

Project Performance Report

Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	-
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)	
Name of Implementing Entity Focal Point	

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)	
Original Completion Date	
Revised Completion Date after approval of extension request (if applicable)	

Were there any approval condition for this Project?

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

List the Website address (URL) of project

Project Contacts			
National/Regional Project Manager/Coordinator	Name	Email	Date

Financial Data

Disbursement of AF grant funds	
Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date (\$)	\$4,707,390.00
Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date (\$)	\$4,575,000.00
Project disbursement rate (%)	94.16
Project execution rate (%)	100.00
Add any comments on AF Grant Funds	None.
Investment Income (\$)	\$0.00
Cumulative Investment Income since inception (\$)	\$0.00

Expenditure Data	
Output	Amount (\$)
1.1 Communication Specialist	\$9,000.00
1.1 Translation Services	\$3,000.00
1.1 Regional Liaison	\$4,180.89
1.2 Grants to Network members	\$156,550.00
1.2 Travel	\$11,050.57
1.1 Printing	\$298.79
2.1 Grants to Network Members (Project 7 - Maldives)	\$22,175.00
13- Malawi	\$193,056.00
14 - Nigeria	\$182,230.00
15- Mali	\$181,180.29
2.1 Grants to Network member (21- Thailand)	\$0.00
3.1 Communication Specialist	\$4,708.43
3.1 IT Services	\$8,466.36
3.1 Grants to Network Members	\$75,000.00
3.2 Communication Specialist	\$12,000.00
3.2 Translation Services	\$3,479.22
3.2 Audio / Video Services	\$0.00
3.2 Printing	\$2,109.88
3.3 Grants to Network Members	\$75,000.00
3.3 Travel	\$0.00
IE fee (\$)	\$98,735.00
Execution cost (\$)	\$177,052.80

Planned Expenditure Schedule		
Output	Projected Cost (\$)	Estimated Completion Date
1.2 Travel	\$46,189.55	9/30/2025
3.1 Communication Specialist	\$7,291.57	10/27/2025
3.2 Translation Services	\$4,520.78	9/30/2025
3.2 Audio / Video Services	\$8,000.00	3/31/2025
3.3 Travel	\$50,000.00	9/30/2025

IE fee (\$)	\$25,565.00
Execution cost (\$)	\$143,125.00

Actual co-financing (if the MTR or TE have not been undertaken this reporting period, do not report on actual co-financing)

Does this Project have Co-Financing ?	Yes
How much of the total co-financing as committed in the Project Document has actually been realized? (\$)	\$1,774,519.12
Estimated cumulative actual co-financing as verified during Mid-term Review (MTR) or Terminal Evaluation (TE). (\$)	\$774,888.39

<p>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.</p>	<p>During this reporting period (from October 12023 to October 2024), the CTCN co-founded a total of 7 projects under the AFCIA programme for a total value of 1,009,455.73 USD. • Thailand: Feasibility and viability study of using Blockchain Technology for a real-time climate risk insurance system in Thailand's agricultural sector o Value financed through AFCIA: 0 USD o Value co-financed by CTCN: 222,210 USD • Ecuador: Improvements to the National Drought Monitor of Ecuador (MONSE) f o Value financed through AFCIA: 0 USD o Value co-financed by CTCN: 134,000 USD • Guatemala : Promoting sustainable irrigation technologies for small farmers o Value financed through AFCIA: 0 USD o Value co-financed by CTCN: 167,000 USD • Suriname: Enhance the resilience of Suriname's water supply system o Value financed through AFCIA: 0 USD o Value co-financed by CTCN: 193,050 USD • Mozambique: Implementation of Water-Food-Energy nexus using digital technologies for local communities in Mozambique o Value financed through AFCIA: 0 USD o Value co-financed by CTCN: 221,780 USD • Malaysia: Development of a Multi-Hazard Platform o Value financed through AFCIA: 189,632.98 USD o Value co-financed by CTCN: 42,781.02 USD Mali: EWS for Floods o Value financed through AFCIA: 171,355.29USD o Value co-financed by CTCN: 28,634.71 USD The cumulative value of co-funding in cash from 2020 to 2024 is 1,774,519.12 USD.</p>
--	--

Risk Assessment

Identified Risks

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

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
Delays in	Moderate	The use of UNON's two-stage bidding process was agreed for the

contracting Network Members may slow implementation		recruitment of Implementing Partners (CTCN Network Members) of UNEP CTCN AFCIA Technical Assistance projects and was used to contract the Implementing Partners of the TAs that initiated implementation during this reporting period. A total of 6 projects registered delays in the bidding process for the projects in Thailand, Mali, Nigeria, Ecuador, Suriname, Guatemala. In the case of Thailand, Mali and Nigeria the delays were due to the fact that no technically acceptable bids were received. For Mali and Nigeria it was decided to contract directly some identified reliable CTCN & UNEP Partners for the implementation (as the experienced CTCN network partners in these respective sectors did not feel comfortable in working in Mali and did not have expertise in RANET in the case of Nigeria). In the case of Suriname, Guatemala, and Ecuador, the delays were due to changes in the bidding process from UN side. Indeed, in the past the bidding processes were advertised manually and shared by emails to the network partners. This system was digitalized through the launch of UN Market Place, a global platform through which the REOIs (Request for Expression of Interest) and RFPs (Request for Proposals) are now advertised. CTCN Network partners involved in LAC were not informed of this change in the modalities and the bidding processes of these 3 projects led to no proposals being received on time. Thus the bidding process had to be re-advertised although it was agreed that these bidding processes could be re-launched from the Request for Proposal (RfP) stage by which only network partners that submitted their Expression of Interest (EoI) during the 1st intent were invited to bid. Also, a call was held between CTCN and UNON to report the problem faced by CTCN Network Members acting in the region. UNON took note and confirmed that they will be investigating to understand the source of the problem and solve it before next bidding processes are initiated. In this context, considering that in total 8 projects suffered delays in the bidding process (thus a total of 32% of the portfolio) it was decided to increase the risk from Low to Medium.
Challenges in coordination between National Designated Entities (NDEs) and Adaptation Fund Designated Authorities (DAs) may impact the quality of submissions	Low	No submission of requests was done during this reporting period as the 3rd and last call for proposals was closed during the previous reporting period.
The lack of enabling environment to encourage and support innovation limits national buy-in	Low	The buy-in of the countries is ensured through different mechanisms: 1/ During the sourcing phase, the modalities of the CTCN requires the requests to be country-driven and signed by the NDE in order to ensure the countries "buy-in". 2/ Secondly, during the implementation all Technical Assistances include the creation of a Steering Committee that meet regularly (the frequency is usually of once a month but can be increased during very key period of the implementation). 3/ Finally and following the closure of the TAs, the CTCN submits every two years a survey to the NDEs that have benefitted from the support of the CTCN to monitor if the initiatives were further scaled up, leveraged, still operational or not and in that case for which reasons.
Not enough high quality requests are received	Low	During this reporting period no submission of requests was done as the 3rd and last call for proposals was closed during the previous reporting period.

Transformational change cannot be achieved through micro-grants	Low	It was noted as a lessons learnt from the MTR that piloting small scale climate change adaptation projects are a way to reach real, palpable impact on community resilience. Under AFCIA, 15 acceleration projects are being implemented. Another recommendation from the MTR was to anchor these technologies piloted into stronger - wider national systems of innovation. Under AFCIA I, 10 enabling environment projects are implemented.
Gender considerations are not adequately taken into account during the design and implementation of innovation grant.	Moderate	During the MTR of AFCIA I, it was recommended to the CTCN that the involvement of women and the monitoring of the impact of the TAs on women should be improved. All TAs that were initiated during this reporting period required a mandatory Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan (GAAP) to be delivered. The CTCN is currently finalizing a template of GAAP with more consistent indicators which should help strengthen the monitoring of the impact on women. The CTCN is also requesting the Implementing Partners, since Sept 2024, to use at least 5% of the budget for gender mainstreaming activities. These activities are reported into the Closure Report. Finally, the CTCN received the feedback that although it was mandatory to have a gender specialist under each TA, the network partners didn't always have the capacity to source such profile and that they were sometimes struggling to access gender experts. In order to provide a response to this barrier, the CTCN developed a gender roster that was launched this year and is accessible from CTCN webpage: https://www.ctc-n.org/networking-and-collaboration/gender-and-climate-technology-expert-roster . The risk has been maintained as Medium as the impact of the measures deployed during 2024 could not be monitored yet. Additionally the CTCN has already identified possible improvements to these measures implemented during this reporting period and this includes the preparation of a CTCN GAAP template with core indicators pre-defined as well as sub-indicators that will ease the monitoring process at project, programme and CTCN level. These indicators will also be updated into CTCN M&E and Closure report.
Funding for scaled-up implementation is not available	Low	A new concept note targeting the "Adaptation Fund Innovation Window" is being formulated for Maldives. As well, following the approval of Burundi's CN in April 2024, UNEP CTCN are working on the formulation of a full proposal for the AF Innovation Window.
Innovations trigger mal-adaptation	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	During the reporting period, two TAs implemented in Sudan, a country at war, were completed. These 2 projects were slightly delayed but the involvement of the country NDE and Project Proponent was so strong that the implementation could continue, using WhatsApp instead of Microsoft teams to limit the risks of internet shortage. The Implementing Partners of these 2 projects were both also very flexible, and solution

		<p>oriented. Final workshops and trainings were organized in Kenya, Nairobi as the experts could not travel to Sudan. It was more expensive of course to take care of the logistics of the direct beneficiaries and ensure their travel to Kenya, but both IP planned these expenses well in advance as the political situation of the country was already at risk last year. The political situation of Mali also impacted the project as no bidders participated to the bidding process. Finally the CTCN obtained the authorization to work with a reliable UNEP Partner (Global Water Partnership) who has a regional office and works in many francophone countries in the continent. This risk has been maintained as medium as there are still projects under implementation and that the political situation could deteriorate in some cases, such as in Mali for example. Should political complication arises, the implementation may register some delays but the team of experts are based in the region and should be able to continue implementing the project. Lessons learnt from the implementation in Sudan as well as from COVID will be deployed (such as the use of WhatsApp to keep continuous communication, and the empowerment of the local team based in the country).</p>
--	--	--

Risk Measures

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

Important delays in the bidding processes to select the awarded partner of the CTCN were witnessed in 6 cases during this reporting period because of 2 main factors: (i) quality of bids (this is the case of Thailand, Nigeria and Mali) and (ii) changes in UNON procurement process that affected 3 projects (Suriname, Ecuador, Guatemala). In the first case scenario, CTCN was authorized by the UN to identify and contract reliable CTCN & UNEP partners to implement the respective TAs (after the bidding process failure). This mitigation measure was very successful and enabled the CTCN to initiate the implementation within a month. In the case of UNON and its change of procurement processes it was agreed between UNEP and UNON to reinitiate the bidding process from the RfP (request for proposal) and opening the process only to the network partners that initially submitted their interest in the project during the 1st process, which represented 15 and 19 partners respectively. This also enabled the CTCN to close the bidding process within 3 months after the failure of the 1st bidding process. In the case of Suriname, the process didn't suffer any complications (acceptable technical bids were received through the bidding process but the signature of contract too longer than expected probably because of lack of resources from UNON side). This has now been resolved. When it comes to the consideration of gender at project level, the CTCN is conscious of this weakness and try to continuously implement improvements in it processes. The use of at least 5% of the budget for gender mainstreaming activities, the introduction of the GAAP, the launch of the gender roster were the main mitigation measures initiated this year. It is too soon to monitor the impact of these measures as all the projects that are implementing them are still under implementation. The CTCN is working on developing a template for the GAAP with pre-defined core indicators as well as sub-indicators that will ease the report of the impact on gender at project, programme and CTCN level. These indicators will be then reflected under the M&E and the closure report. With regards to the political risks, the mitigation measures came from the buy-in of the country and the flexibility of the IP.

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

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

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

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

impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	

12.Pollution prevention and resource efficiency

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	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	

13.Public health

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	

List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	

14. Physical and cultural heritage

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	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	

15. Lands and soil conservation

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard	

measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	

Section 2: Monitoring for unanticipated impacts / corrective actions required

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

Section 3: Categorisation

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

Section 4: Implementation arrangements

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	Safeguards Risk Identification Forms (SRIF) have been developed for 8 projects during this reporting period, 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. Consequently, all 25 AFCIA projects have now an SRIF approved by UNEP Safeguard officer and are available on CTCN webpage (under each TA) .UNEP SRIF is fully aligned with the Adaptation Fund Safeguard Strategy and ESP principles. As all 25 AFCIA projects were rated as low risks through the SRIF process.
Have the implementation arrangements been effective during the reporting period?	Yes

What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	As all 25 AFCIA projects were rated as low risks through the SRIF process, no additional safeguard measure were required and thus no specific arrangement were put in place by the IE during this reporting period. During the implementation, the risks were monitored through the mid-term Result Tracker as well as through the continuous meetings with the Steering Committees that are created under each TA and meet as least once a month to discuss possible bottlenecks, barriers, difficulties, as well as review the calendar, the next steps. During this reporting period, some situation requested some minor adjustments but nothing major as no safeguard measures were required
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?	No

Identified USPs in the reporting period	Application of ESMP to the USP	ESP risks identified for the USP	Has an impact assessment been carried out?	Consultation held for risks and impacts identification for USP	Gender disaggregation to identify risks and impacts	Safeguard measures identified for the USP	Monitoring indicator(s) for each impact
USP 18: [Mali] - "Real-time mapping of flood risk in Mali based on rainfall forecasts, remote sensing and deep learning	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. As a landlocked	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the project was rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer, no specific safeguard measures were established. However the different AF ESP principles	n/a

		<p>country, Mali is one of the most vulnerable to climate stress due to its socio-economic status, geographical location, and climate-sensitive economy. Two thirds of the country lies in the arid Sahara and the semi-arid Sahel. Mali is exposed to recurrent extreme events, including severe droughts, variable rainfall, and catastrophic floods. In Mali, flooding from rivers and rainfall causes loss of life and property almost every year. As throughout the Sahel, there has been a marked increase in the frequency and severity of floods in Mali. Climate projections also suggest</p>				<p>especially principle 11: climate change will be closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports). Should the risk level change during the implementation of the project, then mitigation measures would be identified in collaboration with the Steering Committee for this specific risk and implemented accordingly.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		that extreme rainfall (and hence flooding) will become more frequent in the future. The risk relates to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change. The Technical Assistance aims at increasing the resilience of the community to this climate change risk by developing an Early Warning System for Flood at community level.					
USP 19: [Thailand] - "Feasibility and viability study of using Blockchain Technology for a real-time climate risk insurance system in Thailand's agricultural sector"	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. Thailand's agricultural sector is exposed to increasingly frequent climate	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the project was rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer, no specific safeguard measures were established. However the different AF ESP principles especially principle 11: climate change will be closely monitored	n/a

		change related extreme weather events. The fragility of the farmers being exposed to climate risk poses a threat to livelihoods and food security. The risk relates to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change. The Technical Assistance aims at increasing the resilience of the farmers to this climate change risk by analysing the possibility to use blockchain as a tool that could reinforce the efficiency of the insurance companies in Thailand.				during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports). Should the risk level change during the implementation of the project, then mitigation measures would be identified in collaboration with the Steering Committee for this specific risk and implemented accordingly.	
USP 20: [Suriname] - Enhance the resilience of Suriname's water supply system by modelling drought risks and developing a roadmap of	Yes	While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the SRIF relate to: SS 2: Climate	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the project was rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer, no specific safeguard measures were established.	n/a

prioritized alternatives for aquifer recharge"		<p>Change and Disaster Risks. Suriname is already experiencing some of the effects of climate variability and change through damages from an increase in average atmospheric temperature, reduced average annual rainfall, and the potential for an increase in the intensity of tropical storms. Suriname benefits from abundant water resources, and the supply of drinking water depends mainly on groundwater resources. The water is retrieved via three water resource types namely, surface water, ground water, and direct rainfall. Demand for</p>				<p>However the different AF ESP principles especially principle 11: climate change will be closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports). Should the risk level change during the implementation of the project, then mitigation measures would be identified in collaboration with the Steering Committee for this specific risk and implemented accordingly.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>water is expected to increase as the economy of Suriname expands, particularly in the tourism and agriculture sectors where water requirements could double in the next ten years. The risk relates to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change. The Technical Assistance aims at increasing the resilience of the Suriname to this climate change risk by modelling drought risks and defining solutions to recharge the aquifers in time of drought.</p>					
<p>USP 21: [Malawi] - Development of a National Framework for simple mobile technologies to scale up digital collection and processing of climate</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</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>As the project was rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer, no specific safeguard measures were established. However the different AF</p>	n/a

observations for adaptation actions in Malawi.		<p>Risks. Malawians' livelihood and safety are at risk with a changing climate. More than 80% depend on rainfed agriculture for livelihood and food, many live in flood-prone areas, and there are few alternative incomes or options for social mobility. The human costs of extreme events are large. Cyclone Ana of 2022, for example, caused 49 deaths and over 190,000 IDPs, as well as extensive damages to schools, hospitals, bridges, and roads, including disrupted power and water services. The adaptation project is aiming at mitigating this risk</p>				<p>ESP principles especially principle 11: climate change will be closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports). Should the risk level change during the implementation of the project, then mitigation measures would be identified in collaboration with the Steering Committee for this specific risk and implemented accordingly.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

		through improved climate information services and warnings. The risk relates to AFESP Principle 11 climate change. The Technical Assistance aims at increasing the resilience of the communities by improving the generation of climate data (with a hybrid use of data collected on the ground using simple phone and the use of the IOT) to the national meteorological agency, that will in return be able to communicate more reliable climate forecast on floods to the endangered regions					
USP 22: [Nigeria] - The Radio-Internet climate technology for Agricultural	Yes	While all risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the project was rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer, no specific	n/a

Resilience (RANET-Agric): Harnessing the combined potential of Radio and Internet to enhance agricultural resilience against climate change disasters in rural Kebbi State		through the SRIF relate to: SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks. Farmers in Northwest Nigeria lack effective access to climate change information because there is an existing gap between the innovative climate change adaptation contributions from the internet and research institutes and the end user farmers. These innovative contributions do not get to the farmer (end users) in a form that is appropriate either in terms of communication media and/or language. The lack of access to climate change information and the conservative mindset they harbour towards innovation				safeguard measures were established. However the different AF ESP principles especially principle 11: climate change will be closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports). Should the risk level change during the implementation of the project, then mitigation measures would be identified in collaboration with the Steering Committee for this specific risk and implemented accordingly.	
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>means that these farmers continue to lose a significant portion of their farmlands due to floods and heavy rainfalls, which worsens the already fragile food security within the region. The risk relates to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change. The Technical Assistance aims at increasing the resilience of the farmers to this climate change risk by developing an agro-meteorological systems using Radio and Internet as tools to transfer data both from the farmers to the national meteorological agency and back to the farmers with timely climate decision making</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

		information.					
USP 23: [Mozambique] - Implementation of Water-Food-Energy nexus using digital technologies for local communities in Mozambique	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. SS 4: Community Health, Safety and Security Mozambique has a long coastline affected by extreme weather events such as cyclones. During the 2018-2021 period, cyclones Idai, Keneth, and Ana caused myriad deaths and injuries, alongside the destruction of homes, health units, schools, and crops. The impact of extreme events is predicted to worsen, affecting the most vulnerable sectors including	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the project was rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer, no specific safeguard measures were established. However the different AF ESP principles especially principle 11: climate change will be closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports). Should the risk level change during the implementation of the project, then mitigation measures would be identified in collaboration with the Steering Committee for this specific risk and implemented accordingly.	n/a

		<p>agriculture, water resources and energy. Since the country is highly dependent on agriculture, it is imperative to implement smart agriculture practices that increase productivity, improve food security, bolster resilience, and restore degraded Agro ecosystems. The risk relates to AF ESP Principle 11 climate change. The Technical Assistance aims at increasing the resilience of the farmers to this climate change risk by designing a smart farming systems that could make each farm of Mozambique completely auto sufficient.</p>					
USP	Yes	While all	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the	n/a

24:[Guatemala]		risks probability and impact levels remain low, main risks identified through the SRIF relate to: SS 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks. The objective of this Technical Assistance (TA) is to introduce Solar Photovoltaic Irrigation Systems (SPIS) and suitable technologies and practices to increase the resilience and sustainability of smallholder farmers in the municipalities of Rabinal, and San Miguel Chicaj in the Dry Corridor of Baja Verapaz, Guatemala. The aim is to replicate and upscale the technology nationally as a contribution to the Climate				project was rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer, no specific safeguard measures were established. However the different AF ESP principles especially principle 11: climate change will be closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports). Should the risk level change during the implementation of the project, then mitigation measures would be identified in collaboration with the Steering Committee for this specific risk and implemented accordingly.	
----------------	--	---	--	--	--	---	--

		<p>Change objectives of Guatemala expressed in their NDC, which gives priority to actions that directly influence agricultural and food security issues. This TA aims to provide a sustainable and efficient means of irrigation through the assessment of solar technology options, the design of an appropriate and sustainable business model for the lowest income, and the formulation of a policy framework for the use of SPIS in Guatemala. The risk relates to AF</p> <p>ESP</p> <p>Principle 11 climate change. The Technical Assistance aims at increasing the resilience of the farmers to this climate</p>					
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

		change risk by piloting a solar irrigation pumping system in 2 regions of Guatemala.					
USP 25: [Ecuador] - Implementation of improvements to the National Drought Monitor of Ecuador (MONSE) for the integration of a drought risk scenario module	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. The objective of the assistance is to improve the national drought monitor (MONSE) of Ecuador to generate risk scenarios and monitor the evolution of drought episodes for risk management in the territory by integrating a scenario model obtained by using statistical parametric methods, digital and machine learning. So far, the MONSE	Yes	Yes	Yes	As the project was rated as low risk by UNEP Safeguard Officer, no specific safeguard measures were established. However the different AF ESP principles especially principle 11: climate change will be closely monitored during project implementation through the AF results tracker and CTCN M&E framework (initial and closure project reports). Should the risk level change during the implementation of the project, then mitigation measures would be identified in collaboration with the	n/a

		<p>only contributes to the monitoring of the current state and evolution of past drought episodes. It is imperative to a module that will allow decision makers at national, subnational and local levels to forecast the occurrence of drought episodes in Ecuador and to define actions and measures as appropriate. The risk relates to AF</p> <p>ESP</p> <p>Principle 11</p> <p>climate change. The Technical Assistance aims at increasing the resilience of the country to this climate change risk by improving the existing drought modelling system and enabling the generation of climate forecasting,</p>				<p>Steering Committee for this specific risk and implemented accordingly.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

		climate scenarios.					
--	--	--------------------	--	--	--	--	--

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

With regards to Section 2, and the question "Has monitoring for unanticipated ESP risks been carried out?", UNEP CTCN would like to add that monitoring for unanticipated risks was ensured through the Result Tracker at mid-term. As well, a Steering Committee (SC) has been created under each of the 25 TAs. This SC meets at least once a month to discuss possible bottlenecks, decision-making, review of key deliverables, revision of the timeline, etc. During this reporting period, the following situation arises: - Lack of / poor quality & quantity of climate data: in the case of Zambia, as well as Malaysia, the projects had to be extended because of the difficulty to access reliable climate data on which the project could rely and build the technology on. In the case of Zambia (aquifer mapping) it was decided that the IP will purchase an equipment that would enable the generation of data because the climate information available in the country was not precise enough to enable the definition of the aquifer balance. In the case of Malaysia, the country has strong and reliable climate data, but it took time to get access to this data from the different ministries. At the time of reporting, the data has been collected which will enable the design and launch of the multi-hazard platform. - Political situation: the 2 projects implemented in Sudan were delayed because of the sensible political situation of the country. Nonetheless, all activities were implemented, and the final results were achieved with the support of the NDEs, local proponents, and a flexible IP. In the case of these 2 projects, the final workshops which were also trainings were held in Kenya, as the international team could not travel to the country. The project in Mali has also suffered delays, at bidding stage, because of the political situation of the country. Finally, a UNEP Partner, based in the region, was selected. Due to the geographical proximity, it is expected the the project will manage to finalise the implementation even if the conflict in Mali would deteriorate. - Authorisation of connecting the technology to the governmental utilities: in the case of Nepal, the project got delayed because it took longer than expected to receive the authorisation of the country to connect the designed agro-meteorological platform to the Nepal Ministry of Forests and Environment's server. This approval was received during the reporting period and the project is currently being piloted in the selected community.

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? No
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
Mandatory Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan (GAAP)	Output	Defined at USP level (so far indicators are quite disparate as defined at USP level by each IPs, but the CTCN is developing a template that will be implemented from Q1.2025).	Defined at USP Level	Defined at USP Level	Satisfactory

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
No real issues were encountered on gender during this reporting period. Nonetheless, the MTR highlighted the importance to anchor gender considerations at project level.	Satisfactory	In order to ensure that the TA are equally benefiting women and men and as a lessons learnt from the AFCIA project in Honduras, it was decided that the Implementing Partners should propose to the communities to hold trainings on Fridays and week ends, time during which the women could be more flexible. This has also been implemented in Mozambique for the TA on SPIS also focusing on women, and also demonstrated to be a satisfactory measure. Also, the CTCN was informed by its Network Members, that although it is a mandatory requirement to have a gender expert in each team of experts and for all TAs, all network members didn't have this profile in their own company and were sometimes struggling to access experienced gender experts to help them empowering women during the implementation. In order to address this barrier, the CTCN launched a gender roster in 2024 to facilitates the connection between this profile and CTCN Network Members. The roster can be accessed by following this link: https://www.ctc-n.org/networking-and-collaboration/gender-and-climate-technology-expert-roster

Section 3: Implementation arrangements

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP	Gender equality is a guiding principle of UNEP safeguard screening checklist (SRIF). Gender is mainstreamed throughout the safeguards but is also the center of three specific questions in the first section of the SRIF. By reviewing and clearing the SRIF for each TA, UNEP safeguard and gender officer ensure the project does not have unintended
---	--

	negative impacts on gender equality. UNEP also ensures that gender considerations are taken into account into the knowledge product that will be developed under the AFCIA programme so lessons learned and good practices are well documented and shared
Have the implementation arrangements at the IE been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP?	During this reporting period, a Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan template became a mandatory requirement. for all the TAs initiating implementation in 2024. The IP is also requested as a mandatory requirement to use at least 5% of the budget to gender mainstreaming activities. As well, the CTCN launched a Climate Technology Gender Roster which is a comprehensive database featuring experts in gender and climate technology, ranging from grassroots individuals to indigenous leaders and gender equality specialists. With accessible search and filtering options, the Roster facilitates collaboration for diverse purposes, from participating in panels to contributing to research. The roster can be accessed by following this link: https://www.ctcn.org/networking-and-collaboration/gender-and-climate-technology-expert-roster . The CTCN expects to ease the access to professional gender experts to its network partners considering that this profile is also mandatory for the implementation of all TAs.
Have the implementation arrangements at the EE(s) been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
Have any capacity gaps affecting GP compliance been identified during the reporting period and if so, what remediation was implemented?	Yes

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

With regards to Section 1, and the question "Does the results framework include gender-responsive indicators broken down at the different levels (objective, outcome, output)?", UNEP CTCN would like to add that not at framework level, but at USP level, yes, monitoring and evaluation indicators on gender are defined for selected individual projects. These indicators have been strengthened through the introduction of a mandatory GAAP (Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan) for all TAs initiated since October 2024.

So far, each Implementing Partners have designed their own Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan, using indicators of their own. The CTCN is aware that a better monitoring could be achieved through the introduction of core indicators as well as common sub-indicators defined at CTCN level. The CTCN is currently working on designing this specific template for the GAAP that will reinforce the process of monitoring the impact of the project on gender at project and programme levels. Respective indicators will be reflected into CTCN Closure report next year. It is planned that both GAAP and Closure Report will be reviewed and approved by CTCN Gender Constituency (CTCN AB Member) before being shared with the Implementing Partners. With regards to Section 3, and the question "Have the implementation arrangements at the EE(s) been effective during the reporting period?", It is too soon to monitor the impact of these measures as all the projects that are implementing them are still under implementation. But we have already noticed that a CTCN template for the GAAP needed to be prepared by the CTCN to harmonize the indicators monitored and ease the analysis of the impact. CTCN Gender expert is currently finalizing this template. This template will then be shared with CTCN Gender Constituency for review, comment and approval before being shared with the IP of projects that will initiate their implementation after the approval of the template. The closure report for each technical assistance now includes a section for implementing partners to provide detailed information on the gender aspects related to the project and to report on the resources allocated as part of the 5% budget

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	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 innovation mechanism lead to scaled-up funding	Outcome 8	Outcome indicator: Scaled up funding secured for technology acceleration investment Target: Scaled up funding secured for at least 4 technology acceleration investments	Ontrack	Satisfactory

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

Name	Email
Eva Comba. UNEP Task Manager. Climate Change Adaptation Unit	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.

No change happened under Outcome 1 as the sourcing phase was closed during the previous reporting period. Outcome 1 indicator has been achieved during last reporting period with over 87 countries among which 51.3% of LDCs and 6.3% from SIDS submitting an application to AFCIA and 25 projects selected from 23 countries including 10 from LDCs and 3 from SIDS, thus 52%. Over 420 requests received throughout the 3 calls for proposals (this includes duplication of requests), 36 from LAC region, 142 from Asia, 3 from developed countries and 239 from Africa. Outcome 2 is under implementation and its target in path of being overachieved with 25 micro grants provided: 20 fully funded by AFCIA and 5 co-financed fully or partially by CTCN (including Maldives, Honduras, Sudan x2, Mongolia). 100% of the projects are either under implementation (13) and 7 completed this year leading to a total of 12 closed projects. On outcome 3 and access to scaled up funding has been secured through the approval of the CN of Burundi developed during last reporting period by the AF triggering the formulation of a full proposal as well as the formulation of a concept note for Maldives which will be submitted during next reporting period. This comes in addition to the two projects (Mongolia and Saint Kitts) that had managed to leverage additional funding for their technology during the last reporting period In conclusion, progresses of the programme are rated as highly satisfactory as 1 outcome target has been over achieved and the remaining two will be reached and even exceeded before the end of the programme

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	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	Satisfactory
Component 3: Concrete adaptation actions are triggered by the knowledge	Outcome 8	3.1 Lessons learned and good practices from project implementation support are shared Target: 5 success stories Target: 1	Ontrack	Satisfactory

and evidence produced by the micro-grant mechanism		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)		
--	--	---	--	--

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

Name	Email	Institution
Jonathan Duwyn	jonathan.duwyn@un.org	UNEP CTCN, Director, a.i.

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

Overall, the reporting period has been rated satisfactory because the component 1 has been closed with the selection of the latest projects. AFCIA I currently includes 25 projects in 23 countries (Burundi, Sudan (x2), Mozambique (x2), Mali, Thailand, Guatemala, Ecuador, Suriname, Honduras, Georgia, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Ghana, Pakistan, Zambia, Nepal, Vietnam, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Bahamas, Mongolia, Maldives, Nigeria). Component 2 is on track as all the 25 projects are now either closed or under implementation. A total of 12 projects are closed (7 were closed during this reporting period) and include: Mozambique SPIS, Ghana, Pakistan, Sudan x2, Vietnam, Maldives - the projects closed during the previous reporting period were Burundi, Honduras, Saint Kitts, Mongolia, Liberia. Consequently, 13 are still under implementation and include: Guatemala, Ecuador, Suriname, Thailand, Zambia, Georgia, Malaysia, Malawi, Nepal, Bahamas, Mozambique smart farming, Nigeria, Mali. UNEP CTCN AFCIA I is transitioning towards component 3 with KMS activities being deployed, lessons learnt and impact being monitored. This year 25 factsheets (one by project) were designed, a dashboard was launched, a podcast was shoot by UNEP and the work on the joint impact report with UNDP has been initiated. Thus the programme has very satisfactorily achieved Outcome 1, Outcome 2 is on track, and objectives defined under Outcome 3 are well advanced.

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.

1 – As a major trend, and as referenced in the MTR, the CTCN notices that “Piloting small scale climate change adaptation technologies are a way to reach real, palpable impact on community resilience”. The 15 projects implemented under the acceleration component are being well received by the communities. The impact of such initiatives will continue to be monitored after the closure of the programme via the NDE survey launched by the CTCN every 2 years and through which NDEs are expected to provide details on the sustainability strategies of each TA hosted in their country. 2 – As defined under the Risk Assessment tab, UN bidding process has affected the progress of the programme because of delays and unsuccessful results, but those have been overcome as Component 1 is now closed. The other risks affecting the programme are

political risks (change of NDE, change of government, risk or status of war) for which the most successful mitigation measures seem to be a very strong national involvement along with a flexible and experienced IP. Finally, the last risks that affect the implementation of the projects are the lack of (or the difficulty to access) reliable climate data on which the technology can be built on. This risk is currently affecting the project implemented in Zambia, Malaysia. In Zambia, the CTCN in cooperation with the IP and the Steering Committee have agreed to purchase an equipment (funded by the IP) to generate new data. In Malaysia, the data exists but the process of getting to authorization from the different governmental agencies to access this data took longer than expected. That is why both projects have requested an extension which has been approved. 3. With regards to the recommendation from the MTR, these would be fully integrated into AFCIA II. In the meantime AFCIA I is actively working on recommendation n° 4 (Piloting small scale climate change adaptation technologies are a way to reach real, palpable impact on community resilience) with 2 pilots being implemented in Guatemala and Mali, as well as recommendation n° 7 (the CTCN should more actively pursue a gender focus at project level) with the inclusion of the GAAP (Gender Assessment and Action Plan), the obligation for the IP to spend at least 5% of the budget for gender mainstreaming activities and the development of the gender roster that should support the IP in accessing gender professionals to be part of their team of experts (to address the mandatory requirement of the CTCN). 4. No projects are rated as HU, U or MU.

Overall Rating

Overall rating

Satisfactory

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

The programme is well on track and positive progress are registered. Next reporting period will focus on the component 3 of Knowledge management with the formulation of a joint impact report with UNDP and probably a photo exhibition on AFCIA 1 at COP 30.

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	25	3
Outcomes	# of countries requesting micro-grants to support innovation in adaptation	0	87	20
Outcomes	# micro-grants	0	25	20

	invested in technology acceleration			
Outcomes	Scaled up funding secured for technology acceleration investment	0	4	4
Outputs	Outreach plan developed	0	1	1
Outputs	Number of adaptation technology innovations supported	0	15	15
Outputs	Number of technical analyses to support the enabling environment for technology innovation	0	10	10
Outputs	Number of project stories	0	5	5
Outputs	Operational project dashboard	0	1	1
Outputs	Number of guidance documents	0	0	1
Outputs	Number of communication products	0	8	5
Outputs	Number of business/funding proposals	0	2	2

Comments

Objective: 25 projects funded and implemented under the AFCIA to date Outcome 1 : No changes during this reporting period as the sourcing component (component 1) was closed during previous reporting period. Outcome 2: 3 new Technical Assistances were initiated during this reporting period. These are Mali (EWS for Flood), Nigeria (RANET - Internet and Radio connection for farmers) and Malawi (Use of simple mobile phone technologies and IoT to update water climate data at national level). This make a total of 25 projects among which 12 are closed and 13 under implementation. This indicator is over achieved as 5 projects were co-funded by the CTCN. The programme is implemented in 23 countries : Burundi, Sudan (x2), Mozambique (x2), Mali, Thailand, Guatemala, Ecuador, Suriname, Honduras, Georgia, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Ghana, Pakistan, Zambia, Nepal, Vietnam, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Bahamas, Mongolia, Maldives, Nigeria. Outcome 3: During previous reporting period 3 scaling up financing were presented for Burundi, Saint Kitts and Mongolia. During this reporting period, a concept note for Maldives has been prepared and is currently under revision by UNEP CTCN. Output 1.1 No changes during this reporting period Output 1.2: No changes during this reporting period as the sourcing component (component 1) was closed during previous reporting period. Output 2.1: 3 new Technical Assistances were initiated during this reporting period. These are Mali (EWS for Flood), Nigeria (RANET - Internet and Radio connection for farmers) and Malawi (Use of simple mobile phone technologies and IoT to update water climate data at national level) making a total of 15 adpatation technologies supported : EWS for Flood (x2 in Mali and Sudan), EWS for Forest Fire (Georgia), SPIS (x2 Liberia and Mozambique), Slamdam (Burundi), Drought

modelling and forecasting systems (x2 Saint Kitts and Nevis, Ecuador), aquifer mapping (Zambia), water harvesting technologies (Pakistan), agrometeorological platform (x2 Nepal and Nigeria), Multi hazard platform (Malaysia), drainage system (Maldives), drones for soil mapping (Sudan). Output 2.2 : 5 new projects under this component have initiated their implementation during this reporting period and these include Ecuador (Improving existing drought system by incorporating drought modelling and forecasting), Guatemala (Promoting sustainable irrigation technologies for small farmers), Mozambique (smart farming), Thailand (blockchain for crop insurance) and Suriname (roadmap for aquifer recharge) making a total of 10 enabling environments supported: Enabling environment and NSI for drought forecasting, SPIS (x2 Ghana and Guatemala) , smart farming techniques, blockchain for insurance crop, aquifer recharge, street market, livestock management, resilient agriculture, multihazard platform. Output 3.1: An interactive dashboard is operational and can be accessed this link: <https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoiMjg0YTMtMTNjZWJjNmQzN2JlIiwid>

Output 3.1: A joint impact report with UNDP AFCIA is being prepared and will be launched during next reporting period. Output 3.2: 6 products were presented during the previous reporting period (success stories, newsletter, resource mobilization briefing, powerpoint presentations and recording, videos and social media). During this reporting period, 2 new products have been developed including 25 factsheets (<https://www.ctc-n.org/resources/publications>) and a podcast that can be accessed by following this link: <https://youtu.be/7rBQFBiJvdY> & <https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/audio/resilience-global-adaptation-podcast>. Output 3.3: The Concept Note for Burundi developed during past reporting period was approved by the AF and a FP is being formulated. This reporting period CN on Maldives was formulated and is currently being revised by UNEP CTCN.

Lessons Learned

Implementation and Adaptive Management		
Describe any changes undertaken to improve results on the ground or any changes made to project outputs (i.e. changes to project design)	Challenges & Opportunities	Lesson Learned: Adapting to Data Limitations through Stakeholder Engagement and Flexibility - In a project in Zambia, poor quality and insufficient data for aquifer mapping and water balance calculations made it impossible to deliver results. After extensive negotiations with the Steering Committee, it was agreed that the IP would purchase equipment valued at \$30,000 to collect real-time data on the ground. The project covered a small portion of the cost, with the majority co-financed by the IP, as the equipment has a long lifespan and will support future missions. Cost savings from reduced travel expenses were reallocated to fund the project's share, avoiding the need for a contract amendment. An extension was also approved to allow time for data collection and result delivery. This

		experience underscores the critical role of beneficiary engagement and the flexibility of IPs, both of which can significantly enhance the success of TA in challenging contexts including unstable political situations.
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts?	Opportunities	As all 25 AFCIA projects were rated as low risk under the SRIF no specific safeguard measures were undertaken within the reporting period.
How have gender considerations been taken into consideration during the reporting period? What have been the lessons learned as a consequence of inclusion of such considerations on project performance or impacts? List lessons learned specific to gender, detailing measures and project/programme-specific indicators highlighting the role of women as key actors in climate change adaptation.	Challenges & Opportunities	Lesson Learned: Proactive Supervision Enhances Timely Implementation - While the CTCN has previously granted extensions to facilitate the completion of Technical Assistance (TA) projects, this flexibility will no longer be feasible as the program's end approaches. To mitigate the risk of delays for projects initiated in 2024, the CTCN will implement more frequent Steering Committee meetings (twice a month instead of once) and limit the review and approval time for deliverables to two weeks. This experience highlights the importance of proactive and consistent supervision in ensuring timely project implementation, particularly as program deadlines draw near. During this reporting period, mandatory gender integration measures were introduced for all TAs initiated in 2024, including the requirement for a Gender Assessment and Action Plan (GAAP) and the allocation of at least 5% of the budget to gender mainstreaming activities. To support this, the CTCN launched the Climate Technology Gender Roster, a comprehensive database of gender and climate technology experts, aimed at facilitating collaboration and improving access to specialized expertise for network partners. While it is

		<p>too early to assess the full impact of these measures, an immediate need was identified to develop a standardized GAAP template to harmonize gender indicators and streamline impact analysis. The template is currently being finalized and will be reviewed by the CTCN Gender Constituency before dissemination. Once approved, the closure report template will also be updated to reflect the core gender indicators from the GAAP. This experience highlights that gender integration is a complex, evolving process that requires ongoing refinement to ensure effective implementation and meaningful outcomes.</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 & Opportunities</p>	<p>The project is well on track, with all 25 projects either completed or under implementation. During this reporting period, the CTCN continued to face delays with the implementation of the Technical Assistances. These delays are due to several factors including the following: 1. Delays in the procurement process (due to changes in UNON processes and unsuccessful bidding - no technically eligible bids received at first). 2. Very poor quality and quantity of data available. To date 9 projects have requested an extension. (Zambia, Nepal, Georgia, Liberia, Malaysia, Ghana, Mozambique Pay as you irrigate, Bahamas, Vietnam). The average extension requested is 4 months. 3. Political situation: some countries are experiencing some political troubles (Sudan, Mali) which have impacted in implementation in the past (in Sudan) and may impact the implementation of the project in Mali. . Lesson Learned:</p>

		Proactive Supervision Enhances Timely Implementation - While the CTCN has previously granted extensions to facilitate the completion of Technical Assistance projects, this flexibility will no longer be feasible as the program's end approaches. To mitigate the risk of delays for projects initiated in 2024, the CTCN will implement more frequent Steering Committee meetings (twice a month instead of once) and limit the review and approval time for deliverables to two weeks. This experience highlights the importance of proactive and consistent supervision in ensuring timely project implementation, particularly as program deadlines draw near.
What implementation issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected progress?	Challenges & Opportunities	Lesson Learned: Enhancing Gender Integration in Technical Assistance - A key lesson learned from implementing Technical Assistance in complex political contexts is the critical importance of continuous beneficiary engagement and the flexibility of IPs to adapt to evolving circumstances, both of which significantly enhance the likelihood of success. Additionally, recognizing the frequent delays faced by projects in LDCs and SIDS, it is recommended that the CTCN incorporate a six-month buffer period for project timelines under AFCIA II to better accommodate local challenges and ensure timely delivery.

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

Yes

Climate Resilience Measures	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and	There are many lessons learnt that can be reflected from the implementation of AFCIA 1. Some of them have been raised during the MTR and reported to the AF

<p>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?</p>	<p>in last year's reporting exercise. Additional lessons learnt for 2024's reporting exercise are available under the "Lessons Learnt Tab and include the need to Enhance Gender Integration in Technical Assistance, to ensure Proactive Supervision as a way to Enhance Timely Implementation and the need to Adapt to Data Limitations through Stakeholder Engagement and Flexibility. However, the key lessons learned, particularly those relevant for informing the design of future programmes, have been primarily incorporated into UNEP-CTCN's AFCIA 2 programme proposal, as outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase accountability of implementing partners toward the government and government engagement in project governance structures notably during implementation. • Encourage the mapping and engagement of the national innovation ecosystem as a part of the formal design requirements, when developing the Response Plan. • Maintain a programmatic approach on how the programme will affect change and promote innovation. • Use research and studies to demonstrate the benefit on piloting climate technologies and obtain related learning • Employ systems thinking to the challenge of attracting private finance to adaptation innovation, encouraging the development of accessible and affordable business models. • Encourage projects to design and pursue exit strategies, including the identification of additional financing options • Support global efforts to consolidate and harmonize key performance indicators and increase their coherent use at the level of AFCIA and individual projects. • Strengthen monitoring expectations (e.g. through reporting) and especially learning processes and opportunities in phase II of AFCIA • Explore opportunities for shared learning with similar programmes implemented by other IEs. • Promote awareness and engagement between the NDA, the DA and NDE on similar initiatives promoting innovation. • Increase the coordination between the Adaptation Fund Secretariat, UNEP, CTCN, UNDP and other IEs in promoting adaptation innovation globally, notably around learning and knowledge management • While the government should retain ownership and strategic leadership, include the knowledge flow, competition and iteration of ideas in the context of the national innovation system through the knowledge helix" of government, academia, industry, and civil society.
<p>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?</p>	<p>At the end of 2024, under this reporting period, UNEP CTCN is finalizing the contractual agreement with a short-term consultant hired to analyze the results achieved through AFCIA 1, including the success stories of projects that have been able to scale up, leverage post CTCN TA implementation as well as the challenges that have been encountered. At the moment this report is prepared, 9 countries out of 12 projects closed in 2024 have either already managed or actively working on replicating or scaling up the measures within or outside the project area. These are: 1. Burundi with an approved CN to the AF and the formulation of a Full Proposal that is being prepared to be submitted to the AF as soon as the quality is cleared by UNEP CTCN. 2. Maldives for which a Concept Note is under formulation for the Innovation Window of the Adaptation Fund will be submitted as soon as the quality is cleared by UNEP CTCN. In addition: 3. Mongolia managed to leverage 7 million USD from the Government of Canada to spread the NbS piloted under the AFCIA-funded project 4. Saint Kitts and Nevis has managed to strengthen the drought forecast platform through 100,000 USD from the Caribbean Public Health Agency (CARPHA) to develop a Water Information System for the islands 5. Georgia, where an EWS for Forest Fire is being piloted in Borjomi – Kharagauli National Park, the Project Proponent (the Agency of Protected Areas of Georgia) has co-funded part of the equipment in order to cover approx. 12,000 hectares of land by the EWS. 6. Pakistan: the government of Pakistan, following the submission of a blueprint roadmap, decided to fund the piloting of 2 of the technologies that have been identified in the roadmaps. Furthermore, three projects are currently under active consideration for scaling up, including: 7. Ghana SPIS: Aside from the results of the project itself, there is</p>

	<p>interest from an insurance company and national development bank to be part of an SPIS scheme for smallholders. 8. Mozambique SPIS: Interest mentioned by a financial institution, but only if the farmer association is able to provide collateral for the loan. Steps are undertaken on that side. 9. Mozambique WEF: The project proponent is interested in using the design generated and replicating it in the Zambezi Valley. 9 out of 12 projects represent 75% of projects that have managed or are working towards increasing the scope of the defined TA which confirms the high potential of these small-scale Technical Assistance in being scalable and replicable.</p>
--	---

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

What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in accessing and implementing climate finance readiness support that would be relevant to the preparation, design and implementation of future concrete adaptation projects/programmes?	This section is not applicable to UNEP CTCN.
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?	This section is not applicable to UNEP CTCN.

Concrete Adaptation Interventions

What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing concrete adaptation interventions that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes implementing concrete adaptation interventions?	<p>Under UNEP CTCN AFCIA 1, 15 projects were implemented under the “Acceleration component” that include concrete adaptation interventions. The technologies implemented under these 15 projects can be classified under the following types of interventions (that are reflected on CTCN AFCIA Dashboard):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early Warning Systems for flood, drought, and forest fires (5 TA) • Multi-hazard platforms or agro-meteorological platforms (2 TA) • Aquifer Mapping (1 TA) • Drainage System (1 TA) • Solar-powered irrigation systems (3 TA) • Pay as you use Business models (2 TA) • Drones soil mapping (1 TA) <p>For all these projects, the lessons learned were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data quantity and quality challenges can be mitigated through strong in-country collaboration between governmental bodies, digital technologies (e.g. satellites or GIS data) or the deployment of hard technologies to access very localized data (one example would be the deployment of TEM equipment to map aquifers in Zambia). However, collecting high-quality data requires time, strong country involvement and perseverance and thus is costly. • Without strong data both in quantity and quality, digital technologies would not perform optimally even if they use the most state-of-the-art systems. • Customized single
---	---

	<p>country-hosted systems can face challenges in being sustainable, because of the lack of data and baseline, because of budget constraints from the governments and the difficulty to fund the cloud storage or the software updates in the long term, and because of the transfer of knowledge which ends with the closure of the project. To mitigate that risk it might be relevant in some cases to connect the countries to broader, larger initiatives benefitting from better data and baseline, stronger M&E systems, continuous capacity building and which systems are funded through international institutions and not the countries. The case of supporting countries in accessing EWS for all initiatives could be explored for example under AFCIA 2. . &#183; The financial and institutional sustainability of the intervention needs to be considered from the kickoff of the project and continue post-implementation. This includes the selection of the entities that should be responsible for the sustainability of the technology and the endorsement of such role by the entity itself through the signature of a MoU or Convention or similar agreements. &#183; Technology needs to be adopted by the users (both governmental institutions or communities) and for this they must provide solutions to the problems/challenges faced by and defined by these users. &#183; Training on the technology should be as extensive as possible, gradually reduced over time, and tailored to users' needs to ensure long-term sustainability.</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>Each of the 15 projects and technologies have the potential to be replicated in other countries. However, one of the lessons learned is that demonstrating the impact of specific technologies are not limited to the piloting of the technology at community-level. To be properly scaled up and reach market-stage at the national level, the technology would need to be anchored within a National System of Innovation that will provide the Enabling Environment (Regulations, policies, standards, certification, codes of conduct, framework) as well as the financing opportunities (customized business models adapted to the most vulnerable, incentives, support by banking institutions). Private sector involvement, through insurance companies for example can also play a critical role in protecting communities and end users, enhancing both impact and sustainability. These measures need to be monitored through clear definition of a baseline and key indicators or measures of impact. Finally, time is required to monitor and evaluate the real impact of the measures post-implementation. It should hence be encouraged to ensure post-implementation monitoring after the closure of the project. The project management cycle usually does not provide the structure for this post-implementation monitoring. That is why the CTCN has mandatory post-implementation surveys through which NDES are requested to investigate the status of the TAs 2 years after closure. Specific logistical support is available since CTCN AB 24 (September 2024) to the NDE whenever the TA was implemented in remote areas.</p>
<h2>Knowledge Management</h2>	
<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>When it comes to the 10 “EE component”, which focuses mainly on business models, roadmaps, strategies, the TA used the national endorsed strategies (TNAs, NAPs) along with their national objectives (NDC) as the baseline and data source to initiate the consultation with the stakeholders. For the 15 projects implemented under the “acceleration Component”, two main trends can be identified when it comes to data/information/knowledge to inform the project development and implementation: - The first one aims at using the country&#180;s available ground and meteorological data. That would be the case for Mozambique SPIS project, Zambia, Guatemala, Liberia, Sudan Soil mapping, Burundi, Maldives for which “hard” technologies were tested and used such as drainage systems, inflatable flood and drought barriers, solar irrigation pumping systems, drones to monitor land use. In some cases, it was discovered that the local data, information, knowledge was too weak to be exploitable, and additional mitigation measures had</p>

	<p>to be developed to reach the expected result such as in Zambia for example were the purchase of the Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM) Equipment to map the aquifers and provide input to the aquifer planning decision tool that had been designed. - The second one aims at using the data available (climate change forecast database) at country level combined with a digitalization approach (and complement this data with more global information available publicly from satellites or open source platforms) and that would be the case of Georgia EWS, Mali, Malawi, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Nigeria, Sudan EWSF, Nepal and Vietnam where the digitalization component is the basis of the technology and the purpose of the TA was from the start to improve the quality of timely, and the way this improved information would be shared timely and in an understandable manner to the final user).</p>
Has the existing information/data/knowledge been made available to relevant stakeholder? If so, what channels of dissemination have been used?	<p>The existing information/data/knowledge was made available to the CTCN through CTCN's focal point (the NDE) and the Adaptation Fund's Designated Authority as well as the project proponents and main stakeholders through the regular Steering Committee's meetings. The CTCN and its respective Implementing Partners made the information/data/knowledge available through TA specific google drive folders accessible by all members of the Steering Committees of each project, and whenever deliverables were approved through CTCN webpage.</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>Below is a list of knowledge products that have been created under AFCIA 1: • 25 factsheets https://www.ctc-n.org/resources/publications • A podcast: https://youtu.be/7rBQFBiJvdY & https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/audio/resilience-global-adaptation-podcast. • 2 stories published under UNEP webpage: o Burundi: https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/can-portable-dam-help-africa-counter-rising-waters o Saint Kitts and Nevis: https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/drought-sets-farmers-saint-kitts-and-nevis-turn-technology-help • A blog: https://www.ctc-n.org/news/Sudan-juggling-priorities-during-difficult-time • An interactive dashboard: https://www.ctc-n.org/technical-assistance/adaptation-fund-climate-innovation-accelerator-afcia-I • Success Stories on Liberia: https://www.ctc-n.org/news/solar-farm-table-liberia-improved-solar-powered-irrigation-practices-are-securing-lowland-rice • Newsletters: The project in Liberia was promoted in CTCN newsletter +subscribers. https://track.mdirector.com/files/campanias/105516/4/4/CAM/message_email.html • Many stories from AFCIA-Funded projects were also included in the new 7 Resource Mobilization briefings https://trello.com/c/msNNPFBx recently which will be used extensively during COP28 during meetings and negotiations with different partners, donors, and philanthropic organizations • PowerPoint presentations and recordings: 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 seminar, COP 28 in Dubai, joint UNDP/UNEP CTCN event in the Philippines. • Videos: o The project in Honduras was promoted by the Implementing Partner through a video that can be found by following this link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AVVPYDxUjOA • Social media: Some of the stories were also picked up by external platforms and media example https://twitter.com/smartwatermag/status/1698967116903244285</p>
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	<p>The CTCN was committed to develop, under the Knowledge and sharing Component, 3 the following results: • Output 3.1: at least 5 success stories. 5 have already been published and more will come in 2025. o Burundi: https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/can-portable-dam-help-africa-counter-rising-waters o Saint Kitts and Nevis: https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/drought-sets-farmers-saint-kitts-and-nevis-turn-technology-help o A</p>

	<p>blog on Sudan Soil mapping: https://www.ctc-n.org/news/Sudan-juggling-priorities-during-difficult-time o Success Stories on Liberia: https://www.ctc-n.org/news/solar-farm-table-liberia-improved-solar-powered-irrigation-practices-are-securing-lowland-rice o Other stories: https://trello.com/c/msNNPFBx o Honduras: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AVVPYDxUjOA • Output 3.1: an operational dashboard, that is available: https://www.ctc-n.org/technical-assistance/adaptation-fund-climate-innovation-accelerator-afcia-I • Output 3.2: at least 1 guidance document. This is under development under the title of AFCIA Impact Report and will be ready in October 2025. • Output 3.2: at least 5 communication products and this objective has already been reached and will continue to be produced in 2025. o 25 factsheets https://www.ctc-n.org/resources/publications o A podcast: https://youtu.be/7rBQFBiJvdY & https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/audio/resilience-global-adaptation-podcast. o Monthly newsletter : Newsletters: https://track.mdirector.com/files/campanias/105516/4/4/CAM/message_email.html o Social media: Some of the stories were also picked up by external platforms and media example https://twitter.com/smartwatermag/status/1698967116903244285 o PowerPoint presentations and recordings made in the margins of international events (such as NDE forums, COPs, SBs). • Output 3.3: Number of Funding Proposal: 1 has already been approved by the AF and one is currently under UNEP's clearance.</p>
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.	Data availability and quality remains a major challenge while working with LDCs or SIDS but also a predictable one. Early lessons from the first CTCN project implementation informed the drafting of subsequent TAs, which requested bidders to propose strategies for overcoming limitations in data that may not meet the expected quantity or quality. This challenge is particularly relevant for TAs under the Acceleration component focused on deploying “hard” technologies. In most of these projects, data was obtained using different options: Satellite data, GIS, open data source platform, but also through soil sampling for example in Zambia using the TEM equipment or Sudan with the use of drones. In Acceleration projects aiming at improving the quality and quantity of local data through digitalization, data limitations were assumed from the onset in the purpose of the project and could be overcome through software actualization and improvements such as in Sudan and Malaysia, formulation of climate modelling for example.
Has the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	Yes, the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes of the project in supporting the dissemination of the impact at programme level, the identification of lessons learned, good practices, things to avoid. They help to articulate and design more effective instruction planning, activities, and assessments. They help to articulate what projects should be able to do as a result of the instruction and consequently aid in designing more effective instruction planning, activities, and assessments.
Innovation	
Describe any innovative practices or technologies that figured prominently in this project.	The main trends in technology of AFCIA 1 can be seen in AFCIA I Dashboard: https://www.ctc-n.org/technical-assistance/adaptation-fund-climate-innovation-accelerator-afcia-I and can be filtered by type of interventions, by sectors, types of support, type of solutions. The main trend in on: - Early Warning Systems (EWS): 10 TA - Solar Powered Irrigation System (SPIS): 4 TA - Smart agriculture techniques: 3 TA - Business models for smallholder farmers (pay as you use): 3 TAs
Complementarity/ Coherence with other climate finance sources	
Has the project been scaled-up from any other climate finance? Or has the project build upon any other	Yes

climate finance initiative?	
If you answered yes, kindly specify the name of the Fund/Organization.	AFCIA 1 has been replicated with the opening of a new AFCIA programme, implemented by more Implementing Entities, including WFP and UNIDO with approved proposals at the moment of this PPR, and more IEs expected to be included in the new future. Some projects are in the process of being scaled up through the Adaptation Fund's Innovation Window (this is the case of the project in Burundi and in Maldives at different stages of the process). Some projects were scaled up, replicated by other source of funding and are described under the earlier question on scalability and replicability and include 9 closed projects out of 12 (Burundi, Maldives, Mongolia, Saint Kitts, Georgia, Ghana, Mozambique ² , Pakistan.)

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? After Midterm

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

Core Indicator: No. of beneficiaries

		Total	% of female beneficiaries	% of Youth beneficiaries
Baseline information	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project			
Baseline information	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Baseline information	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)			
Target performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project			
Target performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Target performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)			
Performance at mid-term	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at mid-term	Indirect beneficiaries			

term	supported by the project			
Performance at mid-term	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)			
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)			

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

Output 1.1 Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated

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

	No. of projects/programmes that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments	Sector	Scale	Status
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Output 1.2 Targeted population groups covered by adequate risk reduction systems

Core Indicator 1.2: No. of Early Warning Systems

	No. of adopted Early Warning Systems	Category targeted	Hazard	Geographical coverage	Number of municipalities
Baseline information					
Target performance at completion					
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				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

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

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

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

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

Performance at completion				
Output 2.2. Increased readiness and capacity of national and sub-national entities to directly access and program adaptation finance				
Indicator 2.2.1: No. of targeted institutions benefitting from the direct access and enhanced direct access modality				
	Number of beneficiaries	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

Indicator 3.1: Increase in application of appropriate adaptation responses

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

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

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

	No. of targeted beneficiaries	% of female participants targeted	Level of awareness
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Project/programme sector	Geographical scale	Response level
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
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			
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			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

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

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

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

Core Indicator 5.1: Natural Assets protected or rehabilitated

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

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

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

	No. of targeted households	% of female headed households	Improvement level
Baseline information			

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

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

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

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

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

	Number of Assets	Type of Assets	Sector	Adaptation strategy
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
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			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

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

	Integration level
--	-------------------

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Sector of innovative practice	Geographic Scale	Type
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Output 8: Viable innovations are rolled out, scaled up, encouraged and/or accelerated

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

	No. of innovative	Sector	Status	Effectiveness
--	-------------------	--------	--------	---------------

	practices/ tools technologies			
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid- term				
Performance at completion				

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

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