributed •At least 80% of farmers technically assisted in their fields •At least 60% of CRRP farmers produce rice seed and organic fertilizer •At least 80% of CRRP farmers adopt more than two SLWM practices in their fields •At least 520 of nurseries are created at the local level •At least 260 of composting units are created at the local level •13 equipment packages distributed to farmers /country, more than 50% of participants are women/girls 	Delayed	<p>Farmer Trainings: 24</p> <p>Extension Materials: 5 packages distributed.</p> <p>Technical Assistance: Approx 30% of farmers assisted (target: 80%).</p> <p>Rice Seed & Fertilizer Production: Approx 15% of CRRP farmers producing (target: 60%).</p> <p>SLWM Practices Adoption: 30% of CRRP farmers adopting >2 practices (target: 80%).</p> <p>Nurseries: 80 created (target: 520).</p> <p>Composting Units: 20 created (target: 260).</p> <p>Equipment Packages: 0 distributed (target: 13).</p> <p>Gender Participation: >50% of participants are women/girls (quota met).</p>	Unsatisfactory
Output 2.1.2. Adopted SRI and CRRP practices by smallholder farmers	Outcome 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •13 M&E experts are collecting data •Equipment for data tracking 	Delayed	<p>Progress to Date: M&E Experts: 13</p>	Unsatisfactory

<p>are monitored, analyzed and the results widely shared</p>		<p>mechanism installed and operational •14 Baseline studies established •67 training sessions on M&E system and data collection •4 yearly M&E reports by 13 NEE and the REE</p>		<p>experts are in place within national entities, but they have not yet received training to collate project data from the regional entity. This poses risks of lack of standardization and inconsistent indicators. Data Tracking Equipment: Not yet installed or operational. Baseline Studies: 14 established (target met). Training Sessions: None held yet (target: 67). M&E Reports: None developed to date.</p>
<p>Output 2.2.1. Rice production and post-harvest components in the rice value-chain strengthened</p>	<p>Outcome 6</p>	<p>•6 private sector partners engaged with/country •10 Number of stakeholder meetings held/country •6 capacity strengthening workshops held/country More than 35% of participants are women •At least 80 direct beneficiaries from PPP partnerships/ country, more than 35% of beneficiaries are women •65 PPP supported with equipment, more than 45% of beneficiaries are women</p>	<p>Delayed</p> <p>Private Sector Partners: Most countries have engaged partners (target: 6 per country). Stakeholder Meetings: 3 held per country (target: 10). Capacity Strengthening Workshops: 3 conducted per country, with >35% women participants (target: 6). PPP Beneficiaries: None yet (target: 80 per</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory</p>

				country). PPP Equipment Support: None yet (target: 65).	
Output 2.2.2. Agricultural associations and cooperatives in the rice value chain strengthened in their operations	Outcome 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •At least 6 new FOs formalized/country •5 business plans developed/country •10 trainings to FO /country (=total of 130 trainings), more than 50% of beneficiaries are women •At least 06 credits accessed by FOs/country 	Delayed	<p>Progress to Date: FOs Formalized: Over 50 new FOs formalized in Ghana and Nigeria; some countries have reached 10 (target exceeded in certain countries).</p> <p>Business Plans: None developed yet (target: 5 per country).</p> <p>Trainings: 2 trainings conducted per country, with >50% women beneficiaries (target: 10 per country).</p> <p>Credits Accessed: None accessed yet (target: 6 per country).</p>	Satisfactory
Output 3.1.1. Knowledge and awareness materials developed and widely disseminated, in response to the demand and needs of different stakeholder groups	Outcome 3	<p>1 regional and 13 national communication strategies</p> <p>More than 50% of beneficiaries are women/Youth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •At least 8 knowledge products produced per country (=total of 104) At least 16 knowledge products produced at regional level. More than 50% of beneficiaries are women/Youth •01 Project portal operational •At least 05 field visits organized/country. More than 45% of participants are women/youth •13 national policy briefs and 3 regional policy briefs. More than 	Delayed	<p>Progress to Date: Communication Strategies: 13 national strategies completed (regional strategy pending).</p> <p>Gender Participation: >50% of beneficiaries are women/youth (quota met).</p> <p>Knowledge Products: 3 produced per</p>	Marginally Unsatisfactory

		50% of beneficiaries are women/Youth		country (target: 8 per country; regional products pending). Project Portal: Not yet operational. Field Visits: None organized yet (target: 5 per country). Policy Briefs: None developed yet (target: 13 national, 3 regional).	
Output 3.2.1. Synergies among partners established to mainstream CRRP in West Africa	Outcome 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Total of 8 coalition building meetings. More than 45% of participants are women/youth •9 people participate in 4 international events •13 national CRRP networks 	Delayed	Progress to Date: Coalition-Building Meetings: None held yet (target: 8). International Events: No participation to date (target: 9 people across 4 events). National CRRP Networks: 13 in the process of being established.	Marginally Unsatisfactory

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

Name	Email	Institution
Karim Traore, Erika Styger,	kartraore@yahoo.com,eds8@cornell.edu	IER-CSR-RIZ,

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

The rating for Year 2 is Marginally satisfactory. The second year of the RICOWAS project has been defined by a shift from institutional design to field action. While Year 1 was marked by administrative hurdles, Year 2 has seen most of the beneficiary countries break ground and start on executing some of the core activities

I. Current Progress: Institutional Strengthening & Human Capital, the countries have moved beyond identifying farmers to actively capacitating them. The countries with findings from the baseline study and further activities to reinforce and assist in the establishment of agricultural associations and cooperatives, all the countries have/will conduct a review of Farmer Based Organisations (FBOs) in all their operational areas, identifying specific governance challenges and training needs. Agricultural Extension Agents (AEAs) in all the countries will have been trained as Local ToTs, equipped with logistics (fuel and materials) to

conduct community step-down training. This network is expected to reach a target of 100 farmers per trainer, ensuring the project's "philosophy" reaches the grassroots level. Field-Level Technical Delivery Demonstration plots and field-farmer schools have been realised in almost all the countries, and these fields are and will be used to deliver the specialised package of technologies: SRI & CRRP: System of Rice Intensification and climate-resilient practices. Resource Management: Integrated soil fertility management, irrigation scheduling, and pest/disease control. Resilience: Focus on drought-resistant traits and early-maturing varieties to mitigate climate volatility. The Baseline Assessment Report using mixed-method surveys (FGDs and Key Informant Interviews) has been completed for all countries except Burkina Faso. This provides the empirical "ground truth" needed to measure impact. Furthermore, preliminary surveys for private sector partnerships, covering agri-input services and machinery, are already underway. The Year Ahead While the foundation is solid, Year 3 will focus on converting these technical gains into a self-sustaining value chain. The transition will follow a clear integrative logic: From Training to Policy: The technical data gathered from our AEAs and Master Trainers will be synthesised into Rice Sector Briefs and Policy Advocacy Briefs. These documents will use our real-world field results to influence national climate adaptation strategies. From Demonstrations to Regional Scaling: The current national field sites will become hubs for Regional Exchange Visits. This allows countries to cross-pollinate "good practices," ensuring that the 13 nations move forward as a cohesive bloc rather than isolated entities. From Assessments to Market Reality: The preliminary private sector surveys will now mature into Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs). We will link our reinforced cooperatives directly to companies for the supply of organic fertilisers, seeds, and specialised SRI equipment. From Field Days to Digital Tracking: The manual reporting of Year 2 will be integrated into a centralised CRRP Tracking Database. This platform will publish Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) on the project website, ensuring transparency and attracting further investment. From Harvest to Value Addition: Our focus on post-harvest management in Year 2 will scale into PPPs for threshing, processing, and packaging, specifically designed to improve the livelihoods of vulnerable groups and enhance market competitiveness. The activities initiated this year, particularly the establishment of FBOs and the ToT network, are the essential infrastructure required for the next phase. Without the cooperatives we are currently reinforcing, the upcoming agricultural credits and subsidies would have no vehicle for delivery. Without the demo fields currently being monitored, there would be no evidence-based content for the radio shows, videos, and maps planned for the coming months.

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

Unsatisfactory

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

Year 2 Performance Review: RICOWAS Project: Marginally Satisfactory Executive Summary: From Setup to Ground-Level Momentum While the project faced significant delays in Year 1 due to complex

institutional arrangements across 13 distinct national frameworks, Year 2 marks a critical pivot point. The rating of "Marginally Satisfactory" reflects that while we are not yet at full capacity across all 13 countries, the project has successfully transitioned from a stationary administrative phase to an active execution phase. Concrete results are now visible, providing a clear "proof of concept" that justifies increased confidence in the project's trajectory. Evidence of Acceleration (The "Satisfactory" Elements) Establishment of Demonstration Fields: The "lead" countries (including Nigeria, Ghana, and Senegal) have moved rapidly into the field. Demonstration plots are now showcasing Climate-Resilient Rice Production (CRRP) and System of Rice Intensification (SRI) techniques to thousands of local farmers. Innovation in Action: We have moved beyond procurement to machinery testing. Technical teams are currently calibrating weeders and transplanters in real-world soil conditions, ensuring technology is "locally fit" before mass dissemination. The Cornell Advantage: The full integration of Cornell University has professionalized capacity building. Their involvement has turned training manuals into active field protocols, bridging the gap between high-level research and practical farming. Financial & Administrative Stabilization: The "no-objection" bottlenecks have largely been cleared. Funding is now reaching National Executing Entities (NEEs) consistently, and technical reporting has seen a measurable increase in quality and timeliness. The Path to "Satisfactory": The primary reason for the "Marginally" prefix is the uneven progress across the 13-country bloc. To elevate the project to a full Satisfactory rating in the next cycle, a Peer-to-Peer (P2P) Monitoring & Mentoring Strategy is being implemented: Regional Peer-Mentoring: Countries currently showing high performance will be "twinned" with lagging entities. This peer-level support will focus on overcoming specific administrative and field-level hurdles that national coordinators in the "lead" countries have already navigated. Targeted Monitoring: We are shifting from generic regional oversight to country-specific coaching. Mentors from Cornell and the Regional Executing Entity (REE) will provide intensive support to the 7 countries still in the early stages of field establishment. Regional Knowledge Exchanges: Organized field visits will allow coordinators from lagging countries to see established demo plots in neighboring nations, reducing the "learning curve" for SRI implementation. The foundation is now firmly laid. With the technical oversight of Cornell University and a stabilized financial pipeline, the project is no longer "stuck" in preparation. By leveraging the successes of the top-performing countries to mentor their peers, we are ensuring that the entire West African region moves toward rice self-sufficiency as a unified front.

Project Indicators

List of indicators

Type of Indicator (indicators towards Objectives, Outcomes, etc...)	Indicator	Baseline	Progress Since Inception	Target for Project End
Objectives	Number of direct CRRP beneficiaries	0	50,745	At least 140,000 CRRP direct beneficiaries (at least 30% women and youth).
Objectives	% rice yield increase with CRRP	0	To be reported at project end	50% yield increase.
Objectives	Number of climate-resilient practices / technologies adopted.	0	12	At least 12 CRRP practices/ technologies adopted
Outcomes	Outcome 1.1.: Number of National Rice Strategies	0	0	All 13 countries have integrated climate change

	(NRDS) part of the Rice Offensive having integrated climate change dimension			dimension in their NRDS
Outputs	Output 1.1.1: Number of studies	0	0	15 studies completed (Recommendations integrated in the 13 NRDS)
Outputs	Output 1.1.1: Number of national validation meetings	0	0	13 National validation meetings completed
Outputs	Output 1.1.1: Number of regional validation workshops	0	0	02 regional validation workshops completed
Outputs	Output 1.1.1: % of women participation	0	0	More than 35% of participants are women
Outputs	Output 1.1.1: Number of women interviewed	0	0	More than 25% of interviewed stakeholders are women
Outcomes	Outcome 1.2.: Number of rice value-chain stakeholders increase capacity to scale-up CRRP	0	16	At least 52 researchers, 39 trainers and 26 NEE and 04 REE staff with strengthened capacity in CRRP
Outcomes	Outcome 1.2.: Number of institutions have their staff with increased capacity (gender disaggregated)	0	14	At least 5 institutions/country have improved capacity to scale-up CRRP (total of 65 institutions)
Outcomes	Outcome 1.2.: CRRP regional research group operational	0	1	The regional research group is operational
Outputs	Output 1.2.1.: Number of research projects implemented	0	0	04 research projects completed/country (= total of 52)
Outputs	Output 1.2.1.: Number of training sessions conducted (gender disaggregated participation)	0	5	28 training sessions conducted More than 45% of participants are women
Outputs	Output 1.2.1.: Number of new training modules	0	4	12 training modules developed and published
Outputs	Output 1.2.1.:	0	3 drafts produced	8 scientific articles

	Number of scientific articles published		and are currently being reviewed	published
Outputs	Output 1.2.1.: Number of exchange workshops (gender disaggregated participation)	0	4	26 exchange workshops More than 45% of participants are women
Outputs	Output 1.2.2.: Number of capacity needs assessment studies (gender disaggregated interviews)	0	12 national capacity needs assessments conducted	14 country and one regional capacity needs assessment
Outputs	Output 1.2.2.: Number of regional technical workshops (gender disaggregated participation)	0	2 regional technical workshops conducted to date	04 regional technical workshops
Outputs	Output 1.2.2.: Number of field exchange visits (gender disaggregated participation)	0	11	At least 06 field exchange visits/country (= total of 78) More than 40% of participants are women
Outputs	Output 1.2.2.: Number of data collection kits	0	7	13 data collection kits
Outputs	Output 1.2.2.: Regional communication hub functional	0	0	01 operational regional communication hub
Outputs	Output 1.2.2.: CRS-Riz advanced its status to CRE-Riz	0	0	CRE-Riz established
Outputs	Output 1.2.3.: Number of regional TOT workshops (gender disaggregated participation)	0	2 regional technical workshops conducted to date % of participants are women?	4 regional ToT workshops More than 40% of participants are women
Outputs	Output 1.2.3.: Number of national trainings (gender disaggregated participation)	0	at least 26 national training held to date % of participants are women?	52 national trainings More than 45% of participants are women
Outputs	Output 1.2.3.: Number of trainers trained (gender disaggregated participation)	0	26 trainers trained to date % of participants are women?	At least 39 trainers trained (at regional level) (3/country) More than 45% of participants are women

Outputs	Output 1.2.3.: Number of training modules produced	0	5 training modules developed	At least 7 training modules produced
Outputs	Output 1.2.3.: Number of training kits (equipment, material)	0	0	13 training kits (equipment, material)
Outcomes	Outcome 2.1.: Number of farmers adopting CRRP	0	41060 farmers initiated CRRP adoption	At least 140,000 smallholder farmer beneficiaries adopt CRRP
Outcomes	Outcome 2.1.: Number of ha under CRRP	0	16745 ha	At least 60,000 ha under CRRP
Outcomes	Outcome 2.1.: % Income increase with CRRP	0	8%, but not including all countries.	At least 80% income increase with CRRP
Outputs	Output 2.1.1.: Number of trainings for smallholder farmers (disaggregated by gender and youth)	0	368 trainings	48 farmer trainings held/country
Outputs	Output 2.1.1.: Percentage of trained farmers (disaggregated by gender and youth)	0	15%	At least 80% farmers trainers trained
Outputs	Output 2.1.1.: Number of extension materials distributed	0	6	At least 7 extension material packages distributed
Outputs	Output 2.1.1.: Percentage of farmers technically assisted in their fields (disaggregated by gender and youth)	0	13%	At least 80% of farmers technically assisted in their fields
Outputs	Output 2.1.1.: Percentage of farmers producing rice seed and organic fertilizer	0	16%	At least 60% of CRRP farmers produce rice seed and organic fertilizer
Outputs	Output 2.1.1.: Percentage of farmers adopting SLWM practices in their fields	0	80%	At least 80% of CRRP farmers adopt more than two SLWM practices in their fields
Outputs	Output 2.1.1.: Number of local nurseries established (gender disaggregated)	0	80 nurseries created to date	At least 520 of nurseries are created at the local level

	property)			
Outputs	Output 2.1.1.: Number of local composting units (gender disaggregated property)	0	25 composting units created to date	65 composting units
Outputs	Output 2.1.1.: Number of equipment packages distributed to farmers /country (disaggregated by gender and youth beneficiaries)	0	1	13 equipment packages distributed to farmers /country More than 50% of participants are women/girls
Outputs	Output 2.1.2.: M&E methodology established in first year	0	3	13 M&E experts are collecting data
Outputs	Output 2.1.2.: Data tracking mechanism established	0	0	Equipment for data tracking mechanism installed and operational
Outputs	Output 2.1.2.: Baseline study established	0	12 national baseline studies completed	14 Baseline studies established
Outputs	Output 2.1.2.: Number of training sessions on M&E system and data collection	0	40	67 training sessions on M&E system and data collection
Outputs	Output 2.1.2.: Number of yearly M&E reports	0	5	4 yearly M&E reports by 13 NEE and the REE
Outcomes	Outcome 2.2.: Number of successful PPP partnerships with farmer organizations	0	9 new PPPs established	65 new PPP agreements established and functional (5 PPP/ country)
Outcomes	Outcome 2.2.: Additional benefits (US\$) created based on project intervention	0	To be reported at project end	Total additional benefits (US\$) from PPPS (established at baseline)
Outputs	Output 2.2.1.: Number of private sector partners engaged with/country (disaggregated by gender)	0	0	6 private sector partners engaged with/country t
Outputs	Output 2.2.1.: Number of	0	6	10 Number of stakeholder meetings

	stakeholder meetings held (disaggregated by gender)			held/country
Outputs	Output 2.2.1.: Number of capacities strengthening workshops held (disaggregated by gender)	0	2	6 capacity strengthening workshops held/country More than 35% of participants are women
Outputs	Output 2.2.1.: Number of direct beneficiaries from PPP partnerships (disaggregated by gender)	0	To be reported at project end	At least 80 direct beneficiaries from PPP partnerships/ country More than 35% of beneficiaries are women
Outputs	Output 2.2.1.: Number of PPP supported with equipment (disaggregated by gender)	0	To be reported at project end	65 PPP supported with equipment More than 45% of beneficiaries are women
Outputs	Output 2.2.2.: Number of newly formalized FOs (disaggregated by gender)	0	over 120 new FOs formalised	At least 6 new FOs formalized/country
Outputs	Output 2.2.2.: Number of business plans developed (disaggregated by gender)	0	0	5 business plans developed/ country
Outputs	Output 2.2.2.: Number of trainings to farmer organizations (FO) (disaggregated by gender)	0	87	10 trainings to FO /country (=total of 130 trainings) More than 50% of beneficiaries are women
Outputs	Output 2.2.2.: Number of assisted FOs to access credit and subsidies (disaggregated by gender)	0	0	At least 06 credits accessed by FOs/country
Outcomes	Outcome 3.1.: Number of knowledge-products disseminated	0	24 knowledgeproducts disseminate	At least 120 knowledgeproducts disseminate (8*13 countries plus 16 regional)
Outcomes	Outcome 3.1.: Number of knowledge-sharing events held	0	6 knowledge sharing events	at least 70 knowledge sharing events held and participated in
Outputs	Output 3.1.1.:	0	7 communication	1 regional and 13

	Communication strategy (national and regional level) (gender disaggregated reach)		strategies developed	national communication strategies More than 50% of beneficiaries are women/Youth
Outputs	Output 3.1.1: Number of knowledge-products produced (gender disaggregated reach)	0	24 knowledgeproducts produ	At least 8 knowledge products produced per country (=total of 104) At least 16 knowledge products produced at regional level More than 50% of beneficiaries are women/Youth
Outputs	Output 3.1.1: Project portal functional with regular postings and updates	0	0	01 Project portal operational
Outputs	Output 3.1.1: Number of field visits organized (disaggregated by gender)	0	7	At least 05 field visits organized/country More than 45% of participants are women/youth
Outputs	Output 3.1.1: Number of policy briefs written and disseminated (gender disaggregated reach)	0	0	13 national policy briefs 3 regional policy briefs More than 50% of beneficiaries are women/Youth
Outcomes	Outcome 3.2.: Number of newly formulated partnerships to scale-up CRRP	0	0	5 new regional partnerships established
Outcomes	Outcome 3.2.: Number of partner activities to scale-up CRRP	0	0	5 collaborative activities /country (=65 total)
Outputs	Output 3.2.1.: Number coalition building meetings (disaggregated by gender)	0	To be reported at project end	Total of 8 coalition building meetings More than 45% of participants are women/youth
Outputs	Output 3.2.1.: Number of people participating to international events (disaggregated by gender)	0	To be reported at project end	9 people participate in 4 international events
Outputs	Output 3.2.1.: National CRRP network functional (disaggregated by	0	To be reported at project end	13 national CRRP networks

	gender)			
--	---------	--	--	--

Comments

Lessons Learned

Implementation and Adaptive Management		
Describe any changes undertaken to improve results on the ground or any changes made to project outputs (i.e. changes to project design)	Challenges & Opportunities	No changes
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts?	Challenges	Yes they have been effective.
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	Activities for the RICOWAS Project are in a good track. The first year focused primarily on foundational and preparatory efforts rather than achieving immediate, large-scale results. Significant and proactive steps were taken to integrate gender considerations from the outset. Specifically, considerable efforts were dedicated to ensuring the inclusion of the gender dimension in the various nominations of participants and committee members. This commitment to gender equity will be substantially enhanced in the coming years and extended to all project levels. This will include integrating targeted discussions and presentations for the project steering committee at the regional and national levels, as well as focused engagement with key stakeholders in the participating countries.
Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays?	Challenges	Yes, there were delays in implementation, which arose due to, among others: Lack of a clear understanding of project philosophy by the key stakeholders leads to ambiguity in execution goals and activities. To mitigate this, the detailing of technically sound

		<p>documents is necessary to execute activities, to ensure that the high-level philosophy is broken down into clear, measurable, and executable steps with established technical standards. Startup challenges in the operationalisation of the Regional Execution Entity and the national entities, such as delays in securing personnel, establishing bank accounts, or finalizing Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs). This was mitigated by Coordination among national executing entities (e.g., through regular technical working groups and joint planning sessions). There was also overall insufficient project management capacity at national or regional levels, leading to poor planning, budgeting, or reporting, and this was mitigated by the REE offering Regular support to enhance overall project management capacity, which can include targeted training, mentorship, and standardized reporting tools.</p>
<p>What implementation issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected progress?</p>	<p>Challenges & Opportunities</p>	<p>The RICOWAS project's early phase reveals a mixed picture: strong centralized support driving preparation and planning, contrasted with systemic delays in establishing institutional capacity and ensuring consistent strategic alignment across all 13 West African countries. Positive Lessons Strategic Document: Superiority and Centralised Support. This has impacted the progress as the Implementing Entity's proactive mobilization (OSS) and regional coordination unit (RCoS-Rice/IER) successfully established a high-quality, standardized documentation suite (Annual Work Plans, Budgets, Procurement Plans, etc.). Impact: This focused effort accelerated planning,</p>

streamlined the financial and procurement pipeline for later execution, and ensured that when funds become fully available, execution is based on technically sound, pre-approved documents. This is a critical risk mitigation against poor planning. Collaborative Alignment and a Cohesive Approach, facilitated through the mandatory organization of collaborative working sessions, proved to be a successful mechanism for vertical communication and horizontal alignment. Impact: It fostered a "one-project" philosophy, enhancing communication, improving data quality in submissions, and ensuring national plans logically feed into the regional strategy. This operational cohesion is vital for managing a complex, multi-country portfolio. Negative Lessons Crippling Institutional & Contractual Delay had the effect of plaguing the start up phase, specifically relating to finalising contracts, establishing Project Management Units (PMUs), and officially constituting Steering Committees (both national and regional). Impact: This created a deep operational void. Without functioning PMUs and contractual mechanisms, the pre-planned activities (from Positive Lesson I) could not be executed, leading to a substantial loss of the project's critical initial momentum and delaying the delivery of early results. Regional Coordination challenges have caused slowed regional activities, which are crucial for standardizing methods, facilitating technology transfer across countries, and driving shared policy work, to be significantly impeded. This created a 'silo

effect,' where national entities were left to operate in isolation, hindering the project's core value proposition of being a regional initiative. Strategic Operations and Human Capital Strain as the Project staff, often operating within national executing entities where they hold existing high-demand official duties, suffer from severe functional overload (dual-hatting). Furthermore, there may be inadequate specific motivation or insufficient incentives tied directly to RICOWAS performance. Impact: This organisational stress leads to a significant mismatch in activity progression and impact. Staff cannot dedicate the necessary time to the project, resulting in superficial engagement, inconsistent application of the complex climate-resilient methodologies (the core project philosophy), and an overall dilution of the project's intended impact due to poor quality or incomplete execution. The project will engage in: 1. Capacity Enforcement Strategic De-layering: Deploy project-funded Technical Assistants (TAs) to handle administrative and data tasks, allowing senior experts to focus on high-level oversight and quality control. 2. High-Performance Incentives, and possible linked bonuses: Tie modest monetary or non-monetary rewards to specific, time-bound milestones (e.g., procurement deadlines, field targets). Incentivize excellence through specialized training, regional exchange programs, and co-authorship opportunities on technical publications. 3. Operational Streamlining Standardized Compliance: Uniformly simplify reporting templates across all 13 countries to reduce "cognitive

		load" and administrative friction.
--	--	------------------------------------

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

No

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?	
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?	
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?	
Concrete Adaptation Interventions	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing concrete adaptation interventions that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes implementing concrete adaptation interventions?	
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?	
Knowledge Management	
How has existing information/data/knowledge been used to inform project development and implementation? What kinds of information/data/knowledge were used?	
Has the existing information/data/knowledge been made available to relevant stakeholder? If so, what channels of dissemination have been used?	
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.)	
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	
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.	
Has the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	
Innovation	
Describe any innovative practices or technologies that figured prominently in this project.	
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?	
If you answered yes, kindly specify the name of the Fund/Organization.	

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? Before 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	0	0
Baseline information	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	0	0	0
Baseline information	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0	0

Target performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	140000	30	40
Target performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	1500000	30	40
Target performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	1640000	30	40
Performance at mid-term	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at mid-term	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at mid-term	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0	0
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	0		
Target performance at completion	0	0		
Performance at mid-term				
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	Sector	Scale	Status

	assessments			
Baseline information	0	Food security	Regional	1: No plans conducted or updated
Target performance at completion	15	Food security	Regional	3: Risk and vulnerability assessments completed or updated
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				
Target performance at completion	0				
Performance at mid-term					
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	0	0	Agriculture	1: No capacity
Target performance at completion	175	3	Agriculture	4: High capacity
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	0		Public
Target performance at completion	28	45	Public
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	Public	Regional	Food security	2: Low capacity
Target performance at completion	Public	Regional	Food security	4: High capacity
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	0			
Target performance at completion	0			
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	0	Food security
Target performance at completion	80	Food security
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	0	2: Partially not aware
Target performance at completion	140000	40	5: Fully aware
Performance at mid-term			
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	0	40% to 60%	3: Partially aware
Target performance at completion	65	40% to 60%	5: Fully aware
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	0	Training manuals	National
Target performance at completion	65	Training manuals	National
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	Food security	Regional	3: Moderately responsive (Some defined elements)
Target performance at	Food security	Regional	5: Highly responsive (All

completion			defined elements)
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

	Sector	Targeted asset	Changes in asset (quantitative or qualitative)
Baseline information	Food security	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	1: Not improved
Target performance at completion	Food security	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	5: Fully improved
Performance at mid-term			
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	65		Food security
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	Total number of	Unit	Effectiveness of
--	------------------	-----------------	------	------------------

	Ecosystem (type)	natural assets or ecosystems protected/rehabilitated		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		2: Limited improvement
Target performance at completion	140000	50	5: Very high improvement
Performance at mid-term			
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				
Target performance at completion	156	Physical capital	Food security	Community-based adaptation
Performance at mid-term				
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		Agricultural-related	
Target performance at completion	140000	Agricultural-related	
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	5: All (Fully integrated)
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	0			
Target performance at completion	13	Food security	National	Public policy
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	0		
Target performance at completion	13	5: Fully enforced (All elements implemented)	5: Very effective
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 practice	Geographic Scale	Type
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion	Food Security	Regional	Innovation scaled-up
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Output 8: Viable innovations are rolled out, scaled 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	2	Food security	Completed innovation practices	5: Very effective
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	2	Innovative practice	5: Very effective
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			