



ADAPTATION FUND

# Project Performance Report

## Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	10/31/2022 - 10/31/2023
Project Title	Special Financing Window in Support of Innovation for Adaptation
Project Summary	
Database Number	AF00000215
Implementing Entity (IE)	UN Environment Programme
Type of IE	Multilateral Implementing Entity
Country(ies)	Regional (Global)
Relevant Geographic Points (i.e. cities, villages, bodies of water)	N/A
Name of Implementing Entity Focal Point	Jessica Troni

Project Milestones	
AFB Approval Date	10/11/2019
IE-AFB Agreement Signature Date	5/13/2020
Start of Project/Programme	10/28/2020
Actual Mid-term Review Date (if applicable)	5/1/2023
Original Completion Date	10/27/2025
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, 15 February 2021

### List the Website address (URL) of project

<https://www.ctc-n.org/afcia/unep-ctcn>

## Project Contacts

National/Regional Project Manager/Coordinator	Name	Email	Date
Coordinator	Saliha Dobardzic	sdobardzic@adaptation-fund.org	10/31/2023
Implementing Entity	Jessica Troni	jessica.troni@un.org	10/31/2023
Executing Agency	Rajiv Garg	gargr@un.org	10/31/2023

## Financial Data

Disbursement of AF grant funds	
Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date (\$)	\$4,467,500.00
Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date (\$)	\$4,089,455.00
Project disbursement rate (%)	89.39
Project execution rate (%)	89.39
Add any comments on AF Grant Funds	As of 31st October 2023: 25 projects have been selected under the AFCIA programme. 5 are fully completed (Burundi, Liberia, Honduras, Mongolia, Saint Kitts and Nevis) 12 are under implementation. 8 are under the final stage of contracting. The total cumulative expenditures from the start of the programme until today is USD 3,616,160.89 (3238115.89 of expenditure + 378045 of IE fees). From 01/11/2022 until 31/10/2023 a total of 1,377,548.24 USD was spent as detailed in the table "expenditure data". This is aligned with the disbursement table and budget planned for 2022-2023 of 1,360,546 USD. Next year, it is expected that UNEP CTCN will spend 1,091,229.11USD"
Investment Income (\$)	\$0.00
Cumulative Investment Income since inception (\$)	\$0.00

Expenditure Data	
Output	Amount (\$)
1.1 Communications Sp	\$30,000.00
1.1 Printing	\$4,076.21
1.1 Regional Liaison	\$22,819.11
1.2 Grants to Network Members (concept note develop)	\$50,450.00
1.2 Travel (related to concept note develop)	\$2,759.88
2.1 Grants to Network Members (implementation - innov & tech projects)*	\$0.00
1- Burundi (previous reporting period)	\$214,950.00
2 - Saint Kitts and Nevis (previous reporting period) GBP 149,553	\$201,553.91
3- Liberia (previous reporting period)	\$233,825.00
4- Zambia (previous reporting period)	\$224,990.00
5- Vietnam (previous reporting period)	\$192,999.00
6- Nepal (previous reporting period)	\$142,750.00
7 - Maldives (previous reporting period) (Co-funded project 1)	\$250,000.00
9 - Sudan - community-based Flood and drought early warning system - Co funded project 3	\$199,960.80

10 - Mozambique : Pay as you irrigate	\$224,450.00
11- Georgia -	\$248,440.00
12 - Pakistan	\$187,440.00
2.1 Grants to Network Members (implementation - enabling env projects)*	\$0.00
13- Bahamas (previous reporting period)	\$166,560.00
14-Ghana (previous reporting period)	\$243,807.02
17- Malaysia	\$232,414.00
3.1 Communications Sp	\$18,000.00
3.1 IT Services	\$7,533.64
3.2 Communications Sp	\$18,000.00
3.2 Printing	\$5,890.12
EC.Prog. Manager	\$51,790.97
EC. Procurement Officer	\$44,656.23
EC.Technical Specialist	\$18,000.00
IE fee (\$)	\$300,700.00
Execution cost (\$)	\$114,447.20

### Planned Expenditure Schedule

Output	Projected Cost (\$)	Estimated Completion Date
1.1 Communications Sp	\$6,000.00	10/31/2024
1.1 Translation Services	\$3,000.00	10/31/2024
1.1 Printing	\$298.79	10/31/2024
1.1 Regional Liaison	\$2,260.89	10/31/2024
1.2 Grants to Network Members (concept note develop)	\$124,550.00	10/31/2024
1.2 Travel (related to concept note develop)	\$57,240.12	10/31/2024
18 - Mali	\$160,000.00	3/31/2024
19 - Malawi	\$200,000.00	2/28/2024
20- Nigeria	\$157,713.00	3/31/2024
21- Guatemala	\$31,878.00	6/30/2024
3.1 Communications Sp	\$6,000.00	10/31/2024
3.1 IT Services	\$4,466.36	10/31/2024
3.1. Grants to Network Members (Lessons I earned)	\$55,000.00	10/31/2024
3.2 Communications Sp	\$6,000.00	10/31/2024
3.2 Translation Services	\$6,000.00	10/31/2024
3.2 Audio/Video Services	\$6,000.00	10/31/2024
3.2 Printing	\$109.88	10/31/2024
3.3 Grants to Network Members (Tech investment proposals)	\$55,000.00	10/31/2024
3.3 Travel	\$25,000.00	10/31/2024
EC.Prog. Manager	\$16,209.03	10/31/2024
EC. Procurement Officer	\$25,343.77	10/31/2024
EC.Technical Specialist	\$6,000.00	10/31/2024
EC.Office Equipment	\$8,000.00	10/31/2024
Project Dashboard	\$1,500.00	10/31/2024
EC.Travel	\$120,000.00	10/31/2024

IE fee (\$)	\$98,735.00
Execution cost (\$)	\$177,052.80

<b>Actual co-financing (if the MTR or TE have not been undertaken this reporting period, do not report on actual co-financing)</b>	
Does this Project have Co-Financing ?	Yes
How much of the total co-financing as committed in the Project Document has actually been realized? (\$)	\$774,888.39
Estimated cumulative actual co-financing as verified during Mid-term Review (MTR) or Terminal Evaluation (TE). (\$)	\$774,888.39
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.	No issues related to co-financing to be reported. The projects above received the support of the CTCN as per the rules and procedures defined by UN and as per the mandate of the CTCN. All the requests co-funded by the CTCN have been received through AFCIA calls for proposal and implemented through the financial support of the CTCN.

## Risk Assessment

<b>Identified Risks</b>		
<b>List all Risks identified in project preparation phase and what steps are being taken to mitigate them</b>		
<b>Identified Risk</b>	<b>Current Status</b>	<b>Steps taken to mitigate risk</b>
Delays in contracting Network Members may slow implementation	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The use of UNON's two-stage bidding process was agreed for the recruitment of Implementing Partners (CTCN Network Members) for the implementation of UNEP CTCN AFCIA Technical Assistance projects. This well-established procurement process allows for contracting of Network Members to be efficiently planned within 4-6 months, without causing delays to the implementation schedule. 2 projects registered delays in the bidding process : First was the project in Georgia that is now signed and under implementation but almost got abandoned. The reason for this delay is not directly connected to UN bidding process but can be explained by the fact that the Republic of Georgia did not have in 2021 an agreement with the United Nations to benefit from the tax exemption which is usually provided to the implementers for the implementation of the TA financed by the UN. In 2022, an agreement was signed following which the selected IP accepted to move forward with the project implementation. The other situation is for the project in Thailand for which the bidding process was initiated in June 2023 and finalized in October 2023. The project in Thailand deals with blockchain technology applied to agriculture assurance to farmers. Unfortunately both the vendors failed to qualify the mandatory criterion and the bidding process is in the process of being relaunched. Blockchain is a very recent technology application and there may not be many companies which could demonstrate experience of 5 years or more. Other parameters have been modified in the revised TOR both in the mandatory and point scale criterion. The level of risks has been maintained as Low as the delays only concerned two projects out of 25 with very specific contexts and were limited.</li> </ul>

<p>Challenges in coordination between National Designated Entities (NDEs) and Adaptation Fund Designated Authorities (DAs) may impact the quality of submissions</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>"Coordination between the NDE and the DA has been challenging during the submission phase of the projects. The NDE and the DA are not always affiliated to the same ministries and do not always know each other. In most of the cases, NDEs and DAs did not review and select the applications in a collaborative and consulted manner. Calls for proposals and submissions happened in last reporting periods. Over the 25 projects selected under AFCIA, only 1 request (Burundi) reflected a joint effort between the NDE and the DA. Nonetheless, during the implementation of the Technical Assistancess, the collaboration of the NDE and the DA has been successful. Most of the time one of them takes the responsibility of the implementation while the other participates to the major meetings, trainings, stakeholder's consultations, capacity building events. Both the NDE and the DA plays in role in revising and approving the deliverables. As per the rules of the CTCN, the NDE endorses the proposal and is always a member of each's project Steering Committee. Under AFCIA I programme, the DA was free to decide to be or not part of the Steering Committee of each Technical Assistance. As a mitigation measures, DAs have been systematically invited and encouraged to attend the Steering Committee. They will become mandatory members during the second phase of AFCIA programme (AFCIA II)."</p>
<p>The lack of enabling environment to encourage and support innovation limits national buy-in</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>"The buy-in of the countries have been achieved through the National Designated Entities to the technology mechanism (NDEs) and the national focal points to the Adaptation Fund (DAs) which allow for greater national ownership and for a better understanding of the importance of innovative adaptation technologies through the signature of the request (at submission phase), the revision of the deliverables (at implementation phase) and the post implementation survey sent by the CTCN (at closure of the project). Under AFCIA, 10 specific projects aim at strenghtening the "Enabling Environment" for innovation and technologies adoption. For the other 15 projects registered under the Acceleration Component, the response plans were built in such a way to include the basic Enabling Environment instruments including guidelines, manual, business model or others to ensure the sustainability of the results achieved through the TA. "</p>
<p>Not enough high quality requests are received</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>"The analysis of the 3 calls for project is at such: • During the 1st call for projects, 13% of the application were classified as non-eligible. This percentage decreased to 8% in the second call which demonstrates the benefit of the webinars and knowledge transfer sessions that were organized. The third call for projects received alone more than 200 applications (more than the sum of the 2 first calls) from which 42% was deemed not eligible. This can be explained by the fact that the 3rd call was intensively promoted not only amongst NDEs, but also amongst research centers, universities, think tanks, private sectors, as well as local municipalities. These applicants have lower knowledge of the programme and of the AFCIA programme and many did not attend the webinars organised. Despite the efforts made to build knowledge and capacity of applicants, only a small part of the 100 applications eligible received through the third call for proposals respond to all selection criteria of the AFCIA programme. • Over 420 requests received throughout the 3 calls for proposals (this n° includes duplication of requests), only 36 were sent from LAC region, 142 were sent from Asia, 3 from developed countries and 239 from Africa. • From these 420 requests, 155 were deemed not eligible. • From these 155 non eligible requests, 100 were submitted from Africa, 49 from Asia which is 34% of the total submission and only 3 from LAC thus 8% of the total requests submitted. • This can be explained by the following reasons: - Africa is much bigger in size and number of countries that LAC, thus it is understandable that more requests would be received from this region. - Africa encompasses more LDC/SIDS countries than Asia. Indeed, 33 SIDS and LDCs</p>

		<p>are registered in Africa versus 9 in Asia and 1 in LAC as per UN list of LDCs (<a href="https://unctad.org/topic/least-developed-countries/list">https://unctad.org/topic/least-developed-countries/list</a>) and as LDC/SIDs were a focus under AFCIA, they were highly encouraged to participate in the calls for proposals but have lower capacity to develop quality proposals - Considering the very high number of requests received from Africa, the CTCN focused its personalized actions and encouraged the implementation of bilateral meetings and customized meetings in Asia and LAC regions which justifies the larger percentage of eligible requests received from these 2 regions. As a lesson learnt, UNEP CTCN are suggesting to promote a continuous and traversal communication and knowledge sharing component with the developing countries throughout the implementation of the next phase of the programme (AFCIA II). UNEP CTCN also believe that encouraging the cooperation between AF DA and CTCN NDE would help in improving the quality of the requests received under AFCIA. AFCIA II proposal includes additional elements that will be put in place to enhance the quality of the proposals namely: - Bilateral meetings with the proponents will be convened when requested or needed to improve the quality of the applications by clarifying the objectives, outcomes, and outputs of the programme and discussing possible way forwards. - Webinars targeting non-conventional stakeholders (research institutions, private sectors, civil society...) will be organized - AFCIA Coordination services project will also be an instrument to increase the quality of the request through regional innovation hubs bringing together different stakeholders to work together in support of the ideation process As the selection of requests has been finalized during this reporting period and ongoing response plan processes directly led by CTCN, the level of risk of this indicator has been decreased from medium to low."</p>
<p>Transformational change cannot be achieved through micro-grants</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>"• Under the CTCN UNEP AFCIA programme, 2 Adaptation Fund Concept Note will be formulated under the Adaptation Fund full size innovation window. One of them has already been submitted to the Adaptation Fund in December 2022. This proposal has already received 2 rounds of comments from the Adaptation Fund, and is currently under revision by UNEP. If approved by the Adaptation Fund, the Concept Note will be leveraged to a full scale funding proposal with strong potential for transformation change • Over the 5 Technical Assistances that have been completed under AFCIA, 3 of them have already managed to leverage additional funding. Please, find below a brief summary of the status by projects: o Burundi: A Concept Note is under revision by UNEP and (when approved) will lead to the preparation of a full-scale proposal for the Adaptation Fund. o Mongolia: This TA resulted in the successful leveraging of 7.5 million USD from the government of Canada and 100,000 USD co-funding mobilized from corporate contributions for the scaling up. o Saint Kitts and Nevis: Following the AFCIA Technical Assistance implemented under AFCIA, the project was able to leverage additional 100,000 USD from the Caribbean Public Health Agency (CARPHA) to develop a Water Information System for the islands. Additionally, the following projects are currently intending to leverage additional funding: - Honduras: a concept note has been drafted to support the exercise of scaling up the project and funding sources will be identified for potential future submission - Liberia: According to the Ministry of Agriculture this pilot is demonstrating a model that could have tremendous impact both at the micro and macro level, when implemented at the national scale. "By intensifying production, we are securing the livelihoods of farmers but also reducing the dependence of food imports and markets, we are making agriculture profitable, hoping to attract more innovation and investments as well", concluded Halala Willie Kokulo (Division of Land Development and Water Resources, Department of technical Services Ministry of Agriculture). CARES Group</p>

		<p>together with the Ministry of Agriculture are already exploring national and regional partnerships, and opportunities for scaling up investments and give access to SPIS technology to all smallholders in the country, making smart agriculture the default adaptation measure for rice production in Liberia. This success is a demonstration that transformation change can be achieved through micro-grants or Technical Assistances in the case of UNEP CTCN AFCIA programme. Apart from transformational changes linked with the leveraging of more funds, AFCIA projects were able to drive transformational changes at community and governmental levels. This is true for Burundi, in which the Slamdam is now deployed independently by the communities that hosted the project enabling a better management of water in time of drought and limiting the damages of floods during the rainy season. It is also true in Saint Kitts that now benefits from a drought modelling platform to support governmental decisions on water management, as well as in Liberia as described by the Ministry of agriculture in the quote above. Similar repercussions on the use and deployment of SPIS systems is expected for Ghana and Mozambique. In Zambia, where the groundwater is the major source of domestic water and its use for irrigation is predicted to increase substantially, water management plan for surface and groundwater is being developed including clear measures and actions that could be used in the country to increase the resilience of Zambia in time of drought. In Vietnam, as the water resource management plan will enable the country to gather reliable, up to date information data on the transboundary water that is shared by 3 countries (China, Laos and VietNam) and model solutions to address the needs of water management. Similar situation is faced by Sudan with the Nile providing water to Egypt, Ethiopia, South Sudan, and Sudan and for which the technical assistance will enhance the existing Flood Early Warning System (FEWS) setup by the Nile River basin regional entity the Eastern Nile Technical Regional Office (ENTRO) so that it is appropriate for Sudanese authorities' flood management operations in Sudanese national sub-basins. In Maldives, where excessive groundwater extraction has led to saline water intrusion and reduction of the efficiency of its natural recharge processes, the technical assistance is deploying an infiltration gallery system as an efficient, sustainable method for groundwater extraction for agriculture in HDh.Nolhivaranfaru Island where unpolluted groundwater aquifers will be protected as a consequence of the technology deployed. In Nepal a customized weather and climate information system for climate-resilient agriculture is being developed including the development of an application programming interface (API) for the automatic dissemination of location-specific customised 3-days weather forecast to farmers in a user-friendly language to the local communities. Still in the agriculture sector, Sudan seeks to evaluate the soil erosion using advanced atomic absorption to support climate resilient agriculture and food security. Thus, even though the budget of the TAs are small, the innovation promoted under AFCIA is encouraging transformational change. "</p>
<p>Gender considerations are not adequately taken into account during the design and implementation of innovation grant.</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>"Gender considerations have been included in the design of each of the 25 projects. 6 projects that are (have been) implemented at community level managed to offer very strong gender involvement. This will be the case of Mongolia, Honduras as well as the project in Burundi, Liberia and Mozambique SPIS that included women as main beneficiaries because the project impacted the agriculture sector and consequently the women of these countries as well as the EWS for Forest fires in Georgia developed for the protected natural park and that will affect women and men equally. The TA completed in Mongolia is a very good example of how gender was adequately considered during the implementation of the project. This project and its gender focus was presented during CTCN AB in Bonn in September 2023. A</p>

recording as well as the powerpoint presentation are available by following these links: : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wJesneb3Q3A> (with gender assessment around 25:40). Their presentation is available by following this link: [https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/2023-10/20.2\\_CTCN\\_Mongolia\\_NDE-Alinea.pdf](https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/2023-10/20.2_CTCN_Mongolia_NDE-Alinea.pdf) In this project, gender was taken into account since the design phase and systematically considered during the implementation. The TA in Honduras is also a very good example of how gender was systematically taken into account from the design stage until the closure of the implementation. To ensure gender equal participation, the workshops were conducted during Fridays and weekends (days requested by the community members during the launch of the project) and were consequently able to secure a 50/50% of male and female participation. A video in Spanish and translated into English is available by following this link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AVVPYDxUjOA> High gender impact is also expected for the upcoming 3 projects in Malawi, Nigeria, Guatemala as they were requested by the communities and will be implemented with the support of the communities. Apart from the 9 projects mentioned above, it has been noted by UNEP CTCN and reflected in the MTR that other Technical Assistances implemented through UNEP CTCN AFCIA programme were not always reflecting gender in their results. The reasons for this situation have been analysed and could be summarized as such: the 16 remaining TA have been requested by governmental institutions as project proponents to develop governmental decision tools. This is the case of Nepal EWS, Sudan EWS and soil mapping, Mali EWS, Saint Kitts drought modelling, it will be the case of Ecuador drought forecasting system as well as of Malaysia Multi hazard platform including the one under response plan signing, and it is also the case of the water management projects implemented in Zambia, Vietnam , Maldives and Pakistan or of the project in Bahamas that expect to define guidelines to improve the conditions of street vendors or Ghana that develops a business model for SPIS to make this technology accessible to the smallholder farmers or Thailand with its analyses on how blockchain could be used to offer assurance to farmers or Mozambique aquaponics that would result in the architecture of a smart farm including aquaponics. In that case, the projects are implemented with the support of the governmental institutions and with their respective governmental officers. In this situation, empowering gender is a complex task as the IP needs to deal with the nominated governmental officers. According to these conclusions, the risk has been increased from Low to Medium. Mitigation measures include the use of new indicators for M&E and closure reports, the increase in the financial share made available to gender mainstreaming activities (from 1 to 5%) as well as the gender assessment becoming mandatory for all new CTCN projects. The CTCN has developed (and updated in 2023) its gender policy and formulated a specific action plan for AFCIA that was approved in September 2023 by its Advisory Board and will be applied to all new AFCIA projects. The gender policy applies a two-pronged approach to promote gender equality including (i) gender-specific initiatives meaning “addressing gender inequitable issues” and (ii) gender mainstreaming as “a way of implementing interventions in a human rights-based approach so both men and women can enjoy the benefits equally”. It thus addresses the fact that women are underserved when it comes to technologies and capacity development, so historical imbalances may be corrected, and it provides equal/equitable opportunity to men and women. New indicators for the M&E and Closure Reports were also approved during the AB Meeting in September 2023 and will be used for new AFCIA projects. Finally, it was agreed that a minimum of 5% of the TA will need to be related to gender mainstreaming activities and that a gender assessment will become mandatory



		for all new CTCN projects. This will also be applied to new AFCIA projects (not yet under bidding process). The Advisory Board of the CTCN includes a gender constituency and all CTCN Technical Assistancess are implemented with the engagement of at least one gender expert and a minimum percentage of the project costs towards gender and youth as mandatory requirements."
Funding for scaled-up implementation is not available	Low	"• Under the CTCN UNEP AFCIA programme, 2 Adaptation Fund Concept Note will be formulated and submitted to the Adaptation Fund full size innovation window. • Over the 5 Technical Assistancess that have been completed under AFCIA, 3 of them have already managed to leverage additional funding. Please, find below a brief summary of the status by projects: - Burundi: A Concept Note has already been submitted to the Adaptation Fund in December 2022 and is under revision by the Adaptation Fund. When approved by the Adaptation Fund, the Concept Note will be leveraged to a full scale funding proposal. - Mongolia: This TA resulted in the successful leveraging of 7.5 million USD from the government of Canada and 100,000 USD co-funding mobilized from corporate contributions for the scaling up. Saint Kitts and Nevis: Following the AFCIA Technical Assistance implemented under AFCIA, the project was able to leverage additional 100,000 USD from the Caribbean Public Health Agency (CARPHA) to develop a Water Information System for the islands. Additionally, the following projects are currently intending to leverage additional funding: - Honduras: a concept note has been drafted to support the exercise of scaling up the project and funding sources will be identified for potential future submission - Liberia: According to the Ministry of Agriculture this pilot is demonstrating a model that could have tremendous impact both at the micro and macro level, when implemented at the national scale. CARES Group together with the Ministry of Agriculture are already exploring national and regional partnerships, and opportunities for scaling up investments and give access to SPIS technology to all smallholders in the country, making smart agriculture the default adaptation measure for rice production in Liberia. "
Innovations trigger mal-adaptation	Low	"• UNEP Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) screening is conducted for each project and include a safeguard around Climate Change and Disaster Risks looking at the issue of climate vulnerability and maladaptation • Project concept notes are developed to avoid potential maladaptation risks and include robust M&E frameworks that are applied throughout project implementation. "

### 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
Political Risks	Moderate	"The focal points (NDE, DA) and the CTCN have established a good working relationships and communication channels. UNEP field and regional office may be used should emergency communications be needed. During previous reporting period, the project in Bahamas was put on hold due to a change of government. During this reporting period, an institutional and consensual decision has been found and project has been re-activated. Nonetheless, the risks has been maintained as medium as some host countries will have elections before the closure of the programme. So far, no TAs selected under AFCIA have been directly impacted by the war in Ukraine, conflict in Gaza and associated risk of inflation. "

## 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?

## 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

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

#### 2. Access and equity

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented	

during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	

**3. Marginalized and vulnerable Groups**

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

**4. Human rights**

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the	

safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
<b>5. Gender equality and women's empowerment</b>	
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	
<b>6. Core labour rights</b>	
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	
<b>7.Indigenous people</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	All risks were rated as low during the risk screening process (SRIF). As per UNEP policy, impact assessments should be carried out only for Medium to High risks. However, under the indigenous people s principle, the projects implemented in Liberia, Zambia, Ghana, Vietnam, Nepal, Honduras, Mongolia, Sudan and Georgia, rated level 2 of risks related to the impact "Areas where indigenous peoples are present, or uncontacted or isolated indigenous peoples inhabit or where it is believed these peoples may inhabit". The level 2 considers a risk that is still defined as Low under UNEP guidance but with a higher possibility of occurrences.
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.	Under CTCN requirements, it is mandatory for the consortium partner to demonstrate that the technical assistances will be implemented jointly between an international network partner of the CTCN along with a National Entity. For all these projects for which a level 2 of risks under indigenous people was listed, the technical evaluation requested the local partner to demonstrate expertise, capability and previous experience in working with the dedicated local communities.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Under the Adaptation Fund's Result Tracker, the core indicator (Direct beneficiaries) as well as "indicator 8.1 No. of innovative adaptation practices, tools and technologies accelerated, scaled-up and/or replicated" were monitored for each and every projects. Then, based on the relevancy of each TA, and under this principle of "indigenous people" indicator 3.1.1 Percentage of targeted population awareness of predicted adverse impacts of climate change, and of appropriate responses, core indicator 5.1 Natural Assets protected or rehabilitated, Indicator 6.2: Increase in targeted population's sustained climate-

	resilient alternative livelihoods, Indicator 6.1.1: No. and type of adaptation assets created or strengthened in support of individual or community livelihood strategies were monitored.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Most of the time, the baseline is 0. The baseline by indicator and by project can be seen on the PPR (excel template) using the tab "result tracker by project" created by UNEP CTCN.
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	<p>Please, find below a description of the safeguard measure implemented for each of the 9 projects under which the "indigenous people" principle was rated as level 2 in terms of impact:</p> <p><b>Project in Liberia</b> In Liberia there are at least sixteen ethnic groups. The small Dei group lives in Montserrado County near the coast and Monrovia, primarily between the Lofa and St. Paul rivers. Gbandi and Mende also live in upper Lofa County. No indigenous people have been identified to live in Bong County. The rating of the safeguards has been scored as level 2 as it was unknown at that stage if the project will be implemented in Lofa or in Bong. The project was finally piloted in Bong county where no indigenous people have been identified, thus no safeguards measures were required for indigenous people.</p> <p><b>Project in Zambia</b> The rating of the indigenous safeguards has been scored as level 2 as the project will be implemented in an area that had not yet been selected, and could directly impact the country, at national level. The project was finally piloted in Nyimba where no indigenous communities are registered.</p> <p><b>Project in Ghana</b> The rating of the safeguards has been scored as level 2 as the project will be implemented at national level. Nonetheless the purpose of this project is to design a business model and a framework to promote the use of Solar Irrigation Pumping Systems. No direct impact on indigenous at community level is expected at this stage.</p> <p><b>Project in Vietnam</b> The rating of the safeguards has been scored as level 2 as the project will be implemented in areas where indigenous peoples and ethnic minority groups live. The purpose of the project is to collect data management and information that will populate an environmental/water planning digital platform. The relation with the local communities was ensured by a local partner, who understood and respected the cultural heritage of the population.</p> <p><b>Project in Nepal</b> The rating of the safeguards has been scored as level 2 as it was unknown at SRIF stage if the project will be implemented in areas involving indigenous peoples. Finally the community selected for the pilot was not in an area involving indigenous people. The purpose of this project is to develop and test an agro-meteorological platform with local communities of farmers. The awarded consortium was composed by a</p>

local company with expertise in implementing NbS with indigenous people and an Indian company specialized in the design of agro-meteorological platforms. The pilot is currently being tested by the communities. The community is strongly involved and supportive of the project as they expect to receive direct benefits from the tool. Project in Honduras The rating of the safeguards has been scored as level 2 as it is the project aimed at implementing NbS with communities living in rural mountains areas. One of the mandatory requirements of the CTCN defines that the consortium must demonstrate that local partner will be involved during the implementation and beneficiating from minimum 25% and maximum 50% of the budget allocated to the TA. In this case, the consortium involved a local company based in Honduras with capabilities and expertise in working on agriculture with these same local rural communities in the together with a Spanish consultant group of experts in adaptation. The project was a success. A video was produced and can be seen by following this link:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AVVPYDxUjOA>

Project in Mongolia The rating of the safeguards has been scored as level 2 as it is the project aimed at implementing NbS with communities living in rural mountains areas. One of the mandatory requirements of the CTCN defines that the consortium must demonstrate that local partner will be involved during the implementation and beneficiating from minimum 25% and maximum 50% of the budget allocated to the TA. In this case, the consortium involved the R&D Center for Climate Change and Sustainable Development based in Mongolia with capabilities and expertise in working on agriculture & farming identified local communities together with the Asia Environmental and Agricultural Research Center and a Canadian company called Alinea International. The project was a success and managed to leverage 7 million from the Canadian Government. This story will be published to the GAP Adaptation Report 2024 edition but can also be streamed by following this link: from 13h40 onwards:

<https://www.youtube.com/live/wJesneb3Q3A>

Project in Sudan The rating of the safeguards has been scored as level 2 as it is the project will be implemented at National level. The purpose of the project is to update and improve existing hydrologic and hydraulic models and configure a Flood Early Warnings System (FEWS) in Sudan. Considering the political situation in Sudan, the hydrologic and hydraulic models were created using satellites data. Thus, no indigenous communities were not directly involved or affected by the project. Project in Georgia The rating of the safeguards has been scored as level 2 as this



	<p>project will be implemented at community level in Samtskhe-Javakheti region where Azerbaijanis and Armenians constitute numerical majorities. The purpose of this project is to develop an early warning system for forest fires. The communities were involved since the formulation of the Response Plan through the Project Proponent, the Agency of Protected Areas of Georgia. The community has requested this project to protect their families from fires, following a disaster that occurred in 2018. The communities have been consulted through stakeholder's workshops twice during the reporting period and will continue to be informed and to be involved in the definition of the EWS.</p>
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual impact have been identified.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	No residual impacts were identified and thus no remedial actions have been defined / undertaken. Thank you.
<b>8.Involuntary resettlement</b>	
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	
<b>9.Protection of natural habitats</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No



<p>List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)</p>	<p>For all projects implemented by UNEP CTCN under the AFCIA programme, a Safeguard Risk Assessment was approved by UNEP safeguard officer. All risks reflected in the SRIFS of all AFCIA projects were rated as low. As per UNEP policy, impact assessments should be carried out only for Medium to High risks. Nonetheless, some of the Technical Assistances (Zambia &amp; Georgia) implemented under AFCIA had a level 2 of risks rated in the SRIF. The level 2 considers a risk that is still defined as Low under UNEP guidance but with a higher possibility of occurrences. Under this risk, the following impacts were listed: - adverse impacts specifically to habitats that are legally protected, officially proposed for protection, or recognized as protected by traditional local communities and/or authoritative sources (e.g., National Park, Nature Conservancy, Indigenous Community Conserved Area, (ICCA); etc.)</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 during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.</p>	<p>Two projects were identified with risks related to Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Sustainable Natural Resource. Project in Zambia The rating of the safeguards has been scored as a risk - level 2 as the location of the pilot was not yet defined in the Response Plan. It was thus unknown if the project could take place in a area with habitats that could be legally protected, officially proposed for protection, or recognized as protected by traditional local communities and/or authoritative sources (e.g., National Park, Nature Conservancy, Indigenous Community Conserved Area, (ICCA); etc.) Finally the pilot was conducted in another area : Nyimba where no protected habitats are listed. Project in Georgia The project is being implemented in a protected National Park in Georgia located in Samtskhe-Javakheti where the largest ethnic minorities (Azerbaijanis and Armenians) constitute numerical majorities. The Project Proponent is the Agency of Protected Areas of Georgia. As project proponent, the Agency of Protected Areas of Georgia is involved in any steps, any decision made in the implementation of this project. They are part of the Steering Committee that reviews and approves all the deliverables. Likewise, the CTCN ensures that the project respects not only the AF and UNEP CTCN guidelines related to protected areas, but also the national laws.</p>
<p>List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.</p>	<p>The indicators are defined under the AF Result Tracker and selected at project level. Related to Lands and soil conservation the main indicators are: Indicator 5: Ecosystem services and natural resource assets maintained or improved under climate change and variability-induced stress Core Indicator 5.1: Natural Assets protected or rehabilitated</p>
<p>State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator</p>	<p>The baseline has been defined at project level and can be found in the PPR (excel version) under a tab</p>

	created by UNEP CTCN Called " AF Result Tracker at project level". At programme level, the baseline is defined as 0.
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	During this reporting period, the Steering Committee in presence of the Georgian Agency of Protected Areas were organised every month. The Georgian Agency of Protected Areas approved the action plan defined to collect data that will feed the EWS for forest fires and is currently participating in the discussions around the design, specificities and requirements of the EWS that will be piloted.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual impact is identified.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	As no residual impact is identified, no remedial action has been listed.
<b>10.Conservation of biological diversity</b>	
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	
<b>11.Climate change</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	For all projects implemented by UNEP CTCN under the AFCIA programme, a Safeguard Risk Assessment was approved by UNEP safeguard officer. All SRIFs and all risks reflected in the SRIFs of all AFCIA

	<p>projects were rated as low. As per UNEP policy, impact assessments should be carried out only for Medium to High risks. Nonetheless, all the technical assistances implemented under the AFCIA programme were rated as a level 2 of risks related to Climate Change. The level 2 considers a risk that is still defined as Low under UNEP guidance but with a higher possibility of occurrences. The main impacts that were identified are : - areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions in the next 30 years - Local communities vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and disaster risks (e.g. considering level of exposure and adaptive capacity).</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 during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.</p>	<p>For the 15 projects implemented under the acceleration component of the AFCIA 1 programme, the safeguard measure aimed at testing, piloting or scaling up climate adaptation technologies that would enable the communities or the country to increase its resilience to climate change effects. For the 10 projects implemented under the enabling environment component of the AFCIA 1 programme, the safeguard measure aimed at strengthening the local capabilities, decision-making process of the countries to increase their readiness related to climate change effects.</p>
<p>List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.</p>	<p>Each technical Assistance selected specific indicators defined in the AF Result Tracker to monitor the impact of their project at baseline, target at completion, mid-term, and completion. The indicators more oriented towards monitoring the impact of the project on climate change are: - Indicator 1: Relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to stakeholders on a timely basis with its 2 sub indicators: Indicator 1.1: No. of projects/programmes that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments Core Indicator 1.2: No. of Early Warning Systems Indicator 2: Capacity of staff to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events from targeted institutions increased Indicator 2.1.1: No. of staff trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events Indicator 2.1.2: No. of targeted institutions with increased capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability risks Indicator 2.2.1: No. of targeted institutions benefitting from the direct access and enhanced direct access modality Indicator 3.1: Increase in application of appropriate adaptation responses Indicator 3.1.1: Percentage of targeted population awareness of predicted adverse impacts of climate change, and of appropriate responses Indicator 3.2.1: No. of technical committees/associations formed to ensure</p>

	transfer of knowledge Indicator 3.2.2: No. of tools and guidelines developed (thematic, sectoral, institutional) and shared with relevant stakeholders Indicator 7: Climate change priorities are integrated into national development strategy Indicator 7.1: No. of policies introduced or adjusted to address climate change risks Indicator 7.2: No. of targeted development strategies with incorporated climate change priorities enforced
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	The baseline depends of each project. The definition of the baseline of each Technical Assistance can be found under the PPR (Excel template) in a tab created by UNEP CTCN called "AF Result Tracker at project level". At programme level, the baseline has been defined as 0.
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	The technical Assistance implemented under AFCIA is the safeguard measure applied to the Risk of Climate Change. 15 projects implemented under AFCIA 1 have a technology component and 10 an enabling environment component to mitigate identified climate risk impacts witnessed in each project country/area/site
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual impacts have been identified.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	As no residual impacts have been identified, no remedial actions have been defined. Thank you.
<b>12.Pollution prevention and resource efficiency</b>	
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	
<b>13.Public health</b>	

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	
<b>14. Physical and cultural heritage</b>	
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	
<b>15. Lands and soil conservation</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table	No

II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	

## Section 2: Monitoring for unanticipated impacts / corrective actions required

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

## Section 3: Categorisation

Is the categorisation according to ESP standards still relevant?	No
If No, please describe the changes made at activity, output or outcome level, approved by the Board, that resulted in this change of categorization.	There was no categorization of the safeguards risk of this project because it would depend on the micro grants identified (USPs)

## Section 4: Implementation arrangements

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	Safeguards Risk Identification Forms (SRIF) have been developed following UNEP Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework (ESSF, approved in February 2020) and related guidance on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Stakeholder Response mechanisms. They have been reviewed and approved by UNEP Environmental and Social Safeguard Officer for all project funded by AFCIA. Same procedure has been applied for the projects selected during the last and third call for
---	---

	<p>projects (which was closed on September 30th 2022) and for projects entirely co-financed by CTCN. The SRIF has demonstrated during last reporting period to be fully aligned with the Adaptation Fund Safeguard Strategy.</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 implement the required ESP safeguard measures?</p>	<p>"CTCN as the Executing Entity for the AFCIA program has followed UNEP Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework (ESSF, approved in February 2020) and related guidance on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Stakeholder Response mechanisms, in alignment with relevant UN EMG guidance and with that its partners such as the Adaptation Fund. The following arrangements have been put in place by CTCN during the reporting period: • CTCN has ensured that all AFCIA applications selected where eligible and prioritized based on a set of criteria including ""Eligibility Criteria"", ""Prioritization criteria"" and ""Balancing Criteria"". These criteria aims to confirm that the project is aligned with national priorities, that they have been endorsed by NDEs, that they promote women empowerment, as well as have direct and clear impact on Climate Change and that the project should generate environmental, social and economical benefits. • CTCN has conducted a deeper analysis of the ESS impacts of all projects funded by AFCIA once officially selected through filling in the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF). This second step of the process takes into consideration the identification of potential environmental and social risks and impacts associated with the proposed activities, as per UNEP's ESSF. Assignment of a risk category to AFCIA projects, as per UNEP guidance and in consultation with UNEP's ES Safeguard Advisor, takes into consideration a range of factors, including the nature, type, scale and duration of project activities. Thus far, only AFCIA submissions ranked with a low ESS risk were implemented under the AFCIA program. Once approved by UNEP ESS manager, all SRIF are uploaded online, and publicly available on CTCN webpage, under each Technical Assistance's webpage. • CTCN has also used UNEP's ES principles and safeguards to strengthen the sustainability of the prioritized submissions, while working with Project Proponents, Designated National Authorities (NDEs), DNAs, during the design of AFCIA project concept notes. • CTCN also follows UNEP's procedures on stakeholder response mechanisms to establish a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) for the programme ensuring greater sustainability and accountability in the implementation of AFCIA projects. Information</p>

	about the grievance redress mechanisms (GRM) is communicated during the inception meeting in presence of the stakeholders. Considering the small size of each project, UNEP has decided to use the grievance mechanism available under UNEP to cover the AFCIA programme. This grievance mechanism leads the parties to connect to a webpage from which they can raise their concern. Procedures to access the Independent Office for Stakeholder Safeguard-related Response (IOSSR) is communicated to stakeholders at the start of the implementation of each AFCIA project. A specific page describing the Grievance Mechanisms has been created under CTCN webpage as part of the AFCIA section. This page can be found by following this link : <a href="https://www.ctcn.org/af/programme-faqs/7-safeguard-mechanism-afcia">https://www.ctcn.org/af/programme-faqs/7-safeguard-mechanism-afcia</a> "
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?	Yes
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?	Yes
Has the overall ESMP been updated with the findings of the USPs that have been identified in this reporting period?	Yes

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
USP 1: [Burundi] Easily deployable water-filled flood barrier that can be used to prevent damage from flooding and to store	Yes	"While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the SRIF relate to: SS 2: Climate Change and	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard measures were established. However the	N/A



water vapor-tight to ensure water availability in times of drought		<p>Disaster Risks:  A/The selected area is expected to suffer floods and drought time as it has occurred in the past. The frequency of floods and drought are expected to increase due to climate change. This technology, is found feasible, would lead to building resilience of the local communities.  B/There are local communities vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and disaster risks (e.g. considering level of exposure and adaptive capacity). This risk relates to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change.</p>				AF ESP principle 11: climate change was closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports)	
USP 2: [Saint Kitts and Nevis] Increase the water supply system resilience by managing aquifers	Yes	"While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard	N/A

<p>recharge (MAR) and incorporating drought risks modelling as a planning tool for climate change adaptation measures</p>		<p>SRIF relate to: SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks: A/areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions in the next 30 years. The selected area is expected to suffer dry spells and drought conditions, high flooding and landslides, as it has occurred in the past. This risk relates to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change.</p>				<p>measures were established. However the AF ESP principle 11: climate change was closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&amp;E framework (initial and closure project reports)</p>	
<p>USP 3: [Bahamas] Developing a national framework for the</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>"While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>standardization of stalls and procedures for a climate smart street vendor in the Bahamas. The project in Bahamas is on hold at the moment due to a change of government in the country. Please refer to Footnote 1 in the "Financial Data" Sheet for further details.</p>		<p>risks identified through the SRIF relate to: SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks A/Areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions in the next 30 years. Bahamas is highly vulnerable to extreme climate events such as hurricanes. SS 6: Displacement and Involuntary Resettlement. B/Full or partial physical displacement or relocation of people (whether temporary or</p>				<p>Officer , no specific safeguard measures were established. However the AF ESP principle 11: climate change and AF ESP Principle 8 – Involuntary resettlement were closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&amp;E framework (initial and closure project reports).</p>	
---	--	---	--	--	--	---	--

		<p>permanent).  The project will develop a framework and feasibility study to implement standardization of stalls and a sustainable program for the establishment of open green spaces for Street Side Vendors, with the aim of reallocating street-side vendors from unsafe locations to open green spaces, to organize the informal sector of the economy into a more formalized sector.  These risks relate to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change and AF ESP Principle 8 – Involuntary resettlement.</p>					
<p>USP 4:  [Liberia]  Upscaling lowland rice production to improve food security through improved solar</p>	Yes	<p>"While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the SRIF relate</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard measures</p>	N/A

<p>powered irrigation practices</p>		<p>to: SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks A/ The selected areas are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions in the next 30 years. The historical climate change scenarios include increased average annual temperatures of 0.8°C throughout the country, a 15.7% increase of hot nights which lead to decline in mean annual rainfall. Agriculture is a major sector of Liberia</p>				<p>were established. However the AF ESP principle 11: climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous Peoples were closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&amp;E framework (initial and closure project reports).</p>	
-------------------------------------	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>employing more than 70% of the population.</p> <p>B/ Local communities vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and disaster risks (e.g. considering level of exposure and adaptive capacity).</p> <p>SS 7:</p> <p>Indigenous Peoples : C/ Areas where indigenous peoples are present, or uncontacted or isolated indigenous peoples inhabit or where it is believed these peoples may inhabit. In Liberia there are at least sixteen ethnic groups. The small Dei group lives in Montserrado County near the coast and Monrovia, primarily between the Lofa and St. Paul rivers. Gbandi and Mende also live in upper Lofa County. No</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

		indigenous people have been identified to live in Bong County. The rating of the safeguards has been scored as level 2 as it is unknown at this stage if the project will be implemented in Lofa or in Bong. These risks relate to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous peoples.					
USP 5: [Zambia] Aquifer mapping technologies for Zambia	Yes	"While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the SRIF relate to: SS 1: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Sustainable Natural Resource: A/adverse impacts specifically to habitats that are legally protected, officially proposed for protection, or	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard measures were established. However the AF ESP principle 11: climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous Peoples were closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results	N/A

		<p>recognized as protected by traditional local communities and/or authoritative sources (e.g., National Park, Nature Conservancy, Indigenous Community Conserved Area, (ICCA); etc.) The rating of the safeguards has been scored as a risk - level 2 as the project will be implemented in an unknown location and should impact the country at national level. SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks. B/Areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts,</p>				<p>tracker and CTCN M&amp;E framework (initial and closure project reports).</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



		<p>severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami, or volcanic eruptions in the next 30 years. Water crisis is being experienced in most parts of Zambia especially in drought prone areas. The situation has worsened due to the drying up of surface water resources which much of the population depends on. The reduced amount of rainfall being received because of climate change has negatively affected the water levels of the highly dependent surface water resources.</p> <p>SS 7: Indigenous Peoples : C/ areas where indigenous peoples are present, or uncontacted or isolated</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		indigenous peoples inhabit or where it is believed these peoples may inhabit. The rating of the safeguards has been scored as level 2 as the project will be implemented in an area that has not yet been selected, and will directly impact the country, at national level. These risks relate to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous peoples.					
USP 6: [Ghana] Promoting and upscaling appropriate solar irrigation technology options for smallholder farmers in Ghana through innovative climate adaptation financing mechanisms, a conducive policy	Yes	"While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the SRIF relate to: SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks A/areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard measures were established. However the AF ESP principle 11: climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous Peoples	N/A

<p>framework for technology regulation and tailored training modules</p>		<p>as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions in the next 30 years. Ghana's 4th National communication to the UNFCCC indicates that temperatures in the country are most likely to increase by at least 3°C by 2080 nationwide with the savanna regions recording temperatures above 30°C. The impact of this increased temperature includes a decrease in the length of the wet season, an increase in the number of dry days per month,</p>				<p>were closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&amp;E framework (initial and closure project reports).</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>heatwaves and potential evapotranspiration leading to increasing risk of droughts. B/ local communities vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and disaster risks (e.g. considering level of exposure and adaptive capacity. The agriculture sector in Ghana employs about 47% of the country's labour force, most of which are smallholder farmers. SS 7: Indigenous Peoples C/Areas where indigenous peoples are present or uncontacted or isolated indigenous peoples inhabit or where it is believed these peoples may inhabit The rating of the safeguards has been scored as</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		level 2 as the project will be implemented at national level. These risks relate to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous peoples .					
USP 7: [Vietnam] Localization of water resources management technology to adapt to climate change in Hong-Thai Binh river basin	Yes	"While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the SRIF relate to: SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks : A/areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions in the next 30 years.	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard measures were established. However the AF ESP principle 11: climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous Peoples were closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports).	N/A

		<p>Vietnam was ranked by the Global Climate Risk Index 2020 as the sixth country in the world most affected by climate variability and extreme weather events over the period 1999-2018.</p> <p>SS 7: Indigenous Peoples: B/areas where indigenous peoples are present or uncontacted or isolated indigenous peoples inhabit or where it is believed these peoples may inhabit. The rating of the safeguards has been scored as level 2 as the project will be implemented in areas where indigenous peoples and ethnic minority groups live, though most of the activities of the project are related to</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

		environmental/water planning and management data and information. These risks relate to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous peoples.					
USP 8: [Maldives] Establishment of a skimming well gallery system for agricultural use in HDh.Nolhivaranfaru of Maldives	Yes	"SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks : Impact and probability rated as Low under the SRIF. Main risks identified are: A/outputs and outcomes sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change (e.g. changes in precipitation, temperature, salinity, extreme events). The risk level is evaluated as level 2 as the effectiveness of the infiltration gallery system being piloted may be impacted by extreme weather	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard measures were established. However the AF ESP principle 11: climate change and AF ESP Principle 12 – Pollution prevention and resource efficiency were closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports).	N/A

		<p>events and by e.g. changes the amount of precipitation and surface runoff. SS 3: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency : Impact and probability rated as 2 under the SRIF. Main risks identified are:</p> <p>B/Significant consumption of energy, water, or other material inputs. Though no significant consumption of material inputs is expected, risk level is assessed as level 2. It is noted that the gallery system to be installed requires gravel to encase the gallery pipeline. Measures have been taken in tendering to avoid utilization of local coral gravel (as per government</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--



		regulations); gravel will likely be imported from overseas These risks relate to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change and AF ESP Principle 12 – Pollution prevention and resource efficiency.					
USP 9: [Nepal] Customized weather and climate information system for climate-resilient agriculture in Nepal	Yes	"While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the SRIF relate to: SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks. A/ areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard measures were established. However the AF ESP principle 11: climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous Peoples were closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports).	N/A

		<p>eruptions in the next 30 years. The project is designed to help address projected climate impacts to rural farmer communities of Nepal. Climate change-induced risks threaten Nepal's water dependent, climate sensitive agriculture sector, which alone employs over 2/3 of the country's labour force and plays a key role in the livelihoods of 80% of the population.</p> <p>SS 7: Indigenous Peoples. B/ areas where indigenous peoples are present, or uncontacted or isolated indigenous peoples inhabit or where it is believed these peoples may inhabit. The rating of the safeguards</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>has been scored as level 2 as it is unknown at this stage if the project will be implemented in areas involving indigenous peoples. These risks relate to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous peoples.</p>					
<p>USP 10: [Sudan ] Soil erosion valuation using advanced laboratory measurement methods to support climate resilient agriculture and food security</p>	Yes	<p>"While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the SRIF relate to: SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks. A/ areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise,</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard measures were established. However the AF ESP principle 11: climate change was closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&amp;E framework (initial and closure project reports)</p>	N/A

		storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions in the next 30 years. This risk relates to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change.					
USP 11: [Honduras] Designing nature-based solutions with an ethnic and gender-equity approach, to increase the resilience of rural mountain communities in protected natural areas affected by extreme weather events in Honduras	Yes	While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the SRIF relate to: SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks. A/ areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions in the next 30 years. This risk relates to AF ESP Principle 11	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard measures were established. However the AF ESP principe 11: climate change was closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports)	N/A

		climate change.					
USP 12: [Mongolia] Enhancing climate resilience and economic sustainability of livestock farming in a rural community of Mongolia	Yes	While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the SRIF relate to: SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks. A/ areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions in the next 30 years. This risk relates to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change.	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard measures were established. However the AF ESP principle 11: climate change was closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports)	N/A
USP 13: : [Sudan] - Updating and improving of existing hydrologic and	Yes	"While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific	N/A

<p>hydraulic models and configuring a Flood Early Warnings System (FEWS) in Sudan</p>		<p>through the SRIF relate to: SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks. A/ areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions in the next 30 years. The project is designed to increase resilience against potential climate change impacts as Sudanese nationals will have access to a reliable FEWS to help them plan and avoid extreme damages from flood disasters. SS 7:</p>				<p>safeguard measures were established. However the AF ESP principle 11: climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous Peoples were closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&amp;E framework (initial and closure project reports).</p>	
---	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

		Indigenous Peoples. B/ areas where indigenous peoples are present, or uncontacted or isolated indigenous peoples inhabit or where it is believed these peoples may inhabit. The rating of the safeguards has been scored as level 2 as the project will be implemented at national level." These risks relate to The risks relate to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous peoples.					
USP 14: [Georgia] - Building up integrated monitoring and early warning forest fires detection system in the Borjomi - Kharagauli National Park by innovative remote sensing tools	Yes	"While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the SRIF relate to: SS1: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Sustainable Natural Resource Management	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard measures were established. However the A AF ESP Principle 10 – Conservation of biological	N/A

		<p>A/ adverse impacts specifically to habitats that are legally protected, officially proposed for protection, or recognized as protected by traditional local communities and/or authoritative sources (e.g., National Park, Nature Conservancy, Indigenous Community Conserved Area, (ICCA); etc.)? The project will be implemented in a protected National Park in Georgia located in Samtskhe-Javakheti where the largest ethnic minorities (Azerbaijanis and Armenians) constitute numerical majorities. It is not expected that the project will</p>				<p>diversity, AF ESP Principle 11 climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous peoples were closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&amp;E framework (initial and closure project reports).</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



		<p>have adverse impacts on habitats, protected areas or communities, at the contrary, the project should support a better management and protection of these protected areas and the minorities living in the region. That is why the rating of the safeguards has been scored as level 2. SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks. A/ areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions in the next 30</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>years. Georgia is a rich forested country (approximately 40% of area). The biggest wealth of Borjomi-Kharagauli National Park is the forest (75% of the territory) where large areas of the untouched sections of the mixed forests of Caucasus are protected. The project aims at implementing an early warning and monitoring system for forest fires that will enable to register changes of precipitation, temperature, extreme events and to better prevent them to have negative impacts on the protected areas. SS 7: Indigenous Peoples. B/ areas where indigenous peoples are present, or uncontacted or isolated</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>indigenous peoples inhabit or where it is believed these peoples may inhabit. The project will be implemented in Samtskhe-Javakheti region; thus, the rating of the safeguards has been scored as level 2. According to the most recent 2014 census, the largest ethnic minorities are Azerbaijanis 233,000 (6.3 per cent) and Armenians 168,100 (4.5 per cent). Other ethnic groups include Russians 26,500 (0.7 per cent), Ossetians 14,400 (0.4 per cent), Yezidis 12,200 (0.3 per cent), Greeks 5,500 (0.1 per cent), Kists 5,700 (0.2 per cent), Assyrians 2,400 (0.1 per cent),</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Ukrainians 6,000 (0.2 per cent) as well as small Jewish and Polish communities. Several of these are minorities on both ethnic and religious grounds. Azerbaijanis and Armenians are concentrated in the regions of Kvemo Kartli and Samtskhe-Javakheti, where they constitute numerical majorities. The risks relate to AF ESP Principle 10 – Conservation of biological diversity, AF ESP Principle 11 climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous peoples.</p>					
<p>USP 15 [Mozambique] - Solar based irrigation business model “pay as you irrigate” for women empowerment,</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>"While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the SRIF relate</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard measures</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>water management and food security in Mozambique</p>		<p>to: SS1: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Sustainable Natural Resource Management A/ adverse impacts specifically to habitats that are legally protected, officially proposed for protection, or recognized as protected by traditional local communities and/or authoritative sources (e.g., National Park, Nature Conservancy, Indigenous Community Conserved Area, (ICCA); etc.)? This risk category was, at the time of drafting the SRIF, rated as a level 2 as it was unknown in which commune would the project be implemented. This risk category can be lowered to a level 1</p>				<p>were established. However the A AF ESP Principle 10 – Conservation of biological diversity, AF ESP Principle 11 climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous peoples were closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&amp;E framework (initial and closure project reports).</p>	
---	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

		<p>as the selected commune is now identified and is not a commune with habitats legally protected.</p> <p>SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks. A/ areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic eruptions in the next 30 years.</p> <p>Mozambique is vulnerable to climate changes, being systematically affected by extreme events such as floods, cyclones, and droughts. These events have a direct</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>impact on agriculture. Mozambique is struggling to feed its 30 million people over the country, which in most cases is related to the scarcity of water for agricultural purposes. The “pay as you irrigate” approach will address the issue of bankability of smallholder farmers, since most farmers do not have assets to serve as collateral in formal banks when applying for loans with a special focus on women who are the most disadvantaged and therefore vulnerable to climate change impacts. SS 7: Indigenous Peoples. B/ areas where indigenous peoples are present, or uncontacted or isolated indigenous</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>peoples inhabit or where it is believed these peoples may inhabit. This risk was rated as level 2 when the SRIF was formulated as the pilot area was unknown. Minority groups in Mozambique include Macua 5.5 million (26.1%), Lómuè 1.6 million (7.6%), Sena 1.4 million (6.8%), Chuabo 785,000 (3.8%), Marendje, 75,000 (0.4%), Nyanja 500,000 (2.4%) and Ndau 1.9 million (9%). Minority issues are not sharply drawn in the usual sense in Mozambique. This level of this risk can be reduced to 1 as the project is implemented in a commune</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



		that is not an indigenous community. The risk relate to AF ESP Principle 10 – Conservation of biological diversity, AF ESP Principle 11 climate change and AF ESP Principle 7 – Indigenous peoples.					
USP 16 - [Pakistan] - Development of the locally led technology transfer action plan and a blueprint for action for the uptake of rainwater harvesting system at the local level in Pakistan	Yes	"While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the SRIF relate to: SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks. A/ areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami or	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard measures were established. However the AF ESP principle 11: climate change was closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports)	N/A

		<p>volcanic eruptions in the next 30 years. The project is designed to enable the sustainable implementation of tools, technologies and practices which aim to prevent / reduce damages caused by floods and droughts which are high in the country. This risk relates to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change.</p>					
<p>USP 17: [Malaysia] - Development of a Multi-Hazard Platform for forecasting Local level climate extremes and physical hazards for Iskandar Malaysia</p>	Yes	<p>" SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks. A/ areas that are now or are projected to be subject to natural hazards such as extreme temperatures, earthquakes, extreme precipitation and flooding, landslides, droughts, severe winds, sea level rise, storm surges, tsunami or volcanic</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>As the projects were rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer , no specific safeguard measures were established. However the AF ESP principle 11: climate change was closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&amp;E framework</p>	N/A

		<p>eruptions in the next 30 years. Malaysia's geographic location and low poverty rates mean both its risk and vulnerability to natural hazards, including climate change, are lower than some of its Southeast Asian neighbours. Nonetheless, Malaysia suffers high average annual losses. In 2014 UNISDR estimated these at around \$1.3 billion. While Malaysia can experience drought, landslides, earthquakes, and storm surges, most of its losses are attributable to flooding. Flood risk in urban areas is rising. Growing urban populations are particularly exposed to</p>				(initial and closure project reports).	
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>flash floods driven by high intensity rainfall. In addition, coastal vulnerability has been increasing because of sea-level rise. Storm surge, coastal erosion, and saline intrusion present increasing threats to the development of Malaysia's coastal zones, including fast growing coastal areas which are critical to the country's economic development.</p> <p>Iskandar Malaysia (IM) is one such fastest growing economic zone in the southern tip of peninsular Malaysia which is vulnerable to the disasters due to rapid urbanization and increasing population and exposure to the coastal</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>hazards. This Technical Assistance will develop of a Multi-Hazard Platform (MHP) for forecasting Local level climate extremes and physical hazards for Iskandar Malaysia. It demonstrates strong linkages with NDC and national priorities. This risk relates to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change.</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

**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

N/A

**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
---------------------------	-------	-----------	----------	--------	---------------------------------------

**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>"Although no specific gaps affecting GP compliance have been identified during implementation, opportunities to address gender in a more effective and inclusive manners have been identified by the CTCN, not only under AFCIA implementation but under CTCN delivery model as a whole. Following the need to better catalyse the link between climate change technologies &amp; Innovation and their impact on gender, the CTCN has initiated the revision of its criteria for screening that have been updated and approved during the 22nd Advisory Board meeting held in September 2023 in Bonn, and include gender as both a balancing and prioritization criteria. These criteria that will unfortunately not be used under AFCIA as the selection was over when they got approved, are still available by following this link: <a href="https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/AB2023.22.23_Draft%20Revised_Eligibility_and_Prioritization_Criteria.pdf">https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/AB2023.22.23_Draft%20Revised_Eligibility_and_Prioritization_Criteria.pdf</a></p> <p>Revised indicators on gender were also approved during the Advisory Board Meeting held in Bonn in September 2023. The Monitoring and Evaluation report of the CTCN thus include 2 new indicators on gender: number of participants in climate technology RD&amp;D and innovation-related events (gender disaggregated); percentage of TA budget allocation targeting gender mainstreaming that will be used for all the AFCIA project under implementation or bidding process. The selection of the gender-responsive project/programme indicators was aligned with Adaptation Fund's GP (para. 16). As per Decision 2/CP.17 to facilitate the preparation and implementation of technology projects and strategies considering gender considerations to support action on mitigation and adaptation, the CTCN has developed a Gender Policy and Action Plan which was updated and approved by the Board during the 22nd Advisory Board meeting held in Bonn in September 2023. This new Gender Policy fully integrates the gender principles defined under the Adaptation Fund's Gender Policy, available by following this link: CTCN's gender strategy <a href="https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/resources/ctcn_gender_policy_and_gender_action_plan.docx_.pdf">https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/resources/ctcn_gender_policy_and_gender_action_plan.docx_.pdf</a> This gender policy also responds to the UNFCCC Gender Action Plan (Decision 3/CP.23) and the increasingly acknowledged and important linkages between gender and climate, and thus applies to the full range of CTCN activities including technical assistance, capacity building, networking, communication, knowledge sharing, monitoring, and evaluation. The policy was developed in a collaboration between gender experts and the</p>	Satisfactory	<p>Revised indicators on gender were also approved during the Advisory Board Meeting held in Bonn in September 2023. The Monitoring and Evaluation report of the CTCN thus include 2 new indicators on gender: number of participants in climate technology RD&amp;D and innovation-related events (gender disaggregated); percentage of TA budget allocation targeting gender mainstreaming that will be used for all the AFCIA project under implementation or bidding process. The selection of the gender-responsive</p>

<p>CTCN secretariat. The CTCN also acknowledges the valuable inputs provided by representatives from the UNFCCC Women and Gender Constituency. During the Advisory Board of the CTCN held in Bonn in September 2023, the CTCN was requested to allocate a minimum of 5% of the budget to gender mainstreaming activities. This budget will be used to request the formulation of a mandatory gender assessment under each technical assistance. When it comes to TA implementation and how could /should gender be better involved in the implementation, some good practices have been identified during the implementation of the TA in Mongolia. In this project, it was decided that in order to encourage the participation of women during the workshops and capacity building sessions, these sessions will be organized during Fridays and weekends. This requirement was raised by the community itself to facilitate the representation of all the members of the community. A recording as well as the powerpoint presentation are available by following these links: :  <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wJesneb3Q3A">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wJesneb3Q3A</a> (with gender assessment around 25:40). Their presentation is available by following this link: <a href="https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/2023-10/20.2_CTCN_Mongolia_NDE-Alinea.pdf">https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/2023-10/20.2_CTCN_Mongolia_NDE-Alinea.pdf</a>.</p>		<p>project/program indicators was aligned with Adaptation Fund's (para. 16).</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>UNEP has ensured that gender equality is included among the selection criteria of the proposals selected by CTCN to be funded by AFCIA. In addition, Safeguards Risk Identification Forms (SRIF) have been developed following UNEP Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework (ESSF, approved in February 2020) and related guidance on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Stakeholder Response mechanisms. Gender equality is a guiding principle of UNEP screening checklist. It is mainstreamed throughout the safeguards but is also the center of three specific questions in the first section of the SRIF to ensure the project does not have unintended negative impacts on gender equality. During this reporting period, an assessment was made to demonstrate that the SRIF was fully aligned with Adaptation Fund's 15 principles.</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>"CTCN has robust gender procedures in place to mainstream gender from the early start of the discussion on the Technical Assistance (TA) requests and the design of project concept notes, through implementation and monitoring of impacts on gender equality and women empowerment. Key tools and procedures already in place and used in developing and implementing AFCIA TA micro/grant projects include: • CTCN screening and prioritization criteria applied to all TA assistance projects (including AFCIA projects) include a gender equality and women empowerment criteria, and are aligned with UNEP ESSF (criteria 6. The request promotes and demonstrates gender equality, and empowerment of vulnerable groups, including women and youth) • CTCN Gender Mainstreaming Tool is being used to develop the response plans and guide the design, implementation and monitoring of the TAs. The tool follows a 3-step approach: 1/Perform gender analysis; 2/Develop action plan; 3/Monitor and Evaluate. The goal is to support equal participation and ensure that both women and men benefit from the project and that inequality is not perpetuated. • IPs/Network Members are required to report on gender indicators, and provide gender disaggregated data where applicable • IPs are further required to include in their proposals at least one gender expert Opportunities to address gender in a more effective and inclusive manners have been identified by the CTCN, not only under AFCIA implementation but under CTCN</p>

	<p>delivery model as a whole: 1. the CTCN has initiated the revision of its criteria for screening that have been updated and approved during the 22nd Advisory Board meeting held in September 2023 in Bonn, and include gender as both a balancing and prioritization criteria. These criteria are available by following this link: <a href="https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/AB2023.22.23_Draft%20Revised_Eligibility_and_Prioritization_Criteria.pdf">https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/AB2023.22.23_Draft%20Revised_Eligibility_and_Prioritization_Criteria.pdf</a>. They will unfortunately not be used under AFCIA I as the selection of all micro-grant was over when they got approved but they will be used during the second phase of AFCIA (AFCIA II). 2. Revised indicators on gender were approved during the Advisory Board Meeting held in Bonn in September 2023. The Monitoring and Evaluation report of the CTCN thus include 2 new indicators on gender: number of participants in climate technology RD&amp;D and innovation-related events (gender disaggregated); percentage of TA budget allocation targeting gender mainstreaming that will be used for all the AFCIA project under implementation or bidding process. 3. the CTCN has developed a Gender Policy and Action Plan which was updated and approved by the Board during the 22nd Advisory Board meeting held in Bonn in September 2023. This new Gender Policy fully integrates the gender principles defined under the Adaptation Fund's Gender Policy, available by following this link: CTCN's gender strategy <a href="https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/resources/ctcn_gender_policy_and_gender_action_plan.docx_.pdf">https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/resources/ctcn_gender_policy_and_gender_action_plan.docx_.pdf</a> . This gender policy also responds to the UNFCCC Gender Action Plan (Decision 3/CP.23) and the increasingly acknowledged and important linkages between gender and climate, and thus applies to the full range of CTCN activities including technical assistance, capacity building, networking, communication, knowledge sharing, monitoring, and evaluation. The policy was developed in a collaboration between gender experts and the CTCN secretariat. The CTCN also acknowledges the valuable inputs provided by representatives from the UNFCCC Women and Gender Constituency. 4. During the Advisory Board of the CTCN held in Bonn in September 2023, the CTCN was requested to allocate a minimum of 5% of the budget to gender mainstreaming activities. This budget will be used to request the formulation of a mandatory gender assessment under each technical assistance that will include at least the following components: i) Gender Disparities Analysis (evaluate the status of gender disparities in the project's context, including socio-economic, cultural, and institutional factors. Identify areas where inequalities exist etc) ii) Data Collection (collect and analyse gender-disaggregated data to understand the specific needs and preferences of different genders). iii) Gender-Responsive Design (assess the project's design to ensure that it considers the different roles, responsibilities, and interests of various genders. Consider how the project can empower marginalized genders and promote gender equality.) iv) Gender and Innovation ecosystem (assess how the technology could foster women as entrepreneurs) iv) Gender Budgeting (budget allocation to target gender mainstreaming activities. Also ensure that gender-specific needs are adequately funded). v) Capacity Building vi) Monitoring and Evaluation (shall include regular gender-sensitive assessments to track progress and adjust as necessary).</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 been identified during the reporting</p>	<p>Yes</p>



period and if so, what remediation was implemented?	
---	--

#### Section 4: Grievances

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

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

Comments

## Rating

#### Implementing Entity

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
"Component 1: Outreach and sourcing of innovation micro-grant proposals Outcome 1: The innovation micro-grants mechanism is launched and partnerships for accessing the Adaptation Fund innovation mechanism are accelerated"	Outcome 8	Outcome indicator: No. of countries requesting microgrants to support innovation in adaptation. Target : 20 countries	Completed	Satisfactory
"Component 2: Micro-grants support the development and diffusion of innovative adaptation practices, tools, and technologies Outcome 2.: Adaptation innovation and technology incubation and acceleration supported by government structures and processes"	Outcome 8	"Outcome indicator: No. of microgrants invested in technology acceleration. Target: 20 investments Target: Promising Adaptation Innovations and Technologies are accelerated in 15 countries Technical and financial systems to accelerate adaption innovation and technology action are strengthened in 10 countries"	Ontrack	Highly Satisfactory
"Component 3: Concrete adaptation actions are triggered by the knowledge and evidence produced by the micro-grant mechanism Outcome 3: Experiences from the micro-grant	Outcome 8	"Outcome indicator: Scaled up funding secured for technology acceleration investment Target: Scaled up funding secured for at least 4 technology	Ontrack	Satisfactory

innovation mechanism lead to scaled-up funding"		acceleration investments"		
---	--	---------------------------	--	--

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

Name	Email
Eva Comba.	eva.comba@un.org

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

"Outcome 1 target has been exceeded with over 87 countries among which 51.3% of LDCs and 6.3% from SIDS submitting an application to AFCIA and 25 projects from 23 countries including 10 are implemented in LDCs and 3 in SIDS, thus 52%. The following limitations have been identified on the selection / application process: - Applicants are disproportionately governmental stakeholders including NDE. Additional efforts would have been needed to increase the reach of the Programme among non-conventional stakeholders such as NGOs, civil society, research centers, universities and private sector. - The quality of the proposals was generally quite low and could have benefited from additional support for further improvement Outcome 2 indicator will be reached and even exceeded as 25 projects have been selected to receive micro-grant to support adaptation innovation and technologies (15 under the acceleration window and 10 under the enabling environment window). Currently while 5 projects have been completed and 12 are under implementation, 8 remains at bidding process stage or final stage. Current target is therefore at 17 out of 25. The 5 closed projects rated by the beneficiaries as "very successful" and were able to demonstrate transformational changes. As positive feedback, it should be noted that the MTR confirmed that the selected projects were fully and dully aligned with the national priorities and strategies and that countries were involved through their respective NDE and AF DA. The projects under implementation are evolving smoothly although in most of the cases, a contract extension is expected to (or have been) requested. No impacts are expected at Programme level. As a mitigation measure, UNEP CTCN would recommend, for future opportunities and programmes to include a 6-month buffer period for each project. Limitation during the implementation phase as highlighted by the MTR are as follow: - Gender responsiveness: It has been noted by the MTR that even though the CTCN screens and evaluates the projects with gender criteria, and monitor the impact based on gender indicators, only few projects reflect very strong gender focus. As a mitigation measure, new response plan includes a mandatory gender assessment and a minimum of 5% of the budget being used for gender mainstreaming activities. - Diminishing government engagement during procurement and project implementation, reducing ownership and a conducive enabling environment for technological replication and scale. Active participation will be secured through securing a specific budget for the selected IP to carry regular consultations - Coordination among various climate change interventions at the country level is an issue, as NDE is not always the ministry/department/individual responsible for implementation or for overall coordination. More efforts will have to be made by the IP and CTCN to encourage this internal coordination Outcome 3 indicator is well advanced and should be achieved by the end of the project with 3 out of the 5 closed micro-grant project that have already secured additional financing for scaling up the successfully tested technology / innovation. The good examples provided are reflected in the MTR which states: There have also been demonstrated success in leveraging additional support, namely additional government, or grant funding, for some of the introduced technologies. Nevertheless, going to market remains a challenge for adaptation innovations. In AFCIA phase II a more specific approach will be implemented to ensure greater engagement of private actors to attract additional investments. This will be done, among others, through the organization of regional innovation hubs with the aim of attracting private sector finance to successful technologies Overall, progresses of the Programme are rated as satisfactory as 1 outcome target has been over achieved and the remaining two will be reached and even exceeded (for outcome 2) before the end of the project. Lessons learned have been collected by CTCN and UNEP and through the MTR and key elements will be put in place to further improve future Programme performance"

**Executing Entity / Project Coordinator**

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
"Component 1: Outreach and sourcing of innovation micro-grant proposals"	Outcome 8	"Output 1.1: Outreach plan developed for 70 countries in the programme Target: 1 outreach plan developed Output 1.2: Project concept notes for Adaptation Fund innovation micro-grants mechanism are strengthened in 30 countries through partnerships with CTCN Network Members Target: 30 project concept notes "	Completed	Highly Satisfactory
"Component 2: Micro-grants support the development and diffusion of innovative adaptation practices, tools and technologies"	Outcome 8	"Output 2.1: Promising adaptation innovations and Technologies are accelerated in 15 countries Target: 15 adaptation technology innovations supported Output 2.2: Technical and financial systems to support adaption innovation and technology action are strengthened in 10 countries Target: 10 technical analyses to support the EE for the Technology Innovation "	Ontrack	Highly Satisfactory
"Component 3: Concrete adaptation actions are triggered by the knowledge and evidence produced by the micro-grant mechanism"	Outcome 8	"3.1 Lessons learned and good practices from project implementation support are shared Target: 5 success stories Target: 1 dashboard Output 3.2 Guidance document for adaptation innovation : Target: 1 guidance document is provided Target: 5 communication products Output 3.3: Proposals for scaled up investment of 2 technology investments are developed and funding secured. Target: 2 business/funding proposals (2 CN are submitted)"	Ontrack	Satisfactory

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

Name	Email	Institution
Rajiv Garg	gargr@un.org	UNEP-CTCN

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

" The project is well on track, with all 25 projects selected, 17 under implementation or closed, and 8 at final stage of the bidding process. • Outreach: The outreach strategy is evolving from the sourcing phase to the dissemination of lessons learnt, good practices and success story as 68% of the projects are now under implementation or already finalized. In that sense, during this reporting period, one photo reportage was made on Vietnam and will be used to develop a success story, and two success stories were formulated for Liberia and Saint kitts. A success story on Burundi was published last year and can still be seen by following this link: <https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/can-portable-dam-help-africa-counter-rising-waters>. The dashboard is also operational and can be accessed by following this link: [https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/default/files/af\\_news\\_document/CTCN\\_AFCIADashboard\\_Final.pdf](https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/default/files/af_news_document/CTCN_AFCIADashboard_Final.pdf). the dashboard can also be accessed through the bottom of the main CTCN AFCIA page :<https://www.ctc-n.org/technical->

assistance/adaptation-fund-climate-innovation-accelerator-afcia. • CTCN will continue to draw on lessons learned from AFCIA to better respond to countries' needs. The MTR has been implemented and UNEP CTCN will integrate the recommendations for the second half of the implementation. These recommendations are to: 1/Increase accountability of implementing partners toward the government and government engagement in project governance structures notably during implementation 2/Encourage the mapping and engagement of the national innovation ecosystem as a part of the formal design requirements, when developing the Response Plan 3/ think through how AFCIA will affect change and promote innovation 4/Realise the benefit of piloting concrete interventions and technologies, in addition to technical assistance, research and studies, to demonstrate effects and obtain related learning 5/Employ systems thinking also to the challenge of attracting private finance to adaptation innovation, encouraging the development of accessible and affordable business models 6/Encourage projects to design and pursue exit strategies, including the identification of additional financing options 7/In addition to increasing gender assessment, gender-specific programming, improved disaggregation of indicators and assigning greater resources (both staff and budget) to gender mainstreaming, ensure the key stakeholder also understand the value of these efforts. 8/greater coordination between the Adaptation Fund Secretariat, UNEP, CTCN, UNDP and other similar efforts promoting adaptation innovation globally Also, the CTCN is making efforts to strengthen the impact of the projects on gender (please refer to the page on ""Risks"" and GP for more details) and to gather post implementation impacts of the TA with the objective to demonstrate that small TA can leverage and lead to scale up of innovative adaptation technologies and lead to transformational change. For that specific purpose, discussions with the countries that have benefitted from AFCIA funding were held during the respective climate weeks to gather inputs on possible leveraging of additional funding (which happened for 3 of the 5 completed projects). As well, as part of the MTR process, a questionnaire was sent to the NDEs, IP, and project proponents of all the (non separately interviewed or visited projects) to request inputs on these 3 aspects: 1. How well has your specific project funded through the Adaptation Fund Climate Innovation Accelerator (AFCIA) managed to support innovative adaptation ideas and technologies, also for more marginalised and vulnerable groups, where relevant? 2. Have you managed to obtain additional financing to scale up your AFCIA funded project? 3. Please share additional feedback on three aspects that worked well and three aspect that could have been improved during the identification and implementation of your AFCIA-funded project. If the project has already had an effect on the lives of final beneficiaries, including more vulnerable groups, please provide related details here. If you have managed to expand the innovation and/or leverage additional financing, please provide additional details here, also on the additional amount (USD) leveraged, the financing source etc. According to the mini-survey conducted during the MTR, half of the respondents had obtained additional funding for their projects. Additionally, the projects in Honduras and Liberia had concrete plans to leverage additional funding. According to the Ministry of Agriculture in Liberia, "by intensifying production, we are securing the livelihoods of farmers but also reducing the dependence of food imports and markets. We are making agriculture profitable, hoping to attract more innovation and investments as well." (PPR 2023) The government and implementing partner are exploring options to scale the SPIS technology across rice farming in the country. Similar repercussions on the use and deployment of SPIS systems is expecting for Ghana and Mozambique.

## Other

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

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

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

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

## Overall Rating

### Overall rating

Satisfactory

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

"Outcome 1 target has been exceeded with over 87 countries among which 51.3% of LDCs and 6.3% from SIDS submitting an application to AFCIA and 25 projects from 23 countries including 10 are implemented in LDCs and 3 in SIDS, thus 52%. The following limitations have been identified on the selection / application process: - Applicants are disproportionately governmental stakeholders including NDE. Additional efforts would have been needed to increase the reach of the programme among non-conventional stakeholders such as NGOs, civil society, research centers, universities and private sector. - The quality of the proposals was generally quite low and could have benefited from additional support for further improvement Outcome 2 indicator will be reached and even exceeded as 25 projects have been selected to receive micro-grant to support adaptation innovation and technologies (15 under the acceleration window and 10 under the enabling environment window). Currently while 5 projects have been completed and 12 are under implementation, 8 remains at bidding process stage or final stage. Current target is therefore at 17 out of 25. The 5 closed projects rated by the beneficiaries as "very successful" and were able to demonstrate transformational changes. As positive feedback, it should be noted that the MTR confirmed that the selected projects were fully and dully aligned with the national priorities and strategies and that countries were involved through their respective NDE and AF DA. The projects under implementation are evolving smoothly although in most of the cases, a contract extension is expected to (or have been) requested. No impacts are expected at programme level. As a mitigation measure, UNEP CTCN would recommend, for future opportunities and programmes to include a 6-month buffer period for each project. Limitation during the implementation phase as highlighted by the MTR are as follow: - Gender responsiveness: It has been noted by the MTR that even though the CTCN screens and evaluates the projects with gender criteria, and monitor the impact based on gender indicators, only few projects reflect very strong gender focus. As a mitigation measure, new response plan includes a mandatory gender assessment and a minimum of 5% of the budget being used for gender mainstreaming activities. - Diminishing government engagement during procurement and project implementation, reducing ownership and a conducive enabling environment for technological replication and scale. Active participation will be secured through securing a specific budget for the selected IP to carry regular consultations - Coordination among various climate change interventions at the country level is an issue, as NDE is not always the ministry/department/individual responsible for implementation or for overall coordination. More efforts will have to be made by the IP and CTCN to encourage this internal coordination Outcome 3 indicator is well advanced and should be achieved by the end of the project with 3 out of the 5 closed mocro-grant project that have already secured additional financing for scaling up the successfully tested technology / innovation. The good examples provided are reflected in the MTR which states: There have also been demonstrated success in leveraging additional support, namely additional government, or grant funding, for some of the introduced technologies. Nevertheless, going to market remains a challenge for adaptation innovations. In AFCIA phase II a more specific approach will be implemented to ensure greater engagement of private actors to attract additional investments. This will be done, among others, through the organization of regional innovation hubs with the aim of attracting private sector finance to successful techologies Overall, progresses of the programme are rated as satisfactory as 1 outcome target has been over achieved and the remaining two will be reached and even exceeded (for outcome 2) before the end of the project. Lessons learned have been collected by CTCN and UNEP and through the MTR and key elements will be put in place to further improve future programme performance"

## Project Indicators

## List of indicators

Type of Indicator (indicators towards Objectives, Outcomes, etc...)	Indicator	Baseline	Progress Since Inception	Target for Project End
Objectives	Extent of innovative practices and investments taking place to address climate change adaptation challenges	0	17	3
Outcomes	1. # of countries requesting micro-grants to support innovation in adaptation	0	87	20
Outcomes	2. # micro-grants invested in technology acceleration	0	17	20
Outcomes	3. Scaled up funding secured for technology acceleration investment	0	3	4
Outputs	1.1 Outreach plan developed	0	1	1
Outputs	1.2 Project concept notes	0	30	30
Outputs	2.1 Number of adaptation technology innovations supported	0	12	15
Outputs	2.2 Number of technical analyses to support the enabling environment for technology innovation	0	5	10
Outputs	3.1 Number of project stories	0	3	5
Outputs	Operational project dashboard	CTCN tool to be adapted	1	1 tailored tool for the technology accelerator
Outputs	Number of guidance documents	0	0	1
Outputs	Number of communication products	0	6	5



Outputs	Number of business/funding proposals	0	1	2
---------	--------------------------------------	---	---	---

## Comments

Some of the indicators have been overshoot over the lifetime of the project, kindly refer to the task manager's assessment for detailed analyses on the same. The number of submissions and requests received are an indication of the need and appetite for adaptation technology and support, however the quality at entry is also indicative of the capacity building needs for these submissions to transition from concepts to support. The capacity gap has been proactively addressed through targeted communication, webinars, trainings and bilateral support provided by the CTCN secretariat. This will need to be upscaled and supported further in order to enable technology innovation, creation and deployment.

## 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)	Opportunities	" 1. Changes have been approved during CTCN AB Meeting on the way to approach gender mainstreaming activities. All these changes are described under GP section. What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP? [5]. 2. During this reporting period, the TOR of the project in Mozambique- Pay as you irrigate were revised to reflect the reality on the ground. Indeed, as a result of the first mission conducted by the IP to Mubobo (the commune selected at Response Plan stage by the Country), the main conclusion is that there are no technical conditions to successfully implement the project and test a 'pay-as-you-irrigate' business model. There is insufficient water to irrigate the envisaged irrigable area (5ha), and the water quality is unsuitable for establishing commercial agriculture for a sustainable business model. Due to the low yield of the aquifer and high costs, it is not realistic to construct more boreholes to satisfy the water demand. It is also unrealistic to install desalination technologies. Building a dam in the seasonal stream is also unrealistic since the water flow is seasonal and insufficient. As a result, it was agreed that the best way to move forward is to conduct a detailed technical assessment to identify suitable implementation areas in the Moamba district. The technical assessment resulted positive and the TA is now implemented in this local area.
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts?	Opportunities	The UNEP Environmental and Social Safeguard Framework (ESSF) has been used effectively in screening and prioritization of AFCIA submissions, such as those related to environmental sustainability and gender safeguards, and later used to enhance sustainability during the development of project concept notes. In alignment with the procedures (and AF requirements), at the time of writing this report, Safeguard Risk Identification Forms (SRIF) for the different selected projects have been developed according to the rules and guidelines of UNEP, and have been approved by UNEP Safeguards officer prior to technical assistance projects' implementation. At this stage, SRIFs have been cleared. All 25 projects selected under AFCIA are low risk, thus ESMP were developed.
How have gender considerations been taken into consideration during the reporting period? What have been the lessons learned as a consequence of	Opportunities	"CTCN has robust gender procedures in place to mainstream gender from the early stages of the discussion on the Technical Assistance (TA) requests and the design of project concept notes, through implementation and monitoring of impacts on gender equality and women empowerment. Key tools and procedures already in place and used in developing and implementing AFCIA TA micro/grant projects include: • CTCN screening and prioritization criteria applied to all TA assistance projects (including AFCIA projects) include a gender equality and women empowerment criteria, and aligned with UNEP ESSF (criteria 6. The request promotes and demonstrates gender equality, and empowerment of vulnerable groups, including women and youth) •

<p>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.</p>		<p>Gender Mainstreaming Tool is being used to develop the response plans and guide design, implementation and monitoring of the TAs. The tool follows a 3-step approach: 1/Perform gender analysis; 2/Develop action plan; 3/Monitor and Evaluate. The goal is to support equal participation and ensure that both women and men benefit from the project and that inequality is not perpetuated. • IPs/Network Members are required to report on gender indicators, and provide gender disaggregated data where applicable. IPs are further required to include in their proposals at least one gender expert. Despite this the MTR notes that: Apart from the 9 specific projects, other Technical Assistance implemented through UNEP CTCN AFCIA programme were not always reflecting gender in their results and that despite the SRIFs requirement, a gender focus was often presumed/taken for granted, rather than actively pursued in individual projects. The reasons for this situation has been analysed and could be summarized as such: the remaining TA have been requested by governmental institutions as project proponents to develop governmental decision tools and is therefore targeting directly governmental institutions which are disproportionally men. Opportunities to address gender in a more effective and inclusive manners have been identified by the CTCN, not only under AFCIA implementation but under CTCN delivery model as a whole: 1. the CTCN has initiated the revision of its criteria for screening that have been updated and approved during the 22nd Advisory Board meeting held in September 2023 in Bonn, and include gender both as a balancing and prioritization criteria. These criteria are available by following this link: <a href="https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/AB2023.22.23_Draft%20Revised_Eligibility_and_Prioritization_Criteria.pdf">https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/AB2023.22.23_Draft%20Revised_Eligibility_and_Prioritization_Criteria.pdf</a>. They will unfortunately not be used under AFCIA I as the selection of all micro-grants was over when they got approved but they will be used during the second phase of AFCIA (AFCIA II). 2. Revised indicators on gender were approved during the Advisory Board Meeting held in Bonn in September 2023. The Monitoring and Evaluation framework of the CTCN thus include 2 new indicators on gender: number of participants in climate technology RD&amp;D and innovation-related events (gender disaggregated); percentage of TA budget allocation targeting gender mainstreaming that will be used for all the AFCIA project under implementation or bidding process. 3. the CTCN has developed a Gender Policy and Action Plan which was updated and approved by the Board during the 22nd Advisory Board meeting held in Bonn in September 2023. This new Gender Policy fully integrates the gender principles defined under the Adaptation Fund&amp;#180;s Gender Policy, available by following this link: <a href="https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/resources/ctcn_gender_policy_and_gender_action_plan.docx_.pdf">CTCN's gender strategy https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/resources/ctcn_gender_policy_and_gender_action_plan.docx_.pdf</a>. The new gender policy also responds to the UNFCCC Gender Action Plan (Decision 3/CP.16) and the increasingly acknowledged and important linkages between gender and climate change and thus applies to the full range of CTCN activities including technical assistance, capacity building, networking, communication, knowledge sharing, monitoring, and evaluation. The policy was developed in a collaboration between gender experts and the CTCN secretariat. The CTCN also acknowledges the valuable inputs provided by representatives from the UNFCCC Women and Gender Constituency. 4. During the 22nd Advisory Board of the CTCN held in Bonn in September 2023, the CTCN was requested to allocate a minimum of 5% of the budget to gender mainstreaming activities. This budget will be used to request the formulation of a mandatory gender assessment under each technical assistance"</p>
<p>Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays?</p>	<p>Challenges</p>	<p>" The projects under implementation are evolving smoothly although in most of the cases, a contract extension is expected to (or have been) requested. No impacts are expected at programme level. The delays could be explained because of : - Political delays (5 projects) Sudan currently suffers from a delicate political situation and even though the country is highly committed and stakeholders very responsive, the missions on sites are not allowed by UN and the Implementing entities and thus delay are registered on the 2 AFCIA projects (but it is very satisfactory that both missions are able to continue their implementation thanks to the commitment of the NDE, project</p>



		<p>proponent and implementers). Political delays were also registered in Bahamas last year because of a change of government and its respective change of NDE. The project was finally reactivated in September 2023. Georgia TA was delayed at signature of the contract because of some VAT problems that were finally solved through the signing of an agreement between UN and the Republic of Georgia in 2022. The project in Pakistan, even if it was kicked off recently is registering delay because of the ND governmental officers too busy with the regional climate weeks and COP. As we are at the very beginning of the implementation, hopefully delays will be recovered. As a mitigation measure, it was decided to avoid selecting projects in countries expecting elections – it was for example the case of Paraguay that was finally not moved under AFCIA because of possible risks related to the elections planned in 2023. - Technical deviations (6 projects): this is the case of Nepal, Vietnam, Zambia, Mozambique and Ghana for which the assessment implemented at the start of the project revealed insufficient quality or quantity of data and led to more stakeholders’ consultations than initially planned which affected the timeline of the implementation. Delays due to technical complexities are also expected on Thailand as the bidding had to be re-launched because no bidders could pass the mandatory criterion, Indeed, blockchain being such an innovative technology, IP struggle to demonstrate more than 5 years of experience. The criteria (mandatory as well as technical evaluation ones) have been revised to better reflex the reality of this technology. As a mitigation measure, UNEP CTCN will consider the possibility to include a 6-months buffer to the Technical Assistances. - Financial (1 project) : Maldives suffered some delays due to an incorrect budgeting of the pilot. The project aims at protecting the underground water from saltwater intrusion and provide clean water to local farmers. However the dimensioning of the system was not calculated correctly and thus the system was not able to build a long enough skimming well gallery system to ensure that water would reach the communities. The IP along with the country managed to leverage additional USD 100k to extend the gallery a bit more but they lacked 100k to have a fully functioning system. Delays occurred while looking to leverage these additional funding. As this case is extraordinary, no mitigation measures have been defined yet."</p>
<p>What implementation issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected progress?</p>	<p>Challenges &amp; Opportunities</p>	<p>"The project is well on track, with all 25 projects selected, 17 under implementation, 8 closed, and 8 at final stage of the bidding process. CTCN continues to draw on lessons learned from AFCIA to better respond to countries’ needs. The MTR has been commissioned during this reporting period and UNEP CTCN will integrate the recommendations for the second half of the implementation. These recommendations included an opportunity to strengthen the impact of the projects on gender and to demonstrate that small TA can leverage / scale up innovative adaptation technologies and lead to transformational change. Mitigation measures on gender will be applied as defined under GP section. With regards to scale up opportunities, the success rate is quite satisfying at this stage with 2 projects over 5 having successfully secured funding, 1 in the process of securing funding and the 2 others actively looking to leverage additional source of funding for scale up. Scale up opportunities will also come from the AFCIA programme with the formulation of one additional Concept Note and 2 IP scale proposals to be submitted to the Adaptation Fund. The Result Tracker monitors indicator 8.1 : No. of innovative adaptation practices, tools and technologies accelerated, scaled-up and/or replicated. As reflected under the Rating tab, the target is to have 10 projects implemented under the Acceleration Component and monitored under this indicator. During the reporting period ending on October 2023, 9 Technical Assistances were under implementation under the acceleration component: Zambia: Aquifer Mapping Vietnam: Water management platform to analyse resources in the Hong Kong Binh river basin Nepal: Agro-meteorological platform Maldives: Skimming well gallery system for agricultural purposes Sudan: Soil mapping using drones Sudan: EWS for Flood Mozambique: Pay as you use for a SPIS Georgia: EWS for Forest Fires Pakistan: Improving Harvesting Technologies The Result Tracker also monitors indicator 8.2 of key findings on effective, efficient adaptation practices, products and technologies."</p>

	<p>generated ". During the reporting period ending in October 2023, 11 lessons learnt were identified. These are listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Defining Role and Responsibilities of the Steering Committee Members: One of the main lessons learnt from the implementation of the AFCIA Acceleration Component - is the need to define, from the start of the project, a Memorandum of Understanding (or Constitution document) that will very clearly define the role and responsibility of each member of the Steering Committee. This supports the decision-making process and ease the solution-thinking when a problem arises.</li> <li>2. Communities and Pilots: slow and improved Selection Process - Time and resources spent during the site selection and interaction with the local communities is fundamental and highly recommended for the NDE to be involved and to endorse the selection of technologies and local communities where pilots will be hosted. Communities benefitting from co-operative run by women's group should be prioritized. The communities and co-operatives selected need to be well-established and organised.</li> <li>3. Security Mechanisms: While piloting a climate adaptation technology at small scale, in one selected community, it is important to ensure that security mechanisms (against thief and vandalisms) are put in place. Most of the time, the security mechanisms are handled by the community itself ( rounds of surveillance) or through the co-operatives. The NDE should also be responsible of maintaining the sustainability of the pilot.</li> <li>4. Training and Awareness – A longer-term development programme – beyond the project span will ensure individuals, communities and organisations involved on the use of the technology are fully engaged and aware of all the potential benefits of the technology, and of the risks and mitigation measures that they can implement. To compensate the lack of resources, it is essential to engage very closely with the communities from the first week after the kick off of the project and to ensure very regular presence on the ground during the piloting phase. Ideally, this will consist of implementing one training by week during the first month of piloting, one training every 2 weeks during months 2-4 and one training session by month between months 4-6.</li> <li>5. Strong local Partner: To ensure a continuous engagement with the communities, the expertise and network and capabilities of the local partner is fundamental. The local partner should have expertise in the sector of technologies managed by the TA, it should be well connected to the governmental entities, have good understanding of local customs and traditions.</li> <li>6. Language: When working with local communities, it should be a mandatory requirement to have at least one member of the team locally based that is able to communicate with the community in their mother tongue (and then have the capacity to translate into one of the UN languages).</li> <li>7. Timeline: The timelines established in the terms of reference could be very challenging- because very tight (Micro-grants of max 18 months). Setting clear deadlines for submission of the deliverables and clear time for review contributed to a better production sequence.</li> <li>8. Project Management: Regular meeting with the Steering Committee (at least once a month and twice in month during the definition / implementation of the pilot) supports the country and community involvement.</li> <li>9. Sustainability of the project: Entities and persons responsible of the sustainability of the technology need to be appointed either during the MoU signed at the start of the project (see lessons learnt 1) or during the definition of the pilot. It should involve someone at community level (elected by the community to represent them) and one person from the government (NDE or other).</li> <li>10. Strengthening ownership: Projects should always prioritize approaches that enhance co-design through a collaborative development process between a project team and in-country stakeholders / end users. Maintaining engagement with and effective inclusion of end user feedback strengthens ownership of the systems being produced and ensures it responds to end user needs.</li> <li>11. Outreach activities: It would be useful to have a small amount of funding allocated to outreach activities to promote the technology and TA in the region / country.</li> </ol>
--	---

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

Yes

<b>Climate Resilience Measures</b>	
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?	1.UNEP CTCN should better integrate single pilot idea technology into a broader System of Innovation. 2. UNEP CTCN should better engage with the full knowledge helix (including non-governmental actors, such as the private sector), in developing innovation projects through a more innovative ideation process 3. It is important to pilot concrete interventions and technologies, in addition to technical assistance, research and studies, to reach real, palpable impact on community resilience, demonstrate effects and obtain related learning
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?	"• Over the 5 Technical Assistances that have been completed under AFCIA, 3 of them have already managed to leverage additional funding. Please, find below a brief summary of the status by projects: o Burundi: A Concept Note is under revision by the Adaptation Fund and (if and when the CN gets approved) will lead to the preparation of a full-scale proposal for the Adaptation Fund. o Mongolia: This TA resulted in the successful leveraging of 7.5 million USD from the government of Canada and 100,000 USD co-funding mobilized from corporate contributions for the scaling up. o Saint Kitts and Nevis: Following the AFCIA Technical Assistance implemented under AFCIA, the project was able to leverage additional 100,000 USD from the Caribbean Public Health Agency (CARPHA) to develop a Water Information System for the islands. Additionally, the following projects are currently intending to leverage additional funding: o Honduras: a Concept note has been drafted to support the exercise of scaling up the project o Liberia: According to the Ministry of Agriculture this pilot is demonstrating a model that could have tremendous impact both at the micro and macro level, when implemented at the national scale. "By intensifying production, we are securing the livelihoods of farmers but also reducing the dependence of food imports and markets, we are making agriculture profitable, hoping to attract more innovation and investments as well", concluded Halala Willie Kokulo (Division of Land Development and Water Resources, Department of technical Services Ministry of Agriculture). CARES Group together with the Ministry of Agriculture are already exploring national and regional partnerships, and opportunities for scaling up investments and give access to SPIS technology to all smallholders in the country, making smart agriculture the default adaptation measure for rice production in Liberia. Apart from transformational changes linked with the leveraging of more funds, AFCIA projects were able to drive transformational changes at community and governmental levels. This is true for Burundi, in which the Slamdam is now deployed independently by the communities that hosted the project enabling a better management of water in time of drought and limiting the damages of floods during the rainy season, it is also true in Saint Kitts that now benefits from a drought modelling platform to support governmental decisions on water management, as well as in Liberia as described by the Ministry of agriculture in the quote above, where similar repercussions on the use and deployment of SPIS systems is expecting for Ghana and Mozambique. In Zambia, were the groundwater is the major source of domestic water and its use for irrigation is predicted to increase substantially, water management plan for surface and groundwater is be developed including clear measures and actions that could be used in the country to increase the resilience of Zambia in time of drought. In Vietnam, as the water resource management plan will enable the country to gather reliable, up to date information data on the transboundary water that is shared by 3 countries (China, Laos and VietNam) and model solutions to address the needs of water management. Similar situation is faced by Sudan with the Nile providing

	<p>water to Egypt, Ethiopia, South Sudan, and Sudan and for which the technical assistance will enhance the existing Flood Early Warning System (FEWS) setup by the Nile River basin regional entity the Eastern Nile Technical Regional Office (ENTRO) so that it is appropriate for Sudanese authorities' flood management operations in Sudanese national sub-basins. In Maldives, where excessive groundwater extraction has led to saline water intrusion and reduction of the efficiency of its natural recharge processes, the technical assistance is deploying an infiltration gallery system as an efficient, sustainable method for groundwater extraction for agriculture in HDh.Nolhivaranfaru Island where unpolluted groundwater aquifers will be protected as a consequence of the technology deployed. In Nepal a customized weather and climate information system for climate-resilient agriculture is being developed including the development of an application programming interface (API) for the automatic dissemination of location-specific customised 3-days weather forecast to farmers in a user-friendly language to the local communities. Still in the agriculture sector, Sudan seeks to evaluate the soil erosion using advanced atomic absorption to support climate resilient agriculture and food security. Thus, even though the budget of the TAs are small, the innovation promoted under AFCIA is encouraging transformational change and TA implemented by AFCIA can have larger impacts that are not limited to the project area."</p>
--	--

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

<p>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?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>N/A</p>

**Concrete Adaptation Interventions**

<p>What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing concrete adaptation interventions that would be relevant to the design and</p>	<p>Lessons learned on implementation from MTR: - Integrating single, pilot idea/technology into a broader system of Innovations (e.g., EWS in Burundi, water management, irrigation market, policy framework and incentives of government (e.g., negotiation of customs exemption for import of flood barrier) is necessary - Of the reviewed projects, while outputs were delivered or were likely to be delivered, the one delivering real, palpable impact on community resilience was</p>
---	---

<p>implementation of future projects/programmes implementing concrete adaptation interventions?</p>	<p>the SLAMDAM mobile flood barrier in Burundi, demonstrating the importance of delivering concrete, palpable results on the ground. It is therefore important to realise the benefit of piloting concrete interventions and technologies, in addition to technical assistance, research and studies, to demonstrate effects and obtain related learning. "</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>The potential is quite high for projects to be scaled up or replicated. The programme has generated credible technology ideas and so far 3 technical assistances have managed to scale up funding for technology acceleration. These include. 1. Burundi: The technology is about a low-cost, climate resilient, re-usable, easily replicable, scalable and mobile flood barrier to prevent damage from flooding and ensure water availability in times of drought. One Concept Note has been submitted to the Adaptation Fund and is under review. If deemed eligible by the AF, a full-scale proposal for up to 5 Million USD will be prepared as part of the objective defined under Component 3 of the programme. 2. Mongolia: livestock farming methods in a rural community of Mongolia have successfully leveraged 7.5 million USD from the government of Canada and 100,000 USD co-funding mobilized from corporate contributions for the scaling up. 3. Saint Kitts and Nevis: The drought risks modelling has been so effective that following the AFCIA Technical Assistance implemented under AFCIA, the project was able to leverage 100,000 USD of additional funding from the Caribbean Public Health Agency (CARPHA) to develop a Water Information System for the islands. "</p>
<p><b>Knowledge Management</b></p>	
<p>How has existing information/data/knowledge been used to inform project development and implementation? What kinds of information/data/knowledge were used?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Has the existing information/data/knowledge been made available to relevant stakeholder? If so, what channels of dissemination have been used?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>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.)</p>	<p>UNEP CTCN have started to design communication materials to share good practices and support their dissemination/upscaling such as: 1. Liberia project was promoted in CTCN newsletter that goes out to 11K + subscribers. <a href="https://track.mdirector.com/files/campanias/105516/4/4/CAM/message_email.html">https://track.mdirector.com/files/campanias/105516/4/4/CAM/message_email.html</a> and on social media for a total of 12K+ followers <a href="https://twitter.com/UNEP/status/1646377674624110595">https://twitter.com/UNEP/status/1646377674624110595</a> 2. three web stories were developed on Burundi <a href="https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/can-portable-dam-help-africa-counter-rising-waters">https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/can-portable-dam-help-africa-counter-rising-waters</a>, Liberia <a href="https://www.ctc-n.org/news/solar-farm-table-liberia-improved-solar-powered-irrigation-practices-are-securing-lowland-rice">https://www.ctc-n.org/news/solar-farm-table-liberia-improved-solar-powered-irrigation-practices-are-securing-lowland-rice</a> and Saint Kitts <a href="https://www.ctc-n.org/news/drought-risk-modelling-strengthening-st-kitts-and-nevis-water-supply-resilience">https://www.ctc-n.org/news/drought-risk-modelling-strengthening-st-kitts-and-nevis-water-supply-resilience</a> 3. Many stories from AFCIA-Funded projects were also included in the new 7 Resource Mobilization briefings <a href="https://trello.com/c/msNNPFBx">https://trello.com/c/msNNPFBx</a> used extensively during COP28 4. Saint Kitts, Mongolia, Burundi, Liberia and Honduras were promoted during various events using Powerpoint presentations and recordings. These projects were showcased in 2023 during for example the Adaptation Futures, Climate Weeks in LAC, Africa and Asia, AB meeting in September 2023, Adaptation Fund NIE</p>

	seminar, COP 28 in Dubai, joint UNDP/UNEP CTCN event in Philippines. 5. The project in Honduras was promoted by the Implementing Partner through a video that can be found by following this link: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AVVPYDxUjOA">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AVVPYDxUjOA</a> "
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	N/A
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.	N/A
Has the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	N/A
<b>Innovation</b>	
Describe any innovative practices or technologies that figured prominently in this project.	Burundi Slamdam / Liberia Solar Irrigation Pumping System / Saint Kitts Water management platform / Mongolia Ecosystem based Aadaptation (EbA) / Vietnam water resources management technology to adapt to climate change in Hong-Thai Binh river basin
<b>Complementarity/ Coherence with other climate finance sources</b>	
Has the project been scaled-up from any other climate finance? Or has the project build upon any other climate finance initiative?	Yes
If you answered yes, kindly specify the name of the Fund/Organization.	The AFCIA programme generates credible technology ideas that can attract scaled up support. out of the 5 closed micro-grant projects 3 have already managed to secured additional funding for scale-up. 1. Burundi: One Concept Note has been submitted to the Adaptation Fund and is under review. If deemed eligible by the AF, a full-scale proposal for up to 5 Million USD will be prepared as part of the objective defined under Component 3 of the programme. 2. Mongolia: This TA resulted in the successful leveraging of 7.5 million USD from the government of Canada and 100,000 USD co-funding mobilized from corporate contributions for the scaling up. 3. Saint Kitts and Nevis: Following the AFCIA Technical Assistance implemented under AFCIA, the project was able to leverage 100,000 USD of additional funding from the Caribbean Public Health Agency (CARPHA) to develop a Water Information System for the islands.

## 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**

		<b>Total</b>	<b>% of female beneficiaries</b>	<b>% of Youth beneficiaries</b>
Baseline information	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	70	10	2
Baseline information	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	0	0	0
Baseline information	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	70	5	1
Target performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	1005	46	21
Target performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	78381	46	15
Target performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	79386	46	18
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	10	Drought	1: Ineffective
Target performance at completion	77			
Performance at mid-term			Drought	
Performance at completion				

**Output 1.1 Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated**

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

	No. of projects/programme that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments	Sector	Scale	Status
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion	4		Local	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					
Target performance at completion	3	2: Monitoring and warning service	Inland flooding	National	108
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	Water management	2: Low capacity
Target performance at completion	3963	43	Water management	2: Low capacity
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion			Other	

### 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	63	40	Public
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

	Type	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion	Public	Local	Water management	2: Low 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				
Target performance at completion	25000	National	Agriculture	2: Low capacity

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	Disaster risk reduction
Target performance at completion	60	Disaster risk reduction
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		50	2: Partially not aware
Target performance at completion	100	50	3: Partially aware
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

#### Output 3.2: Strengthened 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 committees/associations	Level of awareness
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion	5	40% to 60%	3: Partially 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	Technical guidelines	Local
Target performance at completion	2	Technical guidelines	Sub-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			
Target performance at completion		Local	5: Highly responsive (All 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			
Target performance at completion		2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	4: Mostly 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	2		
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	4: Effective		Land
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

Core Indicator 5.1: Natural Assets protected or rehabilitated

	Natural asset or Ecosystem (type)	Total number of natural assets or ecosystems protected/rehabilitated	Unit	Effectiveness of protection/rehabilitation
Baseline information		2		
Target performance at completion	Cultivated land/Agricultural land	100	ha rehabilitated	5: Very effective
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	1004811	29.95	
Target performance at completion		50	4: 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	160	27.5		
Target performance at completion			From 5% to 10%	Agriculture

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	3	Adaptation strategies		
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	1000100		
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

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

	Integration level
Baseline information	3: Some
Target performance at completion	3: Some
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		Local	Environmental policy

Target performance at completion	9		Local	Environmental 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			
Target performance at completion	1	4: Enforced (Most elements implemented)	4: 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	Disaster risk reduction	Local	Innovation rolled out
Target performance at completion			
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	0	Disaster risk reduction	Undertaking innovative practices	2: Partially effective
Target performance at completion	9	Other	Undertaking innovative practices	4: Effective
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

	<b>No. of key findings generated</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Effectiveness</b>
Baseline information		Innovative	4: Effective
Target performance at completion	11	Innovative	4: Effective
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			