ADAPTATION FUND

Project Performance Report

Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	10/31/2024 - 10/28/2025
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)	Global
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?

No

List each approval condition, if any, and report on the status of meeting them	
Category of condition	
Condition or Requirement	
Current Status	
Planned actions, including a detailed time schedule	

List (only) inception report/ extension request(s)/ MTR that have been prepared for the project and provide date(s) of submission for each
Inception Report, February 2021. Mid Term Review submitted in February 2024.

List the Website address (URL) of project
https://www.ctc-n.org/technical-assistance/adaptation-fund-climate-innovation-accelerator-afcia-I https://www.ctc-n.org/technical-assistance/adaptation-fund-climate-innovation-accelerator-afcia-I/fact-sheets https://www.ctc-n.org/af/programme-news/afcia-i-resilience-global-adaptation-podcast-interview-nadege-trocellier

Project Contacts			
National/Regional Project Manager/Coordinator	**Name**	**Email**	**Date**
Implementing Entity	Jessica Troni	jessica.troni@un.org	12/28/2025

Financial Data

Disbursement of AF grant funds	
Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date ($)	$5,000,000.00
Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date ($)	$4,575,000.00
Project disbursement rate (%)	94.16
Project execution rate (%)	100.00
Add any comments on AF Grant Funds	During this reporting period 259,026.90 USD have been spent from the 5 Million received by the AF. From the AF funding, overall 3.5 Million USD have been invested into Technical Assistances (25 projects), 640,375 USD into Knowledge Management and Sharing, and 855,275 USD on programme support (Staff, Mid Term and Terminal Evaluation). As of 28th of October 2025, 25 projects have been fully implemented and closed (13 have finalized their implementation during this implementing period). The programme officially ended on 27th October 2025. This is the last PPR for this project. Please note that USD29,831.29 of co-finance is reflected in the expenditure data table.
Investment Income ($)	$0.00
Cumulative Investment Income since inception ($)	$0.00

Expenditure Data	
Output	**Amount ($)**
1.1 Communication Specialist	$0.00
1.1 Translation Services	$0.00
1.1 Regional Liaison	$0.00
1.2 Grants to Network members	$0.00
1.2 Travel	$46,189.55
1.1 Printing	$0.00
2.1 Grants to Network Members	$0.00
2.2 Grants to Network member (Ecuador)	$29,831.29
3.1 Communication Specialist	$7,291.57
3.1 IT services	$0.00
3.1 Grants to Network Members	$0.00
3.2 Communication Specialist	$0.00
3.2 Translation Services	$4,520.78
3.2 Audio / Video Services	$12,250.00
3.2 Printing	$0.00
3.3 Grants to Network Members	$0.00

3.3 Travel	$50,000.00
IE fee ($)	$25,565.00
Execution cost ($)	$138,775.00

Planned Expenditure Schedule		
Output	**Projected Cost ($)**	**Estimated Completion Date**
n/a	$0.00	10/27/2025
IE fee ($)		$0.00
Execution cost ($)		$0.00

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? ($)	$1,804,350.41
Estimated cumulative actual co-financing as verified during Mid-term Review (MTR) or Terminal Evaluation (TE). ($)	$774,888.39
Add any comments on actual co-financing in particular any issues related to the realization of in-kind, grant, credits, loans, equity, non-grant instruments and other types of co-financing.	Cumulative actual co-financing has been of 1,804,350.41 versus an estimated planned 500,000 USD. Thus the CTCN has co-funded 360% more than planned in the contract. Co-funding activities in 2025 includes 29,831.29 USD to the project in Ecuador due to tax issue problem that arose after the signature of the contract between the IP and UNON. All the co-funding has been invested into Technical Assistances. The Implementing Partner was requested to pay taxes (with was not plan under his financial proposal according to UNON instructions). After negotiations between UNON, the IP and CTCN, it was agreed that exceptionally the CTCN will increase the budget allocated to this TA to cover the unexpected taxes.

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 contracting Network Members may slow implementation	Low	Under this reporting period No bidding process were ongoing considering that all the projects were either under implementation or closed so associated risk is considered low Overall The use of UNON’s two-stage bidding process corresponds to the modalities of the CTCN and were used to recruit the Implementing Partners (CTCN Network Members) of UNEP CTCN AFCIA programme. The average time required between the launch

		of the Request for Expression of Interest (REOI) and the signature of the contracts over these 25 projects is of 392.5 days (thus 1 year, and 1 month) with the faster process being of 167 days (5.5 months) and the longest of 858 days (2 years and 4 months). Over the 25 projects only 3 (12%) were awarded within 6 months after the launch of the REOI, 10 (40%) within a year, 6 (24% within 1 year ½) and still 6 (24%) in more than 1-year 1/2. These unpredictable delays can be justified by different reasons from digital technical problems with UNON platform, to low quality of the bids received, discrepancies on the financial proposals of eligible bidders, or tax issues between the UN and the awarded partner's country of registration. Consequently, over the 5-year period of grant implementation, it is estimated that this risk can be ranked Medium. Such risk will be taken into consideration under AFCIA II.
Challenges in coordination between National Designated Entities (NDEs) and Adaptation Fund Designated Authorities (DAs) may impact the quality of submissions	Low	Under this reporting period Strengthening the collaboration between NDE and DAs/NIE was a recommendation of AFCIA I Mid Term Review. Thus, all projects that initiated the design phase of the projects after 2024 demonstrate a stronger involvement of both parties. Consequently, 10 projects out of 25 can justify a strong collaboration between AF FP and CTCN FP (40% of the total portfolio). This includes the latest 8 projects contracted in 2024 (please kindly refer to the procurement tab of 2024 PPR) as well as Burundi & Maldives which are in the process of being scaled up through a CN to the AF. Thus under this reporting period the risk is qualified as low. Overall It has been noticed that NDEs are not always connected or known by the AF DA/NIE and overall 60% of the Technical Assistances were implemented without strong connection between NDEs and DAs. Thus, it is recommended that the risk should be raised from Low to Medium for the overall programme implementation. As a mitigation measure, CTCN has started to connect NDE and DAs/ NIEs for the last 2 years of implementation of AFCIA I. This has resulted in an increased ownership of the Technical Assistances and better sustainability of the projects. Consequently, the CTCN will continue to apply this best practice to AFCIA II by requesting the signature of both the Adaptation Fund´s focal point as well as the NDE in each Response Plans. Most of the time the collaboration demonstrated to be easy. Nonetheless this matchmaking process can have impact in the design of the Response Plan as more stakeholders are involved and time to reach approval on the document could be increased.
The lack of enabling environment to encourage and support innovation limits national buy-in	Low	Under this reporting period Of the 25 projects under implementation, 10 focus on strengthening the enabling environment. The involvement of the government—primarily through the NDE—in every project ensures direct alignment with national strategies and priorities, including the NDC, TNAs, and NAP, among others. The participation of the NDE and, in some cases, the Adaptation Fund Focal Point, also reinforces national ownership and buy-in. Thus under this reporting period the risk is qualified as low. Looking ahead AFCIA II will prioritize the development or strengthening of National Systems of Innovation, fostering stronger interactions among the networks of actors, institutions, and linkages that drive technological change. The programme will aim to demonstrate how policy coherence, standards and certification, transparent data systems, targeted finance, and catalytic intermediaries (such as incubators and accelerators) work together to de-risk investment and accelerate technology diffusion.
Not enough high quality requests are received	Low	Under this reporting period No sourcing occurred during this reporting period as all 25 projects were already selected. Risk is low for this reporting period. Overall The call for proposals approach implemented under AFCIA I demonstrated a risk with regards to the quality of the

		request received. Indeed, out of the 420 requests, 155 were deemed not eligible thus 36% of the total requests received. As a mitigation measure, webinars were organized between the different calls for proposals, targeting the helix knowledge with the objective to build capacity amongst these stakeholders. Under AFCIA II a rolling basis sourcing system will be used. This should enable the CTCN to work more closely with the countries and project proponent in reviewing and approving their requests. While this risk has been reduced throughout the implementation of the programme, it can still be considered Medium for the overall programme as it has been an identified as a challenge.
Transformational change cannot be achieved through micro-grants	Moderate	Under this reporting period It was noted as a lesson learnt from the MTR that piloting adaptation technologies on the ground are a way to reach real, palpable impacts on community resilience and secure buy in. Under AFCIA, 15 acceleration projects have been implemented, and they did create tangible impacts at community level and therefore built strong evidence for scale up and change. However, often these projects were implemented in silos and struggled to go beyond grants and public fundings to leverage the additional financing that will create a transformational and systemic change. As a result the level of risk is estimated as Medium. Looking ahead Another recommendation from the MTR was to anchor these technologies piloted into stronger - wider national systems of innovation. The Adaptation Fund has decided to create a coordination body to connect the different sub-AFCIA programmes. This coordination body should help to reduce these silos and provide systemic change.
Gender considerations are not adequately taken into account during the design and implementation of innovation grant.	Moderate	Under 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. These templates were improved in 2025 by defining core indicators. Overall, eight AFCIA initiatives have prioritized women as direct beneficiaries and have successfully integrated gender-sensitive activities, the other 17 initiatives (68%) have built gender responsive decision-making tools. As a result, UNEP CTCN-AFCIA initiatives have reached 91,187 women (43%) among its direct beneficiaries, retaining a similarly inclusion rate across indirect beneficiaries (44% women) and number of staff targeted for capacity building (46%). Efforts need to continue and be strenghtened to reach at least 50% of women benefitting from the AFCIA II programme. The level of risks is maintained as Medium.
Funding for scaled-up implementation is not available	Moderate	Under this reporting period To date, ten of the 25 initiatives (40%) have already secured additional support and finance for scale up : Burundi, Georgia, Malawi, Ghana, Pakistan, Sudan EWS, Zambia, Maldives, Mongolia, Saint Kitts and Nevis either from governments, private sectors or through new grants. UNEP CTCN-AFCIA provides continued assistance including follow-up and matchmaking to ensure all initiatives are positioned for their next phase of development. It helps partners identify pathways to take forward successful technologies and practices. The risk is maintained as Medium as attracting private banking institutions remain a challenge. Overall the gap between what countries need with regards to the Climate Change adaptation and the source of funding available remains very large. Securing scale up funding especially from the

		private sector remains a challenge, overall risk can then be considered high for the programme. As a mitigation measure, and under AFCIA II, the CTCN intends to involve the financial sector at early stage (ideation process), to ensure that key financial players in a specific country would be aware of the initiative and can more easily identify possible connections with other larger programmes or initiatives, with their priorities and area of work.
Innovations trigger mal-adaptation	Low	Under this reporting period AFCIA I programme focuses on small scale projects or enabling environment which focuses on the basic needs of the country: access to data to activate Early Warning Systems, access to drinkable water, access to food for all. All projects were cleared by UNEP Safeguard Unit before being awarded. The risk of maladaptation is low and is expected to remain low. Overall With the safeguard unit and risk identification in place, and considering the nature and size of the projects implemented under UNEP CTCN AFCIA, risk of maladaptation is considered as low.

Critical Risks Affecting Progress (Not identified at project design)

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

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

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk

Risk Measures

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

Under this reporting period During this reporting period, only a limited number of projects were under implementation and no significant challenges were encountered. Nevertheless, several targeted measures were implemented to proactively reduce identified risks. To mitigate gender-related risks, a Gender Action Plan (GAAP) was introduced by CTCN and applied to all projects implemented in 2025 (8), strengthening the systematic integration, monitoring, and reporting of gender considerations. In parallel, capacity-building efforts were undertaken to support project proponents in better addressing gender and inclusion aspects. While gender parity challenges persist in some governmental institutions, these measures contribute to reducing associated implementation risks. Overall Operating primarily in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) inevitably entails a range of implementation risks, including potential delays, changes in national focal points, and technical or technological constraints. These risks are mitigated through UNEP's strong regional presence, which enables timely support when challenges arise, and through the Climate Technology Centre and Network's (CTCN) close and ongoing engagement with National Designated Entities (NDEs). In addition, all projects are implemented by experienced teams on the ground, whose contextual knowledge and operational capacity can be mobilized to resolve emerging issues. With regard to risks related to contracting Network Members, the CTCN and UNON have established dedicated focal points to streamline coordination, proactively identify areas for continuous improvement, and facilitate timely and effective contractual processes. To address coordination risks between National Designated Entities (NDEs) and Designated Authorities (DAs) under AFCIA II, the formal endorsement of both the NDE and the DA has been made mandatory, strengthening institutional alignment and coordination from the outset of project preparation and implementation. To improve the quality of requests and reduce the risk of weak project design, capacity-building webinars were organized during AFCIA I to support project proponents in strengthening technical quality and overall readiness of their proposals. In AFCIA II. The project intake process was transitioned to a rolling basis, allowing more time for stakeholder consultation and enhanced support to requesting countries. In relation to enabling environment constraints, AFCIA II actively promotes stronger interactions among networks of actors,

institutions, and stakeholders that drive technological change. Regarding transformational change, and in line with recommendations from the Mid-Term Review (MTR), AFCIA II aims to anchor adaptation innovation within broader national systems of innovation. This approach is intended to move beyond isolated interventions and generate more systemic and sustained change. While securing financing for scaling up remains a challenge, the Coordination Services are expected to help mitigate this risk by leveraging synergies with Implementing Entities that already have strong engagement with the private sector, notably UNIDO and UNDP. Finally, with respect to maladaptation risks, the AFCIA Safeguards, Risk Identification Framework (SRIF) will continue to be strengthened, and the grievance mechanism will be widely disseminated among beneficiaries of technical assistance activities, ensuring that potential negative impacts are identified early and addressed in a transparent and inclusive manner.

ESP Compliance

Section 1: Identified ESP Risk Management

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

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

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

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

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

Section 3: Categorisation	
Is the categorisation according to ESP standards still relevant?	Yes
If No, please describe the changes made at activity,	

output or outcome level, approved by the Board, that resulted in this change of categorization.	

Section 4: Implementation arrangements	
What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	During the reporting period, UNEP and the CTCN maintained established arrangements to implement and monitor ESP safeguard measures across the AFCIA portfolio. All 25 SRIFs were developed and approved by UNEP safeguard experts in previous reporting periods, with all projects assessed as low risk and fully aligned with the Adaptation Fund's ESP requirements. Implementation during this period focused on finalising remaining technical assistance (13), with safeguards monitored throughout project execution via the AF Results Tracker, CTCN M&E systems, and closure reports to ensure continued compliance
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?	During this reporting period, the risk has been monitored through a Steering Committee created for each project that was meeting once a month to discuss challenges, solutiions, the workplan, the next steps.
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 disaggregati to identify risks and impacts**	**Safeguard measures identified for the USP**	**Monitoring indicator(s) for each impact**

Section 6: Grievances	
Was a grievance mechanism established capable and known to stakeholders to accept grievances and complaints related to environmental and social risks	Yes

and impacts?	
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

No news USP were contracted during this reporting period. This justifies the reason why the ESMP was not updated for this reporting period.

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	A GAAP template with mandatory core indicators and sub-indicators have been approved during CTCN AB 24 and shared with all Implementing Partners that have started to implement projects in 2025. A total of 8 projects have used this template. This template has helped the IP in considering gender gaps more proactively,	Defined at USP Level	Defined at USP Level	Satisfactory

		by defining quantitative indicators on gender at the beginning of the projects. The gender assessment is also very helpful to better understand the context in which the project will be implemented, cultural aspects to be considered and suports the continuous monitoring of what has worked, what could have worked better			

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
Lack of consistency of gender integration and monitoring at technical assistance level across the programme	Satisfactory	During this reporting period, the CTCN has created with the support from WECF (CTCN Gender Constituency)a Gender Assessment and Action Plan (GAAP) with mandatory core indicators and sub-indicators that has been approved during CTCN AB 24 and is being since then implemented on a systematic basis to all new AFCIA technical assistances. This gender assessment and action plan helps to diagnose gender roles and the involvement of women (and youth) in adaptation technologies. It helps to identify mitigation measures and recommendations for addressing gender disparities and designing effective and meaningful gender responsive interventions. In addition, CTCN included a mandatory threshold of at least 5% of the budget to gender mainstreaming activities for all its technical assistances.
Limited women representation within partner governmental institutions led to some difficulties in reaching equal participation to some key capacity building / training	Satisfactory	The CTCN operates as a demand-driven mechanism and works primarily with government institutions, where women’s representation remains limited in certain contexts. While this structural constraint affected gender balance in some institution-level capacity-building and training activities, CTCN systematically ensures that gender considerations are integrated across all technical assistance. This includes dedicated gender mainstreaming sessions, the identification of gender-responsive enabling environments, and,

activity at institutional level		where relevant, the piloting of gender-responsive and gender-transformative innovations/technologies. CTCN will continue to encourage partner institutions to nominate women participants and to apply inclusive participation criteria in future activities.
Difficulty for CTCN partner delivering AFCIA to access high quality gender expertise	Satisfactory	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.
Barriers for women participation have witnessed to ensure equal access to trainings and technology deployment at community level	Satisfactory	In community led projects, women participation has been ensured by scheduling community meetings, events, and training sessions during times when women are more likely to be available, such as Fridays or weekends.

Section 3: Implementation arrangements	
What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP	The AFCIA I programme was implemented in full accordance with UNEP's gender-related rules and guidelines. Gender equality is a guiding principle of UNEP's safeguard screening checklist (SRIF). Gender considerations are mainstreamed throughout the safeguards and are also the focus of three dedicated questions in the first section of the SRIF. Through the review and clearance of the SRIF for each TA, UNEP's safeguards and gender officers ensure that projects do not generate unintended negative impacts on gender equality. UNEP has also ensured that gender considerations were reflected in the programme impact report developed during this reporting period. Together, the Adaptation Fund and UNEP promoted the importance of women's empowerment at COP 30 in Belém through an event titled "Women Entrepreneurs Driving Climate Innovation and Adaptation", held on 14 December 2025 with the participation of Mirey Atallah, UNEP Chief of the Adaptation and Resilience Branch, Climate Change Division.
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 template for the Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan has been approved during CTCN AB 24. This template includes core and mandatory indicators as well as sub-indicators that can more easily be adapted according to the relevance with the project. This GAAP has been designed in collaboration with the Women Engage for a Common Future (WECF) the Women Constituency of the CTCN. A total of 8 AFCIA projects have used this template.This gender assessment and action plan helps to diagnose gender roles and the involvement of women (and youth) in adaptation technologies. It helps to identify mitigation measures and recommendations for

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

Section 4: Grievances	
Was a grievance mechanism established capable and known to stakeholders to accept grievances and complaints related to gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes
Were grievances received during the reporting period?	No

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

Comments

During the reporting period no specific capacity gaps affecting GP compliance have been identified. Overall, the MTR has highlighted the importance to anchor gender considerations at project level. The CTCN continues to strengthen its approach to gender at project level. Under AFCIA II and with the coordination Services, more emphasis will be done about gender empowerment under the Knowledge and Sharing component with specific webinars built around the role of women in climate adaptation, specific success stories about the gender integration, specific video empowering women of developing countries fighting for their environment.

Rating

Implementing Entity

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Comments	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	Outcome 8	Outcome indicator: No. of microgrants invested in technology acceleration. Target: 20 investments Target: Promising Adaptation	Completed		Satisfactory

technology incubation and acceleration supported by government structures and processes		Innovations and Technologies are accelerated in 15 countries Technical and financial systems to accelerate adaption innovation and technology action are strengthened in 10 countries			
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	Completed		Satisfactory

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

Name	Email
Eva Comba	eva.comba@un.org

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

Overall programme performance is assessed as satisfactory, with all three outcomes achieved or completed as planned, within budget and in alignment with programme objectives. Outcome 1 was satisfactorily achieved through the launch and wide dissemination of three calls for proposals, which generated strong demand for AFCIA support. Across the three calls, over 420 requests were received (including duplicates). Submission quality improved between the first two calls, with non-eligible applications decreasing from 13% to 8%, reflecting the positive impact of capacity-building webinars and knowledge-transfer sessions.The third call alone received over 200 applications, exceeding the total from the first two calls combined. The higher share of non-eligible submissions (42%) is attributable to broader outreach beyond NDEs to universities, research institutions, private-sector actors, and local authorities, many of whom had limited familiarity with AFCIA requirements and did not attend preparatory webinars. Africa accounted for the majority of submissions and non-eligible requests, reflecting the higher concentration of LDCs and SIDS and comparatively lower proposal development capacity. In response, the CTCN prioritised more personalised engagement and bilateral support in Asia and LAC, contributing to higher eligibility rates in those regions. Outcome 2 was fully achieved, with the last 13 projects successfully completed during the reporting period across Guatemala, Ecuador, Suriname, Thailand, Zambia, Georgia, Malaysia, Malawi, Nepal, the Bahamas, Mozambique (smart farming), Nigeria, and Mali. Overall, the programme supported 15 adaptation technology innovations and 10 technical analyses to strengthen enabling environments and institutional readiness. Interventions addressed key climate risks across sectors, including early warning systems, solar-powered irrigation, climate-smart agriculture, water management, aquifer mapping, and digital innovations. All activities were delivered on time, within budget, and in close coordination with government counterparts. Outcome 3 was completed during the reporting period, notably through the formulation of an Adaptation Fund concept note for the Maldives and full size project proposal for Burundi currently under UNEP internal clearance. To date, 10 of the 25 initiatives (40%) have already secured additional funding for scale-up from governments, the private sector, or new grants, including in Burundi, Georgia, Malawi, Ghana, Pakistan, Sudan, Zambia, Maldives, Mongolia, and Saint Kitts and Nevis. UNEP–CTCN-AFCIA continues to provide post–technical assistance follow-up and matchmaking to support remaining initiatives. Overall progress has been satisfactory, with all outcomes achieved or completed as planned. Building on the lessons learned from the first phase of the programme, a second phase (AFCIA II) has been developed to strengthen impact across all three components—outreach and sourcing, innovation incubation and acceleration, and scaling-up of successful solutions. AFCIA II aims to further improve proposal quality, deepen institutional support for innovation, and enhance financing pathways to maximise the sustainability and transformative potential of adaptation innovations.

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	Completed		Satisfactory
Component 3: Concrete adaptation actions are triggered by the knowledge and evidence produced by the micro-grant mechanism	Outcome 8	Output 3.1 Lessons learned and good practices from project implementation support are shared Target: 5 success stories Target: 1 dashboard Output 3.2 Guidance document for adaptation innovation : Target: 1 guidance document is provided Target: 5 communication products Output 3.3: Proposals for scaled up investment of 2 technology investments are developed and funding secured. Target: 2 business/funding proposals (2 CN are submitted)	Completed		Highly Satisfactory

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

Name	**Email**	**Institution**
Ariesta Ningrum	ariesta.ningrum@un.org	UN CTCN

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

Achievements realised During this reporting period, 13 projects have finalized their implementation, adding to the 12 already closed during the previous reporting periods. In total 25 Technical Assistances have been successfully implemented within the contracted timeline. Outcome 3 has also been completed with the submission from the CTCN to UNEP of the Concept Note of Maldives for clearance before submission. Overall, UNEP CTCN-AFCIA directly impacted more than 200,000 people, and enabled governments across 23 countries to pilot innovations that can scale to impact many more. During the five years of deployment, the potential for climate resilience has increased with data gathered, capacity increased and pilots conducted for a wide range of technologies including solar pumps, early warning systems, soil mapping, community data gathering, flood barriers, and agro-tech. 75% of the completed initiatives are already set to scale within their countries with support gained from governments and international funds. The next step is to grow this vital initiative beyond the first 25 initiatives and provide technical assistance to more vulnerable communities ready to adapt to the impacts of climate change, develop innovation systems at national and regional level and attract more the private sector investment Output 3 is considered because in 2025, the following KMS products were created : 3 new videos were produced: Malawi, Nepal (not yet published), Georgia (not yet published) and 19 success stories snapshots A joint Impact Report (not published online yet) developed with UNDP. MediaValet platform, 5 posters of AFCIA projects that were used for the Adaptatin Futures conference and a joint video featuring project photos and projected on a wall at the Adaptation Futures Conference and COP 30 (not published online). 38 Social posts, 19 in LinkedIn and 19 in Facebook. Those KM and communication products add up to the ones already produced during past reporting period and totalling to 27 succes stories and 16 types of communication products developed going well beyond initial targets (of 5 each) Output 3.1 Lessons learned and good practices from project implementation support are shared Target: 5 success stories: overachieved with 27 stories produced including 3 videos (Malawi, Nepal (not yet published), Georgia (not yet published)), 19 success stories snapshots published as part of the impact report or through social media, 3 Published on UNEP webpage and 2 on CTCN one website Target: 1 dashboard: reached (https://www.ctc-n.org/technical-assistance/adaptation-fund-climate-innovation-accelerator-afcia-I) Output 3.2 Guidance document for adaptation innovation: Target: 1 guidance document is provided. target met with A joint Impact Report (not published online yet) developed in close collaboration with UNDP, Target: 5 communication products required: overachieved with 16 types of communication products designed: Factsheets (25 produced, one by project), A podcast, 3 Stories published under UNEP webpage, 2 Success Stories published on CTCN webpage, 3 Videos : Malawi, Nepal (not yet published), Georgia (not yet published), A joint Impact Report (not published online yet) developed with UNDP, A MediaValet platform, 5 Posters of AFCIA projects that were used for the Adaptatin Futures conference, A joint video featuring project photos and projected on a wall at the Adaptation Futures Conference and COP 30 (not published online), Social posts (38 during this reporting period- 19 in LinkedIn and 19 in Facebook), A blog, An interactive dashboard, CTCN Newsletters, 1 Resource Mobilization briefing, PowerPoints presentations and recordings used for events, 2 Videos created by the Implementing Partners Output 3.3: Proposals for scaled up investment of 2 TAs have been developed and funding secured. Target: 2 business/funding proposals: (2 Concept Notes formulated) Challenges identified Challenges related to the procurement process have been identified. Focal points from both UNON and CTCN sides have been nominated and meet every week. A training session is also planned in January 2026 to provide transparency on the process and find ways to mitigate the risk of delays of the bidding processes. Political risks have also created delays in the implementation. As a mitigation measure no response plans or bidding processes are initiated during years of presidential elections in a host country. With regards to Outcome 3, two challenges been identified. - The first one is related to the difficulty of leveraging funding from the private sector to sustain the projects implemented under AFCIA. CTCN is experimenting another approach consisting of engaging with the donors, and private national banks working in the host country and meeting with them from the design stage of the project (the Response Plan formulation) in order to identify from scratch potential interest, potential initiatives that could drive the project post implementation of CTCN TA. - The other challenge is with regards to the dissemination of knowledge. CTCN realizes the importance and impact of high-quality videos and comms material but still have a very limited budget for it under AFCIA I & II. Under the Coordination Services, the regional hubs should help to reach a much broader audience. A Community of Proactive will also be created which should help to stimulate the knowledge sharing amongst Implementing Entity and drive the capacity building of the grantees. Way forward / mitigation measure proposed to improve programming and implementation of AFCIA next phases Overall, under Component 1, it has been recommended during the MTR that AFCIA II should encourage more locally led adaptation projects with a higher participation of the knowledge helix. This is being pursued with the support of UNEP networks, of CTCN Advisory Board and constituency groups, as well as other UN entities, UNEP partners and CTCN network members. Under component 2, it has been identified that a closer collaboration between NDE and DAs would be beneficial to ensure the ownership of the projects. This is being ensured through the mandatory signature of both the NDE and the DA in all the new response plans signed under AFCIA II. With regards to component 3, UNEP CTCN will continue its change-making collaboration with the Adaptation Fund to boost innovation in climate adaptation technologies through a second phase: UNEP CTCN-AFCIA II. In a change from AFCIA I, the programme will aim to broaden its remit from government organizations to include public institutions, private institutions, civil society organizations, community groups, research centres, and universities. National Systems of Innovation (NSIs) are a core feature of UNEP CTCN-AFCIA II, and will provide the enabling environment (including regulations, policies, standards, certification, codes of conduct, framework) as well as the financing opportunities (e.g., business models, incentives, banking support) required to launch from the groundwork of UNEP CTCN-AFCIA I. All initiatives continue to be channelled through the NDEs, but directing their commitment towards the broader NSI environment.

Other

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

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

Name	Email

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

Overall Rating

Overall rating

Satisfactory

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

1. Indicate trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the project indicators. Trend related to Outcome 1 : High demand, not enough budget: This first edition of the AFCIA programe has managed to reach more countries that initially planned. This can be explained by the wide and strong network of NDEs but also by the gap between the needs of the global south versus the resources allocated to adaptation. Despite the very high number of requests received, it was noticed that the quality of the request could be improved. This is improving with AFCIA II as the requests can be submitted on a rolling basis which enables more stakeholders consultations and customized support. It is also important to take into account that the allocated budget of 3.5 million USD to implement 25 projects was under-estimated and the CTCN had to co-fund 8 projects. This challenge has been slightly remodeled under AFCIA II as the initial budget available is lower than during the first edition but most successful projects could receive additional funding to pilot a technology and or strengthen the NSI respective to this specific technology (the 10 most successful projects could thus get up to 330,000 USD instead of 250,000 USD under AFCIA I). Trend related to Outcome 2: Piloting technologies generate tangible impacts and support both innovation and

enabling environment. As referenced in the MTR, UNEP/CTCN noticed that “Piloting small scale climate change adaptation technologies are a way to reach real, palpable impact on community resilience”. It was initially planned that 15 projects will focus on piloting technologies and 10 will essentially focus on the Enabling Environment, and this was achieved. But we also learnt that an enabling environment works better if it is supported by technology such a digital platform. That’s why out of the 10 EE TA implemented, 5 included a technology component: Mongolia by the establishment of a digital crop insurance product, Malaysia with the installation of a digital multi-hazard platform, Ecuador with the deploying of a drought modelling system, Suriname with a water management platform, and Thailand which focused on blockchain technology. The ones that didn’t need technology support were smart farming Technical assistances (in Honduras, Guatemala, and Mozambique), one business model for stallholder farmer in Ghana, and one framework to make the marketplace more sustainable in Bahamas. To date, ten of the 25 initiatives (40%) have already secured additional support and finance for scale up : Burundi, Georgia, Malawi, Ghana, Pakistan, Sudan EWS, Zambia, Maldives, Mongolia, Saint Kitts and Nevis either from governments, private sectors or through new grants. UNEP CTCN-AFCIA provides continued assistance including follow-up and matchmaking to ensure all initiatives are positioned for their next phase of development. It helps partners identify pathways to take forward successful technologies and practices. With AFCIA II, UNEP CTCN will work even more on strengthening NSI and with the cooperation services we will intend to break silos which should lead to an even more visible paradigm shitft. Trend related to Outcome 3: Voices from the ground create perspective During this reporting period, UNDP and UNEP CTCN have collaborated in many aspects: on the creation of a big wall of pictures and story for the Adaptation Futures, as well as the organization of joint event during the Adaptation Furures and the formulation of a joint impact report with UNDP. Photo reportages of AFCIA projects were also produced and disseminated as well as a short video that was done for COP and used whenever possible. These images, these voices from the ground have an immense value as they generate emotions, they highlight the context, the risk, the impact much better than any report. Funds availability is the unique barrier to having one reportage for each project. That is why we have started to add these reportages to the Response Plans. That will hopefully enable us to have more photos and comms content to use of sharing and dissemination without impacting the budget too much. 2. Detail critical risks that have affected progress. Risk 1 : Small scale projects are often implemented in silos making it difficult to create systemic chance. The AFCIA II coordination proposal will try to create a common vision to the multi IEs AFCIA programmes. Risk 2: Political unstability leads to lack of ownership and delays in implementation. Risk 3 delays in procurement of the CTCN partners to deliver the technical assistances (through UNON) The CTCN will aim at supporting SIDS/LDC and developing countries with a stable context (no presidential elections planned for the year during which TAs are prioritized) to limit these risks. CTCN and UNON will also work on improving the delays related to the procurement to reduce the timeline between the approval of a project and its start (which will also limit the risk of having new nominated counterparts on the ground). 3. All recommendations from the Mid-Term Review (MTR) have been considered and, where feasible, implemented under AFCIA and further embedded in the design of AFCIA II and the Coordination Services. Key actions include: - Government engagement and governance: Under AFCIA I, government engagement in project governance was strengthened through closer collaboration between National Designated Entities (NDEs) and Designated Authorities (DAs), particularly during project implementation. Under AFCIA II, this collaboration has been further institutionalised as a formal requirement across the project cycle. - National innovation ecosystem engagement and exit strategies: During AFCIA I, mapping of key national stakeholders and engagement beyond ministries was encouraged. Under AFCIA II, structured stakeholder mapping and the formulation of clear exit strategies at the response plan design stage have become formal design requirements. - Managing and measuring transformational change: During AFCIA I, increased attention was given to how projects contribute to adaptation and innovation outcomes, notably through joint learning and impact reflection exercises. Building on this, a senior M&E expert will be recruited under AFCIA II and the Coordination Services to strengthen the monitoring of transformational change and programme-level impact. - Piloting concrete interventions and technologies: AFCIA I included the piloting of concrete adaptation technologies to generate tangible results. AFCIA II and the Coordination Services will strengthen linkages between small-scale pilots and broader AFCIA sub-programmes to support greater systemic change and potential paradigm shifts. - Mobilising private finance through systems thinking: Under AFCIA I, engagement with co-financing opportunities was pursued where feasible. AFCIA II will apply a more structured systems approach, including multi-stage funding mechanisms, blended finance models, and earlier private-sector

engagement to support scale-up. - Exit strategies and scale-up planning: Under AFCIA I, 40% of projects have already secured additional funding for scale-up. AFCIA II will further guide project proponents in integrating exit strategies and financing pathways as a core technical assistance activity to enhance sustainability and impact. - Gender integration and inclusion: AFCIA I strengthened gender mainstreaming through mandatory Gender Assessments and Action Plans (GAAPs), a gender expert roster, and dedicated budgets. Under AFCIA II, efforts will be continued and reinforced to ensure women, youth, Indigenous Peoples, and vulnerable groups are actively involved not only as beneficiaries but also in project design and scaling efforts. - Coordination, learning, and knowledge management: During AFCIA I, closer coordination with partners, particularly UNDP, was achieved on learning and knowledge management. These efforts will be further institutionalised and sustained through the AFCIA II Coordination Services. 4. Throughout AFCIA I, all projects remained low risk, with no projects rated as High/Unsatisfactory or Moderate/Unsatisfactory. Robust risk screening and monitoring arrangements will continue under AFCIA II.

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	3	3
Outcomes	# of countries requesting micro-grants to support innovation in adaptation	0	87	20
Outcomes	# micro-grants invested in technology acceleration	0	25	20
Outcomes	Scaled up funding secured for technology acceleration investment	0	10	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	0	10	10

	environment for technology innovation			
Outputs	Number of project stories	0	27	5
Outputs	Operational project dashboard	0	1	1
Outputs	Number of guidance documents	0	1	1
Outputs	Number of communication products	0	16	5
Outputs	Number of business/funding proposals	0	2	2
Outputs	Project concept notes	0	30	30

Comments

Please note that the data provided under results is cumulative over the 5 years during which the programme was implemented. Extent of innovative practices and investments taking place to address climate change adaptation challenges. DEFINITION OF THE INDICATOR: The indicator measures the extent to which innovative adaptation practices and investments are taking place, using a scale from 0 to 4: 0 = low/no investment; 1 = enabling environment improvements designed; 2 = public investment made; 3 = private investment leveraged by public investments; 4 = adaptation technologies and practices secure markets. The AFCIA programme contributed to reaching Level 3 across its portfolio COUNTING METHODOLOGY : Scale rating (0–4) assigned to the overall programme based on evidence from grant closure reports. A rating of 3 is justified by 10 projects having secured additional private or public co-financing RESULTS ACHIEVED: This indicator has been amended to fully match the definition. The quantitative data has been amended from 25 (number of projects) to 3. AFCIA has successfully leveraged additional financing for 10 projects (40%) within its portfolio. Of these, 7 projects mobilized private investment, while 3 secured additional public funding. Given that AFCIA constitutes a public investment, and that it has catalyzed both private and public co-financing—with a majority involving private sector engagement—this corresponds to a ranking of 3 as per the indicator definition (i.e. private investment leveraged by public investments). # of countries requesting micro-grants to support innovation in adaptation DEFINITION OF THE INDICATOR: Developing countries that submitted at least one formal request to access UNEP CTCN AFCIA funding through one of the three Calls for Proposals. COUNTING METHODOLOGY : Number of developing countries from which at least one request was received via the AFCIA Call for Proposals process. Countries submitting multiple requests across different calls are counted once RESULTS ACHIEVED: No changes during this reporting period as the sourcing component (component 1) was closed during previous reporting period. The target has been significantly exceeded due to the high level of interest generated during the three AFCIA calls for proposals, driven by extensive dissemination of the programme across a wide range of partners and stakeholders, resulting in more than 400 requests from 87 countries. # micro-grants invested in technology acceleration DEFINITION OF THE INDICATOR: Technical assistances (TAs) funded under AFCIA 1 that included a direct technology acceleration component, corresponding to Output 2.1 of the approved results framework. COUNTING METHODOLOGY : Nº of TAs funded under AFCIA 1 that included a technology component (Output 2.1). Each TA is counted once, regardless of the number of technologies piloted. RESULTS ACHIEVED: 25 projects were implemented during AFCIA I Scaled up funding secured for technology acceleration investment DEFINITION OF THE INDICATOR: TAs funded under AFCIA 1 for which additional funding was secured from a distinct, named external institution or investor, beyond the AFCIA grant itself, in support of technology acceleration COUNTING METHODOLOGY : Number of TAs funded under AFCIA 1 that secured additional funding from a clearly identified, named external source (public or private). Projects that only identified a funding opportunity without confirmed commitment are not counted. RESULTS ACHIEVED: The target has been exceeded reflecting effective outreach and support provided by UNEP and CTCN, as well as strong interest from implementing partners and project proponents to advance pilot initiatives and maximize their impact. A total of 10 projects have secured funding, out of which 6 managed to do so during the reportig period: The 6 countries that managed to secure funding during this reporting period are Maldives (a CN is under review by UNEP before submission to the AF), Georgia for which the national Agency of Protected Areas has co-funded part of the equipment to cover approximately 12,000 hectares of land with the early warning system equipment including cameras, towers of control, connectivity with the digital early warning system board, Malawi for which the the implementing partner, a private company Water in Sight, allocated its own funds to procure and install additional gauge readers, expanding the pilot area beyond the UNEP CTCN-AFCIA project scope and thereby doubling the number of direct beneficiaries, Pakistan where the government funded the piloting of two technologies identified through the blueprint roadmap generated under AFCIA providing clean water access to 50 families, Sudan EWS that managed to secured $50,000 in additional funding from a private company to upgrade its current EWS platform, improving transfer of information between regional entities and reducing cloud maintenance costs, Zambia where the Ministry of Mines has committed to support a groundwater mapping activity at national scale. In previous reporting period 4 other pronects had managed to secure funding including Burundi with the approval of a CN with the AF and the formulation of a Full Proposal under clearance by UNEP, Mongolia that managed to leverage $7.5 million from the Government of Canada and an additional $100,000 in corporate contributions, enabling a scale up that could benefit more than 3.4 million herders, 30% of the Mongolian population, Saint Kitts and Nevis for which the initiative attracted $100,000 from the Caribbean Public Health Agency (CARPHA) to develop a Water Information System that will have an impact on the entire population of 46,922 inhabitants across both islands, Ghana for which the government has requested access to the second AFCIA funding window to pilot the business model for the value chain across the country´s northern and coastal savannah zones. Outreach plan developed DEFINITION OF THE INDICATOR: An outreach plan report is formulated. COUNTING METHODOLOGY : Nº of outreach plan formulated. RESULTS ACHIEVED: No changes during this reporting period Number of project concept notes: DEFINITION OF THE INDICATOR: CTCN Response Plans developed under AFCIA 1, including those that were fully elaborated but ultimately not implemented due to political, institutional or procedural constraints beyond CTCN's control COUNTING METHODOLOGY : Number of Response Plans (concept notes) developed under AFCIA 1, including those fully elaborated but subsequently abandoned for reasons external to CTCN. Each Response Plan is counted once. RESULTS ACHIEVED: 30 concept notes had been selected and further developed while 25 technical assistances have reached final approval. The 5 following concept notes have been fully developed before being abandoned (Chad, Niger, Tunisia, Philippines and Paraguay): - Chad, Tunisia and Philippines: project proponent, an NGO would not accept the procedures of the CTCN (and wanted to receive the assets and implement the project by themselves). These project ideas were shared with UNDP for consideration under their AFCIA programme. - Niger: the project was selected, the RP was signed and the bidding process launched when the political situation in the country deteriorated and UNEP requested its respective agencies to put on hold any activities in the country. - Paraguay: the project was selected but elections were planned in April 2023 which was a couple of months before the Response Plan could be signed. There were risks that the NDE as well as other governmental officers would change which will add risks to the technical assistance. Number of adaptation technology innovations supported DEFINITION OF THE INDICATOR: TAs funded by AFCIA 1 that piloted, adapted or accelerated a climate adaptation technology innovation in a specific country context. COUNTING METHODOLOGY : Number of TAs funded by AFCIA 1 under the acceleration component. RESULTS ACHIEVED:A total of 15 adaptation technical assistances were supported and closed under AFCIA I : 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 in Saint Kitts and Nevis), water data management in Malawi, aquifer mapping (Zambia), water harvesting technologies (Pakistan), agrometeorological platform (x2 Nepal and Nigeria), Multi hazard platform (Vietnam), drainage system (Maldives), drones for soil mapping (Sudan). 7 were closed during this reporting period (Mali, Malawi and Nigeria, Georgia, Zambia, Nepal, Vietnam). Number of technical analyses to support the enabling environment for technology innovation DEFINITION OF THE INDICATOR: TAs funded by AFCIA 1 that strengthened the policy, regulatory, institutional or financial enabling environment for a specific adaptation technology innovation. COUNTING METHODOLOGY : Number of TAs funded by AFCIA 1 under the enabling environment component.

RESULTS ACHIEVED:10 enabling environments supported: Enabling environment and NSI for drought forecasting in Ecuador, SPIS (x2 Ghana and Guatemala) , smart farming techniques in Mozambique and Honduras, blockchain for insurance crop in Thailand, street market in Bahamas, livestock management in Mongolia, resilient agriculture in Honduras, water management platform in Suriname. 6 were closed during this reporting period (Malaysia, Thailand, Suriname, Mozambique WEF, Guatemala, Bahamas). Number of project stories DEFINITION OF THE INDICATOR: A project story is any content piece — blog post, video, or snapshot — that narrates the experience or results of an AFCIA-funded TA and has been publicly disseminated through CTCN or UNEP channels. COUNTING METHODOLOGY : Number of individual content pieces (blogs, videos, or snapshots) published or disseminated through CTCN or UNEP channels. Each distinct piece is counted once. RESULTS ACHIEVED: During this reporting period, 3 success stories videos have been created (Malawi, Georgia and Nepal) and 19 success stories snaphots have been developed (16 will be published as part of the impact report, the 3 others will be shared via social media). this adds up to the 5 success stories already reported in the last PPR totalling to 27 success stories developed and shared on the AFCIA technical assistances. The target has been significantly exceeded due to the high number of success stories emerging from the AFCIA I portfolio, combined with additional efforts by CTCN and UNEP to document and widely disseminate these results to a broad audience. Operational project dashboard DEFINITION OF THE INDICATOR: An interactive, publicly accessible platform that presents AFCIA programme data and results in a visual format. COUNTING METHODOLOGY : Binary: 1 if an operational dashboard has been deployed and is publicly accessible; 0 otherwise. RESULTS ACHIEVED: An interactive dashboard is operational and was created in 2024 during previous reporting period, here: https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoiMjgxNWZkNjEtN2MwZS00YzgzLTg0YTMtMTNjZWJjNmQzN2JlIiwid
Number of guidance documents DEFINITION OF THE INDICATOR: A guidance document is defined as a report in which lessons learnt, good practices, success stories can be shared publicly. Number; of guidance document published. COUNTING METHODOLOGY : RESULTS ACHIEVED:A joint Impact Report has been developed in coordination with UNDP AFCIA during this reporting period and is available by following this link: https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/default/files/resources/UNEP%20CTCN%20AFCIA%20Report_Final%204_low%20res.pdf Number of communication products DEFINITION OF THE INDICATOR: A communication product is any distinct material produced by or on behalf of the AFCIA programme to disseminate information about programme activities, results or impact. This includes factsheets, videos, reports, social media posts, posters, newsletters, and similar outputs. COUNTING METHODOLOGY : Number of distinct types of communication products produced over the programme lifetime. Each format type (e.g., factsheet, video, blog) is counted once regardless of the number of individual pieces produced within that type. Where individual pieces within a type are tracked separately (e.g., social media posts), these are reported as sub-items for transparency. RESULTS ACHIEVED: 16 communication types of products have been designed throughout the project implementation (in red are the ones implemented during this reporting period). 1. Factsheets (25 produced, one by project) 2. A podcast 3. 3 Stories published under UNEP webpage 4. 2 Success Stories published on CTCN webpage 5. 3 Videos : Malawi, Nepal (not yet published), Georgia (not yet published) 6. A joint Impact Report (not published online yet) developed with UNDP. 7. A MediaValet platform 8. 5 Posters of AFCIA projects that were used for the Adaptatin Futures conference 9. A joint video featuring project photos and projected on a wall at the Adaptation Futures Conference and COP 30 (not published online). 10. Social posts (38 during this reporting period- 19 in LinkedIn and 19 in Facebook). 11. A blog 12. An interactive dashboard 13. CTCN Newsletters 14. 1 Resource Mobilization briefing 15. PowerPoints presentations and recordings used for events 16. 2 Videos created by the Implementing Partners The target has been significantly exceeded due to the importance placed on ensuring strong visibility of the programme and effectively communicating its results and impacts. Additional communication products were developed to respond to opportunities that arose during the five years of implementation, including participation in UNEP podcasts, international conferences such as Adaptation Futures, and other outreach events, enabling broader dissemination to diverse audiences Number of business/funding proposals: DEFINITION OF THE INDICATOR: A funding proposal is defined as a formal Concept Note drafted for submission to the Adaptation Fund Innovation Window or equivalent funding mechanism. COUNTING METHODOLOGY : Number of formal Concept Notes drafted under AFCIA 1 for submission to the Adaptation Fund or equivalent external funding mechanism. Each CN is counted once, whether or not it has been approved. RESULTS ACHIEVED: 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 under clearance by UNEP.

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	No changes on the ground were requested during this reporting period. Overall, a key challenge for adaptation and resilience in LDCs is the lack of quality and quantity of climate data. Without robust climate data, it is impossible to understand the baseline, prepare effectively for future climate events and build resilience, or even to monitor efficienty the impact on an initiative. To address this issue, two approaches are recommended, depending on the availability of climate data in a given country: ● Lack of quality and quantity of climate data: Identify the gaps and invest in equipment and/or communities to generate and capture the necessary climate data. ● Strong but dispersed climate data across ministries: Collate existing data and establish a central repository that can be easily accessed by all relevant stakeholders. Whilst the above is extremely difficult to implement, and a significant undertaking, it is still acknowledged as the direction for best practice.
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts?	Opportunities	The AFCIA projects were all identified as low risk projects when it comes to safeguards. Nonetheless, a SRIF was developed and approved by UNEP safeguards team before the start of the implementation. The dissemination and communication of the grievance mechanism to the main stakeholders has been challenging at time. Key lessons from implementing environmental and social safeguard measures are that

		they should be integrated early in the project lifecycle, being defined in consultation with the direct beneficiaries; and monitored to ensure the potential risks are truly mitigated. UNEP CTCN will work on improving the Monitoring system of AFCIA II with the recruitment of a senior expert in Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning.
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	Lessons learnt: Adaptation takes time as it needs behavior change. Engage with youth, women, indigenous people as they must be part of the change. Specific webinars organized, and comms materials targeting women could support the change. UNEP CTN has intended to advance gender integration across all stages of AFCIA interventions by promoting inclusive decision making, and providing targeted training to strengthen women's capacity in the governance of the innovation and related livelihoods. Gender mainstreaming activities were actively strenghtened since the MTR through the introduction of: - A mandatory gender assessment will be included as a mandatory activity in each Technical Assistance - At least 5% of the full technical assistance budget allocated to gender mainstreaming activities. - Gender has been added, during the last CTCN AB meeting, as both a balancing and prioritization criteria of the technical assistance's selection process. - Gender related indicators of closure report have been amended to ensure strong M&E on gender mainstreaming in the technical assistances following last CTCN AB meeting in September. Those efforts will be pursued under AFCIA II. AFCIA coordination services

		will ensure coordination between the Adaptation Fund Secretariat, UNEP, CTCN, and AFCIA windows managed by other Implementing Entities (IEs) AFCIA Coordination Services shall reflect the need to streamline national coordination structures with the GCF, promote awareness and engagement between the NDA and NDE on similar initiatives supporting innovation
Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays?	Challenges	Overall the AFCIA I programme has been implemented within the initially set 5 years period. The cause of the delays observed have been classified as follows : 1. Delays in the implementation due to a late start: The use of UNON's two-stage bidding process corresponds to the modalities of the CTCN to recruit the Implementing Partners (CTCN Network Members) of UNEP CTCN AFCIA programme but can face unpredictable delays. The CTCN and UNON have established focal points to ease the coordination, be proactive in identifying continuous improvements and support a positive change. 2. Lack of ownership at country level. Government ownership is critical for the success of innovation under the CTCN delivery model. Once a technology is proven to deliver results, its roll-out and scale-up require coordination across different entities and localities. Therefore, it is essential for government entities to have a strong role in deciding, setting up, and piloting a technology. Under AFCIA II a close cooperation between at least CTCN NDE and AF DA has become mandatory from the design stage which will strengthen country ownership and support a country-led, smooth implementation. 3.

		Political instability: The CTCN will also postpone any selection of projects in developing countries in which presidential elections are planned within the same year as the signed request to avoid risks in loosing country ownership. With regards to delays related with the modalities of contracting, continuous improvement are being implemented on the bidding process. A focal point has been created both at CTCN and UNON side to identify inefficiencies and propose mitigation measures
What implementation issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected progress?	Challenges & Opportunities	1. Challenge: Pilots are often developed in silos hence it is hard to make systemic change. Lesson Learnt: Technology must be embed into a NSI (frameworks, policies, budgets) which is one of the main objective of AFCIA II programme. 2. Challenge: Behavior change takes time so is adaptation. Lesson Learnt. In order to create a systemic impact on community and increase sustainable resilience, it is recommended to: • Engage continuously with communities from the start of the initiative • Ensure women, youth, indigenous peoples, and vulnerable groups are part of design and scaling efforts, not only beneficiaries • Maximize engagement and end-user feedback by requiring that at least one team member is locally based and able to communicate in the local language. • Ensure that a representative from the community is included in the steering committee throughout the initiative. 3. Challenge: Limited success in attracting (private) finance. Lessons learnt : • Multi scale funding is essential for scaling up innovation and fostering long term impact • Blended finance

		and diverse revenues streams are vital • Potential donors and the private sectors need to be included very early in the process (from design).

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

Yes

Climate Resilience Measures	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing climate adaptation measures that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	Lessons on Innovation A strong enabling environment is essential to bringing new technologies to market, and create a national innovation ecosystem. To stimulate innovation, it is recommended to: • Integrate individual, pilot technologies into broader systems • Prioritize approaches that promote collaboration and co-design (Locally, nationally, and internationally) from the early stage. • Ensure technology adoption readiness, by equipping end users with the skills necessary to use and maintain the technology.
What is the potential for the climate resilience measures undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	
Readiness Interventions (Applicable only to NIEs that received one or more readiness grants)	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in accessing and implementing climate finance readiness support that would be relevant to the preparation, design and implementation of future concrete adaptation projects/programmes?	na
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	na

enhanced resilience to climate change?	
Concrete Adaptation Interventions	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing concrete adaptation interventions that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes implementing concrete adaptation interventions?	Lessons on Readiness A strong enabling environment is essential to bringing new technologies to market. Innovation thrives when there is a complete value chain, with demand driven by local communities. In some cases, sensitive political situations can cause delays and hinder progress. As a result, markets for climate adaptation technologies in LDCs are still emerging. To further stimulate innovation, it is recommended to: ● Encourage the mapping and engagement of the national innovation ecosystem as a part of the formal design requirements at the start of each initiative. o Integrate individual, pilot technologies into broader systems. For example, a water technology may require the long-term development of water management systems, irrigation markets, a policy framework, and government incentives (e.g., customs exemptions). o Prioritize approaches that promote collaboration and co-design, involving the project team, in-country stakeholders, and end users in the development process. Continuous engagement with and inclusion of end-users ensures that systems are tailored to meet local needs and enhances the long-term sustainability of the technology. ● Maintain a programmatic approach towards how the programme will affect change and promote innovation. o When piloting a technology, encourage early site visits by experts to identify the most appropriate locations for the pilot and subsequent roll-out. These visits should also assess existing knowledge and local capacity to support the technology, helping to prepare a capacity building plan. o Ensure technology adoption readiness, by equipping end users with the skills necessary to use and maintain the technology. Adequate training and preparation are critical for successful adoption. ● Promote awareness and engagement between international, national, and local actors on similar initiatives driving innovation. Lesson learned on enabling environment: ● Increase accountability of implementing partners toward the government and government engagement in governance structures, notably during implementation. o Maximize engagement and end-user feedback by requiring that at least one team member is locally based and able to communicate in the local language. This person should also have the capacity to translate into one of the UN languages to ensure effective communication with all stakeholders. o Ensure that a representative from the community is included in the steering committee throughout the initiative. This ensures continuous engagement, strengthens local ownership, and increases the likelihood of successful uptake if the pilot is successful Lesson learnt on monitoring: Post implementation monitoring is fundamental: Monitoring the impact of the projects post implementation is understand the sustainability of the action. The management cycle is not always adapted to it. The info gap slows our ability to identify which approaches work and which do not. Data and metrics thneeds to continue to be monitored
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?	Lesson learn on upscaling: Private Sector Engagement Replication and scaling require new and additional funding streams, particularly from the private sector. AFCIA initiatives must include a strategy to actively include the private sector, and not limit that involvement to financial institutions and related financing . The following are recommendations to incorporate private sector into implementation activities which must start at the project idea stage, with active engagement of individual players: - Identify the private sector across the value chain, for the climate solution: role, business interest and entry points. - Identify linkages between sectors and private sector players: climate change risks for private sector businesses, aggregation for business opportunities, identification of business models to attract financing. - Assessment of risk mitigation instruments for the private sector investors, and gaps in the same. - Establish how and whether

	existing policies (across relevant ministries e.g. including fiscal instruments, standards for adaptation technologies etc.), are set up to attract private sector involvement and investments. - Consider how SMEs and MSMEs can be included in potential solutions – particularly for adaptation programmed. - Define precise exit strategies upon project completion that anchors the next steps with private sector players that have already been engaged in the design and/or implementation. ● Apply systems thinking to the challenge of attracting private finance to adaptation innovation, encouraging the development of accessible and affordable business models. o Private sector involvement must be brought into networks early in the initiative. They play a critical role in protecting communities and end users, enhancing both impact and sustainability. o The private sector is noted to take a keen interest when their technology is used, to ensure it performs optimally. Encourage initiatives to design and pursue exit strategies, including the identification of additional financing options Demonstrating the impact of a specific technology is not limited to the piloting of the technology at community level. To properly scale up and reach the market stage at the national level, the technology must be anchored within a National System of Innovation (NSI).
Knowledge Management	
How has existing information/data/knowledge been used to inform project development and implementation? What kinds of information/data/knowledge were used?	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´s available ground and meteorological data. - 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).
Has the existing information/data/knowledge been made available to relevant stakeholder? If so, what chanels of dissemination have been used?	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.
Please list any knowledge products generated and include hyperlinks whenever posssible (e.g. project videos, project stories, studies and technical reports, case studies, tranining manuals, handbooks, strategies and plans developed, etc.)	16 communication types of products have been designed throughout the project implementation (in red are the ones implemented during this reporting period). 1. Factsheets (25 produced, one by project) https://www.ctc-n.org/resources/publications 2. A podcast: https://youtu.be/7rBQFBiJvdY & https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/audio/resilience-global-adaptation-podcast. 3. Stories published under UNEP webpage: oBurundi: https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/can-portable-dam-help-africa-counter-rising-waters oSaint Kitts and Nevis: https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/drought-sets-farmers-saint-kitts-and-nevis-turn-technol… 4. Success Stories published on CTCN webpage: https://www.ctc-n.org/news/solar-farm-table-liberia-improved-solar-powered-irrigation-practices-are… 5. Videos : Malawi, Nepal (not yet published), Georgia (not yet published) 6. A joint Impact Report (not published online yet) developed with UNDP. 7. A MediaValet platform: https://unep.mediavalet.com/v5/browse/categories/90a11e5f-3d5c-4acd-9831-a2a92dce39a5 8. Posters of AFCIA projects that were used for the Adaptatin Futures conference 9. A joint video featuring project photos and projected on a wall at the Adaptation Futures Conference and COP 30 (not published online). 10.

	Social posts (38 during this reporting period- 19 in LinkedIn and 19 in Facebook). 11. A blog: https://www.ctc-n.org/news/Sudan-juggling-priorities-during-difficult-time 12. An interactive dashboard: https://www.ctc-n.org/technical-assistance/adaptation-fund-climate-innovation-accelerator-afcia-I 13. Newsletters: The project in Liberia was promoted in CTCN newsletter +subscribers. https://track.mdirector.com/files/campanias/105516/4/4/CAM/message_email.html 14. Resource Mobilization briefings https://trello.com/c/msNNPFBx 15. PowerPoints presentations and recordings used for events 16. Videos created by the Implementing Partners https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AVVPYDxUjOA 17. Some of the stories were also picked up by external platforms and media example https://twitter.com/smartwatermag/status/1698967116903244285
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	Yes, the learning objectives have been met and, in several areas, exceeded. The programme established Knowledge Management and Sharing (KMS) targets, including the development of five success stories and communication products, one dashboard and one guidance document. These targets were overachieved with 27 stories and 16 types of communication products, reflecting the strong relevance of learning and visibility for the programme. Close collaboration with UNDP supported effective dissemination of results, notably through joint dashboards and impact reports that strengthened evidence-based learning. Beyond reporting, KMS products have served as a valuable tool to extract good practices and lessons learned. Communication products, including videos, have amplified voices from the ground, generating a strong emotional and practical understanding of why AFCIA is a key mechanism and how small-scale initiatives can deliver meaningful adaptation impact.
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.	Learning objectives contributed to project outcomes by providing a clear focus for all stakeholders, aligning all project activities and assessments with desired goals, and enabling measurable progress tracking. They served as a blueprint for the project, ensuring that content, activities, and evaluations were purposeful and directly supported the final results, ultimately leading to a more effective and successful outcome. In the vase of AFCIA, it became clear during the design of the impact report that monitoring and evaluation of the impact could have been stronger. Under AFCIA II a MEL expert will be hired to define core criteria that could use to ensure a more quantifiable summary of the impact. These core criteria will need to be adapted to the AFCIA window so that they can easily be used by all AFCIA IEs. During AFCIA I, it was also identified that although post implementation of TA is critical to monitor the sustainability of an action, it is difficult to implement on the ground. The CTCN has launched an initiative in 2025 to support countries in monitoring the impact of CTCN TA post implementation. But so far no requests have been received. Difficulty of getting consistent M&E information across the portfolio has also been a challenge both for UNDP and UNEP during this 1st phase of AFCIA. Even though both programmes followed the Adaptation Fund Results Tracker, it was hard to compare and measure relevant progress consistently across the programme. Building a strong evidence-based system for replication and scaling up will be one of the most important challenges under the coordination services proposal. Under AFCIA 1, a joint dashboard was developed with UNDP (but the indicators had to be customized to each programme). A joint impact report has also been developed which follows the same structure (but again when it comes to the impact the sessions had to be customized). A M&E expert will be hired under AFCIA II and will also support the effort at multi sub-programme level to identify a limited number of core indicators' that will be relevant to all IEs and that will monitor the impact of innovation and adaptation.
Has the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes	Learning objectives contributed to project outcomes by providing a clear focus for all stakeholders, aligning all project activities and assessments with desired goals, and enabling measurable progress tracking. They served as a blueprint for the

of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	project, ensuring that content, activities, and evaluations were purposeful and directly supported the final results, ultimately leading to a more effective and successful outcome. In the vase of AFCIA, it became clear during the design of the impact report that monitoring and evaluation of the impact could have been stronger. Under AFCIA II a MEL expert will be hired to define core criteria that could use to ensure a more quantifiable summary of the impact. These core criteria will need to be adapted to the AFCIA window so that they can easily be used by all AFCIA IEs. During AFCIA I, it was also identified that although post implementation of TA is critical to monitor the sustainability of an action, it is difficult to implement on the ground. The CTCN has launched an initiative in 2025 to support countries in monitoring the impact of CTCN TA post implementation. But so far no requests have been received.
Innovation	
Describe any innovative practices or technologies that figured prominently in this project.	Of the 25 initiatives supported by UNEP CTCN-AFCIA, 15 (60%) focus on accelerating the deployment of new or existing technologies, while 10 (40%) emphasize capacity building to create enabling environments necessary for innovations to thrive. While many of the initiatives identified water management as a pressing issue (either too much or too little), others targeted challenges including soil degradation, forest fires, and limited climate data for adaptation planning. To tackle these issues, the initiatives piloted a diverse range of innovative adaptation technologies including early warning systems (EWS), solar-powered irrigation systems, drone-based soil mapping, and rainwater harvesting. These solutions help communities anticipate and manage climate risks more effectively. Complementary technologies such as forecasting tools and climate insurance mechanisms allow communities to take informed risks, manage responses and recover faster when disasters strike. Through partnerships with local innovators, UNEP CTCN-AFCIA ensures that these initiatives not only deliver tangible short term results but also build long-term resilience, empowering people to adapt, recover and prosper in the face of climate change. 1.Interventions by sector of the 25 initiatives Early Warning Systems = 9 Water management = 6 Food security = 10 More speficially, AFCIA has supported 15 adaptation technology innovations including: ● EWS for flood (x2 in Mali and Sudan) ● EWS for forest fire (Georgia) ● SPIS (x2 in Liberia and Mozambique) ● SLAMDAM (Burundi) ● Drought modelling and forecasting systems (x2 in Saint Kitts and Nevis, Ecuador) ● Aquifer mapping (Zambia) ● Water harvesting technologies (Pakistan) ● Agrometeorological platform (x2 in Nepal and Nigeria) ● Multi-Hazard Platform (Malaysia) ● Drainage system (Maldives) ● Drones for soil mapping (Sudan) AFCIA has contribute to 10 technical analyses to support the enabling environment for technology innovation including: ● Enabling environment and SPIS (Ghana and Guatemala) ● Improving existing drought system by incorporating drought modelling and forecasting (Ecuador) ● Climate-smart farming (Mozambique) ● Blockchain for crop insurance (Thailand) ● Roadmap for aquifer recharge (Suriname) ● Coastal region climate forecasting (Malaysia) ● Climate-smart free trade zones (Bahamas) ● Pastureland management (Mongolia) ● Biodiversity hot spots (Honduras)
Complementarity/ Coherence with other climate finance sources	
Has the project been scaled-up from any other climate finance? Or has the project build upon any other climate finance initiative?	Yes
If you answered yes, kindly	To date, ten of the 25 initiatives (40%) have already secured additional support

specify the name of the Fund/Organization.	and finance for scale up : Burundi, Georgia, Malawi, Ghana, Pakistan, Sudan EWS, Zambia, Maldives, Mongolia, Saint Kitts and Nevis either from governments, private sectors or through new grants. UNEP CTCN-AFCIA provides continued assistance including follow-up and matchmaking to ensure all initiatives are positioned for their next phase of development. It helps partners identify pathways to take forward successful technologies and practices. The following examples illustrate how AFCIA-supported pilots have successfully managed to enhance their scalability and investability: ● Burundi and the Maldives: Both countries are developing full proposals for the Adaptation Fund, worth up to $5 million each. In Burundi, if approved, the project is expected to benefit over 48,000 households (approximately 255,000 people 60% women) across 14 provinces. In Maldives, the project aims to provide access to safe drinking water for over 5 million people. ● Georgia - Early warning system for forest fires: The Agency of Protected Areas has co-funded part of the equipment to cover approximately 12,000 hectares of land with the early warning system equipment including cameras, towers of control, connectivity with the digital early warning system board. in the EWS has been tested in a national park, to protect the biodiversity as well as the communities living in the area. ● Pakistan - Indigenous water management: The government of Pakistan has funded the piloting of two technologies identified through the blueprint roadmap generated under AFCIA providing clean water access to 50 families. ● Mongolia - Sustainable livestock farming: The initiative leveraged $7.5 million from the government of Canada and an additional $100,000 in corporate contributions, enabling a scale up that could benefit more than 3.4 million herders, 30% of the Mongolian population ● Saint Kitts and Nevis - Water management: The initiative attracted $100,000 from the Caribbean Public Health Agency (CARPHA) to develop a Water Information System that will have an impact on the entire population of 46,922 inhabitants across both islands ● Malawi - the Implementing Partner, Water in Sight allocated its own funds to procure and install of additional gauge readers, expanding the pilot area beyond the AFCIA project scope and thereby doubling the number of direct beneficiaries. ● Ghana - The government has requested access to the second AFCIA funding window to pilot the business model for the tomato value chain across the country´s northern and coastal savannah zones. ● Sudan – the EWS for Flood project has secured 50,000 USD in additional funding to upgrade its current EWS platform improving transfer of information between regional entities and reducing cloud maintenance costs ● Zambia – The Ministry of Mines has committed to support a groundwater mapping activity at national scale. The ten AFCIA I initiatives that secured additional financing demonstrate a diverse range of scale-up pathways, from government co-investment and implementing partner (IP) pro-bono contributions, to private-sector matchmaking and regional institutional collaboration. The cases can be grouped into three broad categories, followed by a set of cross-cutting success factors. Case 1 : Investment was provided directly by the implementing partner (IP), beyond the scope and budget of the original technical assistance, to strengthen the quality or sustainability of the pilot. Malawi: The IP, a private Swedish company Water in Sight, recognized that a modest additional investment in technology would substantially increase the reach and impact of the mobile climate data collection system. It therefore co-funded the procurement of additional equipment (weather and river observation equipment and online sotware functionalities called Blue IQ), enabling the Blue IQ platform to serve a larger number of communities and gauge readers. Zambia: During implementation, the IP , a South African company called OneWorld, identified that the government-supplied groundwater data was insufficiently granular to produce a reliable aquifer

	model. The IP invested its own resources to deploy the Danish-developed sTEM 5 Amp system, collecting data from 180 points across two sites in the Nyimba District. This decision ultimately produced a tool accurate enough to guide a future national-scale geological survey by the Ministry of Mines (which would represent a second phase of leveraging). Sudan: With the country entering a period of conflict, the government raised concerns during a Steering Committee meeting about its ability to sustain the digital early warning platform over time. A solution was collectively agreed: the system would be transferred to ENTRO, the Nile Basin regional agency, to ensure institutional continuity. The IP. DHI, a research institution based in Denmark agreed to co-fund 50% of the additional equipment and hardware required for this transfer, with CTCN committing the remaining 50% through AFCIA II to finance associated capacity building and training Case 2 : Governmental or quasi-governmental institutions that were proponents or active participants in the project committed additional funding to extend the reach of the pilot. Georgia: The Agency of Protected Areas, which served as both project proponent and active Steering Committee member, decided to co-fund the early warning system for forest fires in order to expand coverage beyond the original pilot area of the Borjomi-Kharagauli National Park. This co-investment enabled approximately 12,000 additional hectares to be covered with fire detection equipment, protecting biodiversity, communities, and a critical carbon sink. Pakistan: The Ministry of Water Resources, also serving as project proponent, chose to pilot two of the technologies identified in the blueprint roadmap produced under AFCIA I at a small scale using its own budget. This represents a direct translation of an AFCIA-generated knowledge product into government-funded action, providing clean water access to 50 additional families. Saint Kitts and Nevis: The Department of Environment coordinated with other governmental institutions on the islands to raise an additional USD 100,000, channelled through the Caribbean Public Health Agency (CARPHA), to install monitoring equipment that improved data collection and enabled more precise modelling of groundwater levels and drought risk across both islands. This collaboration also produced a Water Information System benefitting the entire population of 46,922 inhabitants. Ghana: The scale-up originated from a very close collaboration between the Adaptation Fund Designated Authority (DA) office and the National Designated Entity (NDE), both of which had been actively involved in co-designing the business model to enable smallholder farmers to access solar irrigation pumping systems. Becoming aware of the AFCIA II funding window, they submitted a follow-on request, adding a financial partner to the consortium, with discussions around co-funding ongoing. Case 3: External financing was attracted from the private sector or international donors, based on concrete evidence of impact and a compelling business or investment case. Mongolia: The scale-up pathway was catalysed by a combination of CTCN’s institutional network, the IP’s entrepreneurial leadership, and a strong alignment with the Government of Canada’s development priorities. The IP, a Canadian company named Altea, recognized early that the project, combining climate-resilient livestock farming, digital crop insurance, and a strong focus on women’s economic empowerment in nomadic herding communities, had strategic relevance for Canadian development cooperation. CTCN facilitated matchmaking with its Advisory Board member representing Canada, leveraging an existing relationship of trust. This combination of private sector initiative, diplomatic familiarity, and government interest resulted in USD 7.5 million from the Government of Canada to scale up the digital insurance model nationally, with the potential to benefit more than 3.4 million herders, 30% of Mongolia’s population. Private actors were engaged from the earliest stages of the pilot, with 16 private sector actors and 16 governmental institutions participating throughout implementation. The case of Burundi and Maldives enters into this category as they will request funding form the AF

	Innovation Window using the AFCIA pilot as a demonstration of the paradigm change they could lead to. Cross cutting success factors Across all ten cases, the following factors were consistently associated with the ability to leverage additional financing or government uptake: • Strong country ownership: Project proponents and government counterparts maintained a detailed, operational understanding of the project, its technical achievements, remaining challenges, and the vision of what could be achieved with additional investment. This ownership was a prerequisite for convincing funders and unlocking co-financing. • Dedicated implementing partners with a horizon beyond the technical assistance: IPs that saw the AFCIA grant as a foundation rather than an end point were more likely to invest additional resources, facilitate connections, and help position the project for the next stage. • Active Steering Committee engagement: In almost all cases, the actors who provided additional funding were those most closely involved in project governance. Steering Committees served not only as oversight mechanisms but as spaces where trust was built, evidence was shared in real time, and co-investment decisions were made collectively. • Evidence of results and a clear investment case: Projects that generated robust, well-documented evidence of on-the-ground impact, including data on beneficiaries, income increases, and technology performance, were better positioned to attract follow-on funding. In several cases, pilot data directly fed into funding proposals. • Viable business models and risk mitigation strategies: Particularly for private sector engagement (as in Ghana and Mongolia), the development of financially sustainable business models, including insurance products, rental schemes, and blended finance arrangements, was essential to de-risking investment and attracting partners. • Strategic use of CTCN's network and convening role: CTCN's Advisory Board, NDE network, and global partnerships (including with GIZ, CARPHA, and international donors) were leveraged to facilitate matchmaking and connect promising pilots with relevant funders and technical allies. • Early and iterative engagement with the private sector: Rather than approaching investors after project completion, the most successful cases integrated private sector actors from the design phase onward, building familiarity, interest, and co-ownership well before formal scale-up discussions began.

Results Tracker

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

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

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

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

Core Indicator: No. of beneficiaries

		Total	**% of female beneficiaries**	**% of Youth beneficiaries**
Baseline information	Direct beneficiaries supported by the	0	0	0

	project			
Baseline information	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	0	0	0
Baseline information	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0	0
Target performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	5000	30	10
Target performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	20000	35	20
Target performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	25000	32.5	15
Performance at mid-term	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	10000	40	15
Performance at mid-term	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	1000000	40	15
Performance at mid-term	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	1010000	40	15
Performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	212264	41.92	17.32
Performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	2050232	41.64	23.38
Performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	2262496	41.78	20.35

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

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

	Number of targeted stakeholders - Total	**Number of targeted stakeholders - % of female targeted**	**Hazards information generated and disseminated**	**Overall effectiveness**
Baseline information	0	0	Other	1: Ineffective
Target performance at completion	10508	46	Other	5: Very effective
Performance at mid-term	10449	33.9	Other	2: Partially effective
Performance at completion	10758	49.39	Other	5: Very effective

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	0	Multi-sector		1: No plans conducted or updated
Target performance at completion	17	Multi-sector	Sub-National	3: Risk and vulnterability assessments completed or updated
Performance at mid-term	20	Multi-sector	Sub-National	3: Risk and vulnterability assessments completed or updated
Performance at completion	22	Multi-sector	Sub-National	3: Risk and vulnterability assessments completed or updated

Output 1.2 Targeted population groups covered by adequate risk reduction systems

Core Indicator 1.2: No. of Early Warning Systems

	No. of adopted Early Warning Systems	Category targeted	Hazard	Geographical coverage	Number of municipalities
Baseline information	0	2: Monitoring and warning service	Other		0
Target performance at completion	3	2: Monitoring and warning service	Other	National	3
Performance at mid-term	3	2: Monitoring and warning service	Other	National	600
Performance at completion	17	2: Monitoring and warning service	Other	National	947

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

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

	Number of staff targeted - Total	Number of staff targeted - % of female targeted	Sector	Capacity level
Baseline information	0	0	Multi-sector	1: No capacity
Target performance at completion	6474	36.68	Multi-sector	4: High capacity
Performance at mid-term	6328	46.35	Multi-sector	3: Medium capacity
Performance at completion	11615	71.92	Multi-sector	4: High capacity

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

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

	Total staff trained	% of female staff trained	Type
Baseline information	0	0	Public
Target performance at completion	1250	40	Public
Performance at mid-term	1057	27.1	Public
Performance at completion	2514	33.16	Public

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

	Type	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information	Public		Multi-sector	1: No capacity
Target performance at completion	Public	National	Multi-sector	4: High capacity
Performance at mid-term	Public	National	Multi-sector	3: Medium capacity
Performance at completion	Public	National	Multi-sector	4: High capacity

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

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

	Number of beneficiaries	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information	0		Multi-sector	1: No capacity
Target performance at completion	2	National	Multi-sector	4: High capacity
Performance at mid-term	100	National	Multi-sector	3: Medium capacity
Performance at completion	143	National	Multi-sector	4: High capacity

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

Indicator 3.1: Increase in application of appropriate adaptation responses

	Percentage of targeted population applying adaptation measures	Sector
Baseline information	0	Multi-sector
Target performance at completion	14.35	Multi-sector
Performance at mid-term	10.67	Multi-sector
Performance at completion	65	Multi-sector

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

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

	No. of targeted beneficiaries	% of female participants targeted	Level of awareness
Baseline information	0	0	2: Partially not aware
Target performance at completion	4495156	50.45	4: Mostly aware
Performance at mid-term	4294966	50.01	3: Partially aware
Performance at completion	4252951	50	4: Mostly aware

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

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

	No. of technical committees/associations	% of women represented in committes/associations	Level of awareness
Baseline information	0	20% to 39%	2: Partially not aware
Target performance at completion	25	40% to 60%	4: Mostly aware
Performance at mid-term	25	40% to 60%	3: Partially aware
Performance at completion	25	40% to 60%	4: Mostly aware

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

	No. of tools and guidelines	Type	Scale
Baseline information	0	Technical guidelines	
Target performance at completion	46	Technical guidelines	National

Performance at mid-term	34	Technical guidelines	National
Performance at completion	56	Technical guidelines	National

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	0		Multi-sector
Target performance at completion	18		Multi-sector
Performance at mid-term	18		Multi-sector
Performance at completion	18		Multi-sector

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	Sector	Type

	improvement level		
Baseline information	1: Ineffective	Multi-sector	Land
Target performance at completion	4: Effective	Multi-sector	Land
Performance at mid-term	2: Partially effective	Multi-sector	Land
Performance at completion	4: Effective	Multi-sector	Land

Output 5: Vulnerable ecosystem services and natural resource assets strengthned 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/rehabilitat	Unit	Effectiveness of protection/rehabilitation
Baseline information	Cultivated land/Agricultural land	0	ha rehabilitated	1: Ineffective
Target performance at completion	Cultivated land/Agricultural land	1118	ha rehabilitated	4: Effective
Performance at mid-term	Cultivated land/Agricultural land	515	ha protected	3: Moderately effective
Performance at completion	Cultivated land/Agricultural land	3000716	ha rehabilitated	4: Effective

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

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

	No. of targeted households	% of female headed households	Improvement level
Baseline information	0	0	1: No improvement
Target performance at completion	2079337	30.67	4: High improvement
Performance at mid-term	2011825	33.5	3: Moderate improvement
Performance at completion	2039357	34	4: High improvement

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	0	0	From 0 to 0.5%	Agricultural-related
Target performance at completion	1076891	40.52	From 5% to 10%	Agricultural-related
Performance at mid-	1009897	30	From 10% to 20%	Agricultural-related

term				
Performance at completion	1036891	40.15	From 10% to 20%	Agricultural-related

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

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

	Number of Assets	Type of Assets	Sector	Adaptation strategy
Baseline information	0	Adaptation strategies	Multi-sector	Supporting livelihoods
Target performance at completion	61	Adaptation strategies	Multi-sector	Supporting livelihoods
Performance at mid-term	57	Adaptation strategies	Multi-sector	Supporting livelihoods
Performance at completion	1559	Adaptation strategies	Multi-sector	Supporting livelihoods

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	0	Agricultural-related	0
Target performance at completion	1057312	Agricultural-related	11323
Performance at mid-term	1013231	Agricultural-related	6863
Performance at completion	1017332	Agricultural-related	8173

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

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

	Integration level
Baseline information	3: Some
Target performance at completion	4: Most
Performance at mid-term	3: Some
Performance at completion	4: Most

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

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

	No. of Policies introduced or adjusted	Sector	Scale	Type
Baseline information	0	Multi-sector	National	Environmental policy

Target performance at completion	20	Multi-sector	National	Environmental policy
Performance at mid-term	20	Multi-sector	National	Environmental policy
Performance at completion	20	Multi-sector	National	Environmental policy

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

	No. of Development strategies	Regulation	Effectiveness
Baseline information	0	2: Partially not enforced (Most elements not implemented)	2: Partially effective
Target performance at completion	4	4: Enforced (Most elements implemented)	4: Effective
Performance at mid-term	4	3: Partially enforced (Some elements implemented)	3: Moderately effective
Performance at completion	4	4: Enforced (Most elements implemented)	4: Effective

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			Innovation rolled out
Performance at mid-term			Innovation rolled out
Performance at completion			Innovation rolled out

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

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

	No. of innovative practices/ tools technologies	Sector	Status	Effectiveness
Baseline information	0	Multi-sector	No innovative practices	1: Ineffective
Target performance at completion	25	Multi-sector	Completed innovation practices	4: Effective
Performance at mid-term	25	Multi-sector	Completed innovation practices	4: Effective
Performance at	25	Multi-sector	Completed	4: Effective

completion			innovation practices	

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	0		1: Ineffective
Target performance at completion	50	Innovation rolled out	4: Effective
Performance at mid-term	20	Innovation rolled out	4: Effective
Performance at completion	57	Innovation rolled out	5: Very effective