

# Project Performance Report

## Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	11/15/2023 - 11/15/2024
Project Title	Use of Nature-based Solutions to Increase Resilience to Extreme Climate Events in the Atlantic Region of Central America
Project Summary	
Database Number	AF00000281
Implementing Entity (IE)	Central American Bank for Economic Integration
Type of IE	Regional Implementing Entity
Country(ies)	Regional (Belize, Guatemala, Honduras)
Relevant Geographic Points (i.e. cities, villages, bodies of water)	Belize: Monkey River Watershed Guatemala: Reserva Natural Protectora de Manantiales Cerro San Gil y Parque Nacional Río Dulce Honduras: Cusuco National Park
Name of Implementing Entity Focal Point	Manfred Kopper / mkopper@bcie.org Ruben Avila / avilar@bcie.org

Project Milestones	
AFB Approval Date	7/28/2022
IE-AFB Agreement Signature Date	5/16/2023
Start of Project/Programme	11/15/2023
Actual Mid-term Review Date (if applicable)	8/15/2026
Original Completion Date	5/15/2029
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 with Annexes, submitted on 13 December 2023

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

<https://www.wri.org/initiatives/nature-based-solutions-adaptation-central-america-atlantic-region> The name REFORES was chosen for the project with a focus on marketing and ease of recall. This short and memorable name encapsulates the essence of the project: "Forest Restoration for Climate Resilience in the Caribbean." REFORES not only highlights the importance of forest restoration but also captures the project's main goal: strengthening climate resilience in the Caribbean region through nature-based solutions.

Project Contacts			
National/Regional Project Manager/Coordinator	Name	Email	Date
Government(s) DA	Belize_Hunter Hales, Ministry of Economic Development	Hunter.Hales@med.gov.bz	10/1/2024
Government(s) DA	Guatemala_Renata Cazali, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN)	rcazali@marn.gob.gt	6/11/2024
Government(s) DA	Honduras_Paulette Genieviev Herrera Lope, Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SERNA)	pgherrera@serna.gob.hn	7/16/2024
Implementing Entity	Ricardo Madrigal	madrigalr@bcie.org	5/13/2024
Executing Agency	CATIE_Diego Delgado	ddelgado@catie.ac.cr	11/15/2023
Executing Agency	WRI_Luciana Gallardo Lomeli	Luciana.Gallardo@wri.org	11/15/2023
Regional Project Manager	Pamela Ramos, Project Coordinator, Central American Bank of Economic Integration	ramosp@bcie.org	5/2/2024
Coordinator	Ruben Avila	avilar@bcie.org	5/2/2024

## Financial Data

Disbursement of AF grant funds	
Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date (\$)	\$1,213,000.00
Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date (\$)	\$1,013,000.00
Project disbursement rate (%)	8.3
Project execution rate (%)	8.30
Add any comments on AF Grant Funds	<p>In accordance with the disbursement schedule outlined in the agreement, CABI has received US\$ 1,213,000 for the implementation of the project in Year 1. From this amount, CABI disbursed the following amounts to the Executing Entities, CATIE and WRI, on July 1, 2024: US\$ 423,900 for Project fund and Execution costs for WRI. US\$ 589,100 for Project fund and Execution costs for CATIE. By November 15, 2024, the disbursed funds have been utilized at 74%: Executing Entity WRI: US\$ 237,214.36 (56% of total) Executing Entity CATIE: US\$ 513,598.25 (87% of total) The challenges encountered during the project's initial phase impacted the achievement of 26% of the activities planned for Year 1. However, despite these initial setbacks, the project has succeeded in strengthening its operations and positively overcoming the learning</p>

	curve. The pending activities are primarily related to external procurement processes which are currently in the bidding process. This delay has been a key lesson learned, as it has allowed for adjustments to administrative procedures and improved internal coordination to streamline the process for future implementation.
Investment Income (\$)	\$0.00
Cumulative Investment Income since inception (\$)	\$0.00

## Expenditure Data

Output	Amount (\$)
1.1: Forest restoration is promoted among local, national, and regional stakeholders to influence national regulatory framework, subnational land use plans and land use strategies in coastal areas	\$38,000.00
1.2: Integrate data, information and results of this project into National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and, where relevant, National Determined Contributions (NDCs)	\$12,000.00
2.1: Three Community early warning systems designed and implemented responding to local needs of information and with at least one Hydro climatological impact prioritized by each System. The CEWS will be in operation and feeding information into regional Disaster Management platforms and will be designed with emphasis on the needs of minority groups and women participation	\$155,000.00
3.1: Design, plan, and develop enabling conditions for Increased engagement and participation of communities and social actors in the restoration areas on degraded public lands. In coordination and cooperation, at least one site, with corresponding investments by private partners in private land	\$375,000.00
3.2: Three landscapes under restoration activities, one in each country, with implementation and maintenance protocols	\$40,000.00
3.3: Wider potential for replication by the private sector examined and communicated to the Impact Investors associated to Initiative 20x20 and other financial groups	\$25,000.00
4.1: Increased the knowledge and capacity for implementing restoration as an adaptation measure, in subnational and national stakeholders and 50% of them should be Women	\$75,000.00
4.2: Regional Training program, including activities implemented to shared lessons learned and a Regional Information System. promote the deployment of the benefits and structure of restoration as an adaptation measure from all representative groups of actors, including farmer organizations, women's groups, private sector and government from local to national, private investors in the Atlantic Forest of the Coastal Areas of Honduras Gulf and other countries that are vulnerable to hurricanes in coastal zones	\$5,000.00
4.3: Regional information system focused on land use-based responses information related to the intensification of extreme weather events in coastal zones (managed by the CCCCC)	\$28,000.00
IE fee (\$)	\$25,294.87
Execution cost (\$)	\$260,000.00

## Planned Expenditure Schedule

Output	Projected Cost (\$)	Estimated Completion Date
1.1: Forest restoration is promoted among local, national, and regional stakeholders to influence national regulatory framework, subnational land use plans and land use strategies in coastal areas	\$168,000.00	11/13/2025
1.2: Integrate data, information and results of this project into National	\$72,000.00	11/13/2025

Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and, where relevant, National Determined Contributions (NDCs)		
2.1: Three Community early warning systems designed and implemented responding to local needs of information and with at least one Hydro climatological impact prioritized by each System. The CEWS will be in operation and feeding information into regional Disaster Management platforms and will be designed with emphasis on the needs of minority groups and women participation	\$265,000.00	11/13/2025
3.1: Design, plan, and develop enabling conditions for Increased engagement and participation of communities and social actors in the restoration areas on degraded public lands. In coordination and cooperation, at least one site, with corresponding investments by private partners in private land	\$390,000.00	11/13/2025
3.2: Three landscapes under restoration activities, one in each country, with implementation and maintenance protocols	\$175,000.00	11/13/2025
3.3: Wider potential for replication by the private sector examined and communicated to the Impact Investors associated to Initiative 20x20 and other financial groups	\$175,000.00	11/13/2025
4.1: Increased the knowledge and capacity for implementing restoration as an adaptation measure, in subnational and national stakeholders and 50% of them should be Women	\$105,000.00	11/13/2025
4.2: Regional Training program, including activities implemented to shared lessons learned and a Regional Information System. promote the deployment of the benefits and structure of restoration as an adaptation measure from all representative groups of actors, including farmer organizations, women's groups, private sector and government from local to national, private investors in the Atlantic Forest of the Coastal Areas of Honduras Gulf and other countries that are vulnerable to hurricanes in coastal zones	\$115,000.00	11/13/2025
4.3: Regional information system focused on land use-based responses information related to the intensification of extreme weather events in coastal zones (managed by the CCCCC)	\$42,000.00	11/13/2025
IE fee (\$)		\$180,000.00
Execution cost (\$)		\$260,000.00

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

Does this Project have Co-Financing ?	No
How much of the total co-financing as committed in the Project Document has actually been realized? (\$)	\$0.00
Estimated cumulative actual co-financing as verified during Mid-term Review (MTR) or Terminal Evaluation (TE). (\$)	\$0.00
Add any comments on actual co-financing in particular any issues related to the realization of in-kind, grant, credits, loans, equity, non-grant instruments and other types of co-financing.	

## Risk Assessment

### Identified Risks

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

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
Long term durability of the restoration pilots.	Moderate	(Implementation of restoration activities has not started (these are planned for year three)). The project team intends to further explore the mechanisms for deploying and sustaining these activities. Additionally, the team is exploring ways to integrate restoration efforts within the regulatory frameworks of each country to ensure their continuity and replicability. To facilitate continuous communication, a policy advisory committee has been established, ensuring an inclusive and participatory approach to decision-making, which will foster the sustainability and replicability of restoration activities across the region. Finally, the project team aims to establish partnerships with local organizations and governments to ensure the continuity of the project beyond the initial funding phase.
Changes in administration and counterpart implementing agencies impact project deliverables.	Moderate	The team has established and convened the Trinational Policy Steering Committee, which will meet periodically to review progress and report on results. The formal structure and connection with this group will ensure sustained advocacy for the project, guaranteeing its continuity and alignment with the countries' strategic objectives. At the local level, the project team has secured agreements and commitments with both local and national authorities to ensure the project's continuity, even amidst administrative changes. These agreements include the formation of committees and working groups. In Year 2, the project team plans to enhance its communication activities by (a) building awareness and possibly launching advocacy campaigns to maintain political support, and (b) integrating the project's interventions into institutional planning to foster a greater sense of ownership by relevant entities. To date, the project team has addressed the information needs of the government in Guatemala, in coordination with the Ministry of Environment, and incorporated the project's details into SEGEPLAN, aligning it with national priorities. This alignment ensures the project's strategic relevance and continuity. The project management team has followed up on SEGEPLAN's request; however, official communication from SEGEPLAN is still pending. Additionally, since the formation of the Trinational Policy Steering Committee, Belize's representation in the REFOR project has changed and needs to be verified and updated. No changes are foreseen in Honduras.
Disagreements between stakeholders on restoration sites.	Low	CATIE will conduct an analysis to identify and prioritize potential restoration sites in Year 2, based on: - A combination of participatory mapping, along with technical and strategic criteria, to establish a solid baseline of prioritized sites. -Synergies with Community EWS in the prioritized watersheds across the three target areas identified in Year 1. This baseline will be integrated with a decision-making tool provided by WRI, complemented by inter-institutional collaboration to assess the capacities of existing actors to carry out restoration work. This triangulation will allow for the final sites to be defined, ensuring shared understanding and consensus among the involved parties. Further actions to mitigate this risk, which also has a legal dimension, include the establishment of agreements to implement restoration measures within inclusive resilience frameworks that are adapted to the local territories. These agreements should engage key actors from the Restoration Networks/Roundtables that were recently established or strengthened in Year 1 and integrate restoration actions with territorial planning. Other mitigation measures include training programs and monitoring and reporting mechanisms that will provide evidence of the contributions from various actors.

Lack of buy in from local communities.	Low	(This hasn't represented a barrier for the current reporting period). The priorities in various communities have shifted since the project's formulation due to factors such as evolving social dynamics, the occurrence of different hazards (e.g., fires, which are more prevalent in Belize), and the availability of technical cooperation. Workshops led by CATIE, building on the consultations from the preparation phase, have engaged local communities. Through these efforts, CATIE is aligning the project's activities with the priorities and needs of these communities. Additional mitigation measures for this risk will include considering the different livelihoods of the communities as a starting point, ensuring the inclusion of minorities in the implementation process, integrating livelihoods into restoration networks or roundtables, clearly communicating the benefits of the implemented measures over different timeframes, and providing training and technical assistance. The project also plans to implement a multi-sector training program to enhance knowledge and capacity on restoration and early warning systems (EWS) for resilience, while creating incentives for participation. This will include seeking funding for complementary proposals focused on climate resilience.
Restored areas are degraded by human activity.	Moderate	(Not present during the current reporting period). Although no areas have been restored yet and therefore have not been at risk of degradation, initial assessments for project site selection are considering existing activities within the landscape and their potential impact on land degradation dynamics (e.g., expansion of cardamom cropping systems and wildfires encroaching into protected areas) as a precautionary measure. Restoration activities will be accompanied by monitoring measures to prevent any degradation-related activities. The establishment of natural barriers and the implementation of environmental education programs for nearby communities will be considered, depending on the relevance to the selected project sites. It is critical to implement mitigation measures such as monitoring cultivated areas within protected areas (in collaboration with other stakeholders and in alignment with their plans), establishing natural barriers, and conducting environmental education programs for local communities. Additionally, sustainable agricultural practices targeting deforestation-causing crops within project sites will be promoted.
Natural Hazards	Moderate	(Weather events have recently impacted the project, limiting participation in workshops due to storm Sara. However, there have been no material damages, as restoration activities are yet to commence). It is anticipated that tropical storms will continue to pose risks to events and activities in the future. As a result, planning may need to be adjusted according to specific seasons, which could affect project timelines. The team will implement contingency planning for its operations to address these challenges. For restoration activities, schedules will be adjusted based on climate forecasts, and plant species suited to extreme weather conditions will be used to increase resilience. The project aims to establish a strong connection between Nature-Based Solutions (NBS) and enhanced resilience, with the objective of reducing the impacts resulting from exposure to natural hazards.
COVID-19	Low	(COVID and other illnesses have not posed a threat during the current reporting period). There has been no immediate need to mitigate this risk; however, the project team will maintain an ongoing awareness of public health safeguards, including disease surveillance and mitigation measures. Collaboration with relevant health institutions will be prioritized to prevent and manage potential health risks throughout the project's implementation.
Land tenure conflicts	Low	(Conflicts related to land tenure and social problems in priority areas have not been present during the current reporting period). No conflicts or land tenure issues were identified during the initial assessments conducted in the project's



		preparation phase. To mitigate this risk during implementation, the following measures will be adopted: - Potential restoration sites will be validated through a participatory consultation process, assessing the level of risk associated with land tenure conflicts, along with other relevant criteria. - The establishment of restoration sites will be considered in uninhabited areas, buffer zones, connectivity networks, or other regions where restoration efforts contribute to enhancing the climate resilience of local livelihoods.
Interventions are found to be not cost effective.	Low	WRI will conduct a long-term cost-effectiveness analysis using inputs from CATIE's analyses and other relevant sources, to provide clarity on the viability of alternatives for restoration to achieve adaptation outcomes. WRI's work will also include an analysis of successful projects, both regionally and globally, that demonstrate the technical and financial viability of Nature-Based Solutions (NBS) for adaptation. The project team will then assess how restoration activities, once implemented, can be sustained and replicated through various financial mechanisms, including investments, Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES), incentives, or business models designed to fund nature-based solutions.
Climate adaptation benefits do not materialize	Low	(Not present during the current reporting period). General areas are being selected based on the potential for maximum impact of Nature-Based Solutions (NBS) for climate adaptation, utilizing participatory processes that take into account the contribution of restoration methods to local livelihoods. During the implementation phase, the project team will document the link between restoration activities and the anticipated short-term adaptation benefits at various scales, including farm, micro-watershed, and landscape levels. Additionally, the expected costs of selected restoration sites may be examined if necessary. It is essential to consider that the project addresses climate resilience through two complementary strategies over time: Community Early Warning Systems (EWS) for immediate response and the restoration of critical areas to provide essential environmental services for climate change adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in the medium and long term. This dual approach is integral to local planning and capacity-building processes.
EWS do not operate as expected/deliver the minimum information required.	Low	Not present during the current reporting period. The operation and scaling of the Early Warning Systems (EWS) from the community to municipal and national levels depend on the organizational capacity of the emergency response system. In Belize, this system is particularly reliant on the voluntary participation of communities, with support from some NGOs. As a result, the training process will be focused primarily at the community and municipal levels, with an emphasis on identifying lessons learned, knowledge, and affordable technologies. This approach aims to ensure the engagement of young leaders, fostering their involvement to guarantee the continuity of the EWS beyond the project's completion.

### Critical Risks Affecting Progress (Not identified at project design)

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

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

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
Delayed disbursements may affect the project's execution timelines.	Low	- Disbursement Monitoring. - Compliance with the deadlines set by the Adaptation Fund for the submission of PPRs will be ensured, maintaining constant and efficient communication

		throughout the review process to resolve any issues that may arise. - Alternative Resources: In the event of delays in disbursements, the use of the Executing Entities' own resources is being considered to continue project critical activities. This will apply exclusively to activities that have been previously approved by CABEL. These resources will be reimbursed with the project funds once the disbursements are processed. Guidelines for activating this measure, when necessary, have been incorporated into the Project's Operational Manual.
Shifting national priorities: In Belize, local communities have demonstrated a shift in preference for EWS to address wildfires as a hazard in response to recent fire events in the region.	High	In Belize, climate-driven threats have shifted from a focus on flooding to forest and landscape fires. Given that the focus of the Early Warning Systems (EWS) proposed in the project document is on hydrometeorological hazards, it is not feasible to change this focus. Therefore, these EWS are being approached as multi-hazard systems, in line with the framework proposed by United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR). Additionally, synergies will be pursued with other projects or programs (e.g., SERVIR Central America) for the design and implementation of fire-specific EWS.
Rising costs: A long gap between the period in which the project was prepared and the present has resulted in a change of several conditions - most notably the rise in costs from restoration to other inputs necessary for the project's implementation.	Moderate	Although general statements on the rising cost of inputs for restoration due to recent inflation have been noted, no concrete steps can be taken yet, as restoration measures tailored to specific sites will only follow site selection in Year 2. A detailed cost analysis will be conducted for the selected sites, incorporating CATIE's and WRI's assessments in Year 2. Based on identified opportunities and alignment, the project team may explore sources of co-financing or propose models to ensure the financial sustainability of the restoration activities.

## 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?

As the project is in the early stages of implementation, most risk mitigation measures have not yet been fully implemented during the current reporting period. However, the following actions are being taken: The project team has convened the Steering Committee representatives, appointed by the authorities of the three countries, who will serve as chairs and coordinators between national agencies. Given that Nature-Based Solutions (NBS) are managed by different government entities in each country, it is critical for the project's focal point (also a Steering Committee member) to assume a coordination role within their respective countries. Furthermore, we are ensuring the participation of local communities and stakeholders through informative workshops held within the project's areas of influence in the three countries.

## ESP Compliance

### Section 1: Identified ESP Risk Management

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

#### 1.Compliance with the law

Are environmental or social risks present as per table Yes



II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Project fails to comply and infringes existing laws and regulations.
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.	Mitigation: Project has been designed around restoration of degraded lands in nature reserves/protected land. This activity is in full compliance with existing law.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Not identified during project development
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Not identified during project development
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	Project has been designed around restoration of degraded lands in nature reserves/protected land. The project has engaged with policymakers through Component 1 to analyze and provide guidance to policymakers on strengthening regulation and/or sub-national programs that are conducive of adaptation to extreme weather events.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	N/A
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	N/A
<b>2.Access and equity</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Project fails to ensure equity, inclusion, and access in all project activities.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	MITIGATION: All activities will be in public land and are designed to benefit local populations with local groups engaged in implementation of filed activities including in the implementation of the pilots. The community consultation has identified groups that will be active in the project activities, however, and given that at the beginning of the project, the areas of intervention will be reconfirmed, as in the case of Guatemala, a database of potential beneficiaries must be compiled, with particular attention to women, youth and other vulnerable groups. In addition, in the case of indigenous peoples, decisions derived from the community based on prior, free and informed consultation must be taken into account.

List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Not identified during project development
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Not identified during project development
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	Minority and vulnerable groups have been actively engaged in workshops, where participants have been identified and informed about the project's complaints and grievance mechanism. Efforts have been made to ensure accessibility and understanding of this mechanism, reinforcing transparency and inclusivity in project implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	N/A
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	N/A
<b>3.Marginalized and vulnerable Groups</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Potential exclusion of marginalized and vulnerable groups from project activities
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	MITIGATION: All activities have been designed for the benefit of local populations which are mostly composed of marginalized and vulnerable groups. Local knowledge and labor will be deployed for restoration work. The project will place special consideration to vulnerable or minority groups when planning activities, distributing benefits and capturing needs and preferences among groups (e.g. days, places and times for effective participation, communication in native languages, etc.). Mapping of relevant stakeholders (communities, vulnerable groups, institutions, etc.), levels of influence and interest among them. Development of a participation program at the beginning of the project aligned with principles of equity, inclusion, and transparency.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	N/A
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	N/A
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	Workshop participants have been made aware of the project's complaints and grievance mechanism. Marginalized and vulnerable groups have been identified and taken into account during workshops.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	N/A
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	N/A

4.Human rights	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Project activities have a negative impact on human rights.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	<p><b>AVOIDANCE:</b> Project management and coordination to ensure compliance. There is a human rights commission in each country with representatives that will also monitor the situation</p> <p><b>MITIGATION:</b> Develop project action plans in a participatory manner, including diverse social and vulnerable groups, and with the technical assistance of the involved national institutions. Implementation of a Complaints and Grievance mechanism.</p>
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Not identified during project development
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Not identified during project development
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	A Complaints and Grievance Mechanism was developed and put in place to capture instances of human rights violations
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	N/A
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	N/A
5.Gender equality and women's empowerment	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	The project will take place in areas where in some cases women are excluded from decision making.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	<p><b>MITIGATION:</b> Community consultation has identified women groups that will be active in project activities. A Gender Action Plan has been developed to ensure that gender-focused activities will include raising awareness in the region to inter alia: i) acknowledge women for their contribution as an income-generating individual in the household; and ii) highlight their role in climate change adaptation. This will enhance the value of women within their communities, as well as promote their equitable participation of women in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the</p>

	project.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Not identified during project development
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Not identified during project development
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	A Gender Action Plan has been updated and started implementation to safeguard and promote equality and women's empowerment. The update was made taking into consideration recommendations derived from the gender analysis prepared for each country.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	N/A
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	N/A
<b>6.Core labour rights</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	There is a risk of inequitable access of indigenous and minority groups to project resources and benefits
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.	MITIGATION: Community consultation has identified indigenous minority groups in the area, which constitute most of the population and will be active in project activities, providing most of the labor required at a local level. Prior to the development of the activities, it will be necessary to train the people involved to avoid accidents at work. Each area of intervention of the project must have the data of the closest health and emergency care centers. Verify that project personnel (permanent and contracted) have medical insurance. Ensure minimum safety conditions for the people involved in the different activities of the project, this can include ensuring that they have appropriate work schedules, insurance to cover work risks, as well as the provision of safety equipment, access to health care clinics.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Not identified during project development
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Not identified during project development
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	The current reporting period has not called for hiring of external people and people for local work. People hired by the executing entities count with contracts compliant with ILO and national law labor regulations.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	N/A

Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	N/A
<b>7.Indigenous people</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	There is a risk of inequitable access of indigenous and minority groups to project resources and benefits. Some restoration measures will also take place in indigenous lands.
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.	MITIGATION: local populations which are overwhelmingly composed of marginalized and vulnerable groups The project will continue to conduct consultations with the Indigenous Peoples involved through appropriate procedures and their representative institutions; to obtain the "Free, Prior and Informed Consent". The basis for making the queries will be as follows: - Meetings and consultations will be held in the places, times, and in the languages and formats determined by the peoples themselves. - Consultation methods should recognize existing Indigenous Peoples' organizations, including councils of elders, leaders, and tribal leaders, and should pay special attention to women, youth and elders. - The consultation has a significant influence on the overall design choices of the project, eg, location and beneficiaries. - The consultation with the indigenous peoples about the project activities and their potential adverse impacts will be done based on adequate and pertinent information. Inclusive, culturally appropriate, and language-adapted communication methods will be used to disseminate project information so that members of these communities understand how the project may affect their lives.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Not identified during project development
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Not identified during project development
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	A methodology for the participation of indigenous peoples and local groups was developed and socialized. For its implementation, the project team sought to engage and ensure the participation of indigenous groups at workshops aimed at identifying at-risk areas within the priority landscapes. Additionally, an Indigenous Peoples specialist has been appointed to lead and implement processes related to vulnerable and marginalized groups.
Describe the residual impact for each impact	N/A

identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	N/A
<b>8.Involuntary resettlement</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
<b>9.Protection of natural habitats</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	On the ground adaptation measures are designed to restore degraded natural habitats important for adaptation to extreme weather events.
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.	MITIGATION: All restoration on-the-ground activities will adhere to EIA regulations in the countries and will consist of natural regeneration, assisted natural regeneration and of planting of native species.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Not identified during project development
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Not identified during project development
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	No measures implemented during the reportign period as the project team is still conducting an assessment on site identification. Preventive measures have been adopted in planning per the



	project's Environmental and Social Management Plan defined in the Social and Environmental Assessment.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	N/A
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	N/A
<b>10.Conservation of biological diversity</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	On the ground adaptation measures are designed to restore degraded natural habitats important for adaptation to extreme weather events.
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.	MITIGATION: All restoration on-the-ground activities will adhere to EIA regulations in the countries and will consist of natural regeneration, assisted natural regeneration and of planting of native species.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Not identified during project development
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Not identified during project development
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	N/A for the reporting period as on-the-ground activities have not taken place. Mitigation measures are considered in planning of restoration activities.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	N/A
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	N/A
<b>11.Climate change</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	The proposed project's climate change interventions focus on reforestation of degraded forests and mangroves. None of these interventions would result in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions.
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.	Mitigation: All restoration on-the-ground activities will adhere to EIA regulations in the countries and will consist of natural regeneration, assisted natural regeneration and of planting of native species
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Not identified during project development

State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Not identified during project development
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	N/A for the reporting period as on-the-ground activities have not taken place. Mitigation measures are considered in planning of restoration activities.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	N/A
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	N/A
<b>12.Pollution prevention and resource efficiency</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Project activities are not expected to result in the generation of any considerable amounts of pollution, particularly hazardous or toxic waste.
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.	MITIGATION: Implementation protocols would ensure an efficient use of resources and a minimal production of waste.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Not identified during project development
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Not identified during project development
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	N/A for the reporting period as on-the-ground activities have not taken place. Mitigation measures are considered in planning of restoration activities.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	N/A
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	N/A
<b>13.Public health</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact	

identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
<b>14. Physical and cultural heritage</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	The project plans no construction or hard infrastructure. There is a low risk that the adaptation interventions involving could result in negative impacts on physical and cultural heritage, especially in Maya sites that may located in the restoration areas.
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.	MITIGATION: The participatory approach to project design includes the use of local knowledge to ensure that restoration activities will not affect cultural heritage sites. The likelihood of negative impacts related to project interventions is very low. During project implementation, any findings of cultural heritage will be notified to the National Authorities by the implementing Agency. If findings occur, the surrounding areas will be excluded from project activities and moved to other areas. On the basis of the findings if any, including from local authorities and communities including indigenous groups, opportunities for adjustments in the implementation will be proposed by the Executing Agencies, reviewed by CABEI and adopted as required.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Not identified during project development
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Not identified during project development
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	N/A for the reporting period as on-the-ground activities have not taken place. Mitigation measures are considered in planning of restoration activities.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	N/A
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	N/A
<b>15. Lands and soil conservation</b>	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No

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

## 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?	Yes
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	<p>An updated Environmental and Social Assessment was carried out based on the actual conditions of the project implementation sites and the potentially affected populations. As a result, new risks were identified, and corresponding mitigation measures were incorporated into the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), which has been duly updated. Key safeguard measures taken include: - Development of community-based fire prevention plans and training of producers to reduce the risk of vegetation loss due to uncontrolled burning. - Implementation of participatory processes for beneficiary identification, including census activities for vulnerable populations and validation through community assemblies. - Promotion of the inclusion of women, youth, and Indigenous Peoples across all project activities, ensuring equitable access to project resources, training opportunities, and participation in decision-making. - Enforcement of national labor standards, including formal contracts, access to social security, equal pay for equal work, and awareness campaigns to prevent child labor. - Promotion of sustainable agricultural practices, including localized input application, composting, and appropriate handling of hazardous waste and empty containers. -</p>

	Coordination with environmental authorities to prevent negative impacts on protected areas and buffer zones, and exclusive use of native species in restoration activities. - Continuous monitoring of interventions, strengthening of capacities in ecological restoration practices, and tracking of key environmental indicators. - Training of beneficiaries on responsible greenhouse management and proper disposal of discarded materials, in coordination with municipal recycling and waste collection services. All these measures have been implemented from the outset and are being maintained throughout project implementation through participatory monitoring mechanisms and ongoing evaluation.
--	---

### 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.	N/A

### 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?	At the beginning of this reporting period, CABEL included E&S clauses in both CATIE and WRI agreements to ensure they comply with the Adaptation Fund's and the Bank's E&S policies. For the development of the Operations Manual, CABEL's Environmental and Social Sustainability Office (OSAS) included an ESMP that integrates mitigation measures from the ESMF of the project proposal and the Bank's environmental and social safeguards. EE's have the responsibility to fulfill this plan under the supervision of the Bank.
Have the implementation arrangements been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	The current reporting period captured the EEs efforts in further developing the project's implementation arrangements including drafting and approving several guidance documents that are shared between EEs. These include: -Operations Manual, which indicates how the project aims to function integrally with the backing of CATIE and WRI -Supervision Plan, which highlights how information, reporting and oversight is planned within the project. - Visibility Plan, indicating how messaging information products will be promoted among internal and external audiences within the project. - Complaints and Grievance Mechanism, defining how grievances are to be received and resolved within the project. -An Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) for the project was developed, summarizing the project's potential impacts based on the safeguards of the Adaptation Fund and CABEL.

	The ESMP includes preventive, mitigating, and corrective measures for identified impacts rated as severe or moderate. This instrument will serve as the basis for monitoring compliance with the Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) throughout the project's implementation. -GAP, Implementation description. -Annual Work Plan for WRI, including defined activities for each project component for the year. -Annual Work Plan for CATIE, including defined activities for each project component for the year.
Have the implementation arrangements at the EEs been effective during the reporting period?	Yes

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

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

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

**Section 6: Grievances**

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

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

**Comments**



# GP Compliance

## Section 1: Quality at entry

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

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

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

Gender-responsive element	Level	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Rated result for the reporting period
Under Output 3.1: Roundtables, networks and workshops include a 50% of women's participation	Output	50% of participants in roundtables and networks who are women	0	50% Progress: 21 workshops, 29 meetings, 7 field trips and 5 exchange of knowledge and experiences days were carried out and, of 874 participants, 45% were women	Good
Under Output 3.2: Beneficiary women present and/or involved in restoration activities	Output	% of beneficiaries in landscapes under restoration who are women	0	50% Progress: Not applicable for the current reporting period.	Poor
Under Output 4.1: 50% of trainees are women	Output	% of participants and trainees in Output 4.1 workshops and webinars who are women	0	50% Progress: Not applicable for the current reporting period.	Poor
Under Output 4.2: Regional training program	Output	Number of women-led organizations involved	0	9 Progress: Not applicable for the current reporting period.	Poor
Under Output 4.2: Regional training program	Output	Number of women trained	0	50% Progress: Not applicable for the current reporting period.	Poor

## Section 2: Quality during implementation and at exit

List gender equality and women's empowerment issues encountered during implementation of the

**project/programme. For each gender equality and women's empowerment issue describe the progress that was made as well as the results.**

<b>Gender equality and women's empowerment issues</b>	<b>Rated result for the reporting period</b>	<b>Provide justification of the rating provided</b>
[to be completed at final PPR]		

### **Section 3: Implementation arrangements**

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP	At the beginning of this reporting period, CABEI included E&S clauses in both CATIE and WRI agreements to ensure they comply with the Adaptation Fund's and the Bank's gender policies. For the development of the Operations Manual, CABEI's Environmental and Social Sustainability Office (OSAS) included an ESMP that integrates mitigation measures from the ESMF of the project proposal and the Bank's environmental and social safeguards, which highlights the importance for the implementation of the Gender Action Plan. EE's have the responsibility to fulfill this plan under the supervision of the Bank.
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?	Both Executing Entities (EEs), CATIE and WRI, have developed key documents to ensure compliance with the Gender Policy (GP) in the project. These include: - Operations Manual: Outlines the project's functioning, integrating gender indicators. - Grievance Mechanism: Defines how grievances will be received and addressed. - Environmental and Social Safeguards by CATIE: Include provisions for gender and minorities. - Gender Action Plan (GAP) by CATIE: Provides gender-responsive measures. - Supervision Plan by WRI: Highlights the planning of project monitoring and oversight. - Visibility Plan by WRI: Specifies how project messages will be communicated. Both EEs have also developed annual work plans that integrate gender-responsive measures, ensuring that these considerations are present in all project components.
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	No

period?	
---------	--

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

Comments

## Rating

Implementing Entity				
Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
Outcome 1: Strengthened regulations, planning and policy strategies that support restoration as an adaptation measure to achieve resilience to intensifying extreme weather events.	Outcome 7	Activity 1.1.1: Achieve a detailed understanding of the current regulatory framework in each beneficiary country and develop specific proposals to improve existing policies, promoting ecological restoration as a key measure to address the challenges of extreme climate events. Activity 1.1.2: Workshops and working meetings to update relevant public documents, including regional land-use planning strategies, with equal participation from local authorities, communities, and women's groups. Activity 1.2.1: To obtain a clear and precise assessment of how the NDCs and national adaptation plans are incorporating Nature-Based Solutions (NBS) as an integral part of their strategies for climate change adaptation. Additionally, identify opportunities to strengthen the integration of these solutions into national and regional policies, in order to promote more effective and sustainable adaptation to the impacts of climate change.	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Outcome 2: Designed and implement 3 Local Community early warning system for improving alerts and response capacities to extreme weather events.	Outcome 1	Activity 2.1.1: Analysis of extreme events in the project's area of influence and preliminary description of potential sites for the development of community early warning systems (CEWS) Activity 2.1.2: Design proposal for three community early warning systems in Belize, Guatemala, and Honduras. Activity 2.1.2.1: Geospatial information for vulnerability modeling: Establishing a baseline to identify areas not recently deforested to ensure that project	Ontrack	Satisfactory

		interventions are directed toward suitable territories. Activity 2.1.2.2: Procurement of computer equipment to support the required systems.		
Outcome 3: Increase Resilience of 3 socio–ecological landscapes in the Atlantic Forest of Belize, Guatemala and Honduras by restoring coastal water basins areas with native species and deploy forest economic activities.	Outcome 5	Activity 3.1.1: Baseline of knowledge on stakeholders, forest restoration experiences, and ecosystems in the project's area of influence. Activity 3.1.2: Resilience Results Framework Based on the Vulnerability Approach. Activity 3.1.4: Methodology for the Participation of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities in the Implementation of Project Activities. Activity 3.2.1: Introduction and Training Workshops for the Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Participation Framework in the Implementation of Project Activities. Activity 3.2.2: Local Networks Workshops and Restoration Roundtables in Belize, Guatemala, and Honduras. Activity 3.3.1: Potential Local Restoration Costs for Adaptation: Database on Potential Restoration Costs for Adaptation Purposes in the Three Landscapes, Effective through Restoration-Based Adaptation Measures in the Atlantic Coast.	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Outcome 4: Improved knowledge and skills among actors at local, national and regional levels to scale up restoration as an adaptation activity and build regional exchange platforms.	Outcome 3, Outcome 2	Activity 4.1.1: Report on installed capacities and training needs of stakeholders linked to the REFORES project in Honduras, Guatemala, and Belize. Activity 4.3.1: A typology for entries on relevant restoration and adaptation documents to be referenced in the regional reference system. Activity 4.3.2: Develop and maintain a dedicated webpage for the project within the 20x20 Initiative and WRI platforms, providing updated and relevant information on the project's objectives, progress, and outcomes. Additionally, create a visibility plan to enhance the project's image, ensuring its recognition and accessibility among stakeholders and the general public.	Ontrack	Satisfactory

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

Name	Email
Pamela Ramos	ramosp@bcie.org

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

CABEI rates the project as Satisfactory due to significant progress in key areas despite initial challenges,

such as delays in the first disbursement and procurement processes. Corrective measures have mitigated these challenges, enabling continued progress toward the project's objectives. As next steps, CABI will focus on closely monitoring the implementation of pending activities and reviewing planning documents with the Executing Entities to facilitate the second disbursement. Additionally, priority will be given to finalizing ongoing procurement processes to secure the required services and to developing a communication strategy aimed at promoting the project's sustainability.

## Executing Entity / Project Coordinator

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
Outcome 1: Strengthened regulations, planning and policy strategies that support restoration as an adaptation measure to achieve resilience to intensifying extreme weather events.	Outcome 7	Output 1.2: Integrate data, information and results of this project into National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and, where relevant, National Determined Contributions (NDCs).	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Outcome 2: Designed and implement 3 Local Community early warning system for improving alerts and response capacities to extreme weather events.	Outcome 1	Output 2.1: 3 Community early warning systems design responding to local needs of information and with at least one Hydro climatological impact prioritized by each System. The CEWS will be in operation and feeding information into regional Disaster Management.	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Outcome 3: Increase Resilience of 3 socio –ecological landscapes in the Atlantic Forest of Belize, Guatemala and Honduras by restoring coastal water basins areas with native species and deploy forest economic activities.	Outcome 5	Output 3.1: Design, plan and develop enabling conditions for Increased engagement and participation of Communities and social actors in the three restoration areas in degraded public lands, in coordination and cooperation, in at least one site, with corresponding investments by private partners in private land. Output 3.3: Wider po-tential for replication by the private sector exam-ined and communicat-ed to the Impact Investors as-sociated to Initiative 20x20 and other financial groups.	Delayed	Marginally Unsatisfactory
Outcome 4: No. and type of natural resource assets created, maintained, or improved to withstand conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by type of assets).	Outcome 2	Output 4.2. Regional Training program, including activities implemented to shared lessons learned and a Regional Information System. promote the deployment of the benefits and structure of restoration as an adaptation measure from all representative groups of actors, including farmer organizations, women's groups, private sector and government from local to national, private investors. Output 4.3: Regional information	Delayed	Marginally Unsatisfactory

		system focused on land use-based responses information related to the intensification of extreme weather events in coastal zones		
--	--	--	--	--

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

Name	Email	Institution
Luciana Gallardo Lomeli	Luciana.Gallardo@wri.org	WRI

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

Following delays in kick off and its initial disbursement, the REFORES project team focused on realigning the project with countries existing priorities and addressing documentation and developing extensive guidance requirements from the Implementing Entity. Building towards the delivery of the project's outputs, WRI focused its work on repositioning and realigning the project within the three countries' governments as was needed following an extended period between its preparation phase and kick off. This accomplishment was ultimately evidenced in the consolidation of the project's Policy Steering Committee, to respond to the review of policies and overall project performance, and its insertion in a regional platform to position the project and disseminate results and lessons learned. A focus on the linkage between climate ambitions and the contribution of restoration for adaptation was also explored in an initial analysis of the countries' NDCs. WRI further concentrated on complementary readiness activities for on-the-ground adaptation, particularly those contributing to the prioritization, review, and selection of opportunities for restoration activities. This included defining the scope of work for developing a decision-making tool and compiling data on vulnerability to climate hazards. However, progress on the development and implementation of these tools in each country has been hindered by internal review and approval processes with CABEL. This highlighted the need for dedicated personnel to navigate the Implementing Entity's policies, particularly concerning acquisitions and financing. Finally, the project team has advanced plans and activities to enhance regional knowledge sharing and exchange among the three countries. However, progress on this component has been delayed by internal (Executing Entity) and external (Implementing Entity) due diligence requirements for hiring key services. These processes have incurred disproportionate costs (where the cost of compliance exceeds the cost of services), diverting resources away from project activities. As these barriers are tied to institutional rules and processes that lack flexibility, it will be crucial to consider redirecting resources toward staff focused exclusively on navigating these norms.

## Other

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
Outcome 1: Strengthened regulations, planning and policy strategies that support restoration as an adaptation measure to achieve resilience to intensifying extreme weather events.	Outcome 7	Output 1.1: Forest restoration is promoted among local, national, and regional stakeholders to influence national regulatory framework, subnational land use plans and land use strategies in coastal areas Output 1.2: Integrate data, information and results of this project into National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and, where relevant, National Determined Contributions (NDCs).	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Outcome 2: Designed and	Outcome 1	Output 2.1: 3 Community early warning	Ontrack	Satisfactory



implement 3 Local Community early warning system for improving alerts and response capacities to extreme weather events.		systems design responding to local needs of information and with at least one Hydro climatological impact prioritized by each System. The CEWS will be in operation and feeding information into regional Disaster Management		
Outcome 3: Increase Resilience of 3 socio—ecological landscapes in the Atlantic Forest of Belize, Guatemala and Honduras by restoring coastal water basins areas with native species and deploy forest economic activities.	Outcome 5	Output 3.1: Design, plan and develop enabling conditions for Increased engagement and participation of Communities and social actors in the three restoration areas in degraded public lands. in coordination and cooperation, in at least one site, with corresponding investments by private partners in private land Output 3.2: Three landscapes under restoration activities, one in each country, implementation and maintenance protocols	Ontrack	Marginally Satisfactory
Outcome 4: No. and type of natural resource assets created, maintained, or improved to withstand conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by type of assets).	Outcome 2	Output 4.1: Increased the knowledge and capacity for implementing restoration as an adaptation measure, in subnational and national stakeholders and 50% of them should be Women. Output 4.2: Regional Training program, including activities implemented to shared lessons learned and a Regional Information System. promote the deployment of the benefits and structure of restoration as an adaptation measure from all representative groups of actors, including farmer organizations, women's groups, private sector and government from local to national, private investors. Output 4.3: Regional information system focused on land use-based responses information related to the intensification of extreme weather events in coastal zones	Ontrack	Marginally Satisfactory

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

Name	Email
Diego Delgado	ddelgado@catie.ac.cr

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

During this year the project team has made significant progress in strengthening institutional links with key actors in the governmental, NGO, private and academic sectors at the national and local levels, which has allowed satisfactory progress in the products committed to advance the products committed for this period. These products have consisted mainly of the review of different sources and the implementation of participatory workshops at the community level that have allowed to better understand the perception of the different target audiences. Consequently, the coordinators in each country have consistently adjusted the project's main strategies aimed at addressing short-term disaster risks (CEWS) and defining why, where, how, with whom and with what resources to restore ecosystems. Likewise, the knowledge gathered through

the gender and social inclusion workshops has been contributing to these achievements. The necessary adjustment of the project and the operational and financial arrangements during project start-up, as is common, has caused delays in some components, but the gap has been reduced considerably. Another source of delay to obtain the programmed products has been the process of knowing the local demands and their integration with sources of information of different nature (climatic and hydrological data) in an adequate conceptual framework and results that make sense at the local level. The main recommendations for the future are to communicate the project strategy in a consistent manner in the resilience framework complementing the advantages and challenges at different timeframes; as well to maintain an continuous and fluent communication among different stakeholders.

## 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.**

It is considered that the project is Satisfactory. Although the project officially commenced on November 15, 2023, and the first disbursement from the IE to the Executing Entities (EEs) was made on July 1, 2024, causing delays in the execution of some planned activities, the measures adopted and the effective collaboration between the IE and the EEs facilitated significant project progress, completing key milestones that add value to the expected outcomes. The pending activities for the first year are scheduled to be completed between February and March 2025, ensuring continuity and the achievement of the project objectives. Positive Progress: - Advances in Policies and Regulations. - Community Participation. - Design Proposals and Potential Sites for Community Early Warning Systems (CEWS). - Capacity Building Evaluation. Negative Progress: - Delays in Initial Disbursements. - Challenges in Procurement Processes. - Emerging Climate Risks. Recommendations for Next Steps: - Consider additional training for EE staff on CABEL's procurement policies and regulations or hire support staff in this area to mitigate future delays. - Regularly review and adjust the project's work plans to accommodate emerging priorities and external challenges, ensuring the project remains relevant and responsive. - Strengthen the monitoring framework to capture both immediate and long-term outcomes, helping to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions and make data-driven adjustments. - Continue to build the capacity of local actors to ensure the sustainability and ownership of project initiatives beyond its duration. - Strengthen partnerships with regional and national organizations to enhance the reach and impact of project activities, especially in disaster risk reduction and climate adaptation. - This approach will ensure that the project builds on its initial successes while addressing the challenges encountered during the early stages of implementation.

## Project Indicators

### List of indicators

Type of Indicator (indicators towards Objectives, Outcomes, etc...)	Indicator	Baseline	Progress Since Inception	Target for Project End
Goals	Anticipated number of beneficiaries Belize, direct	0	To be measured at the end of project	200, 50% women.
Goals	Anticipated number of beneficiaries Belize, Indirect	0	To be measured at the end of project	500, 50% women.

Goals	Anticipated number of beneficiaries Guatemala, direct	0	To be measured at the end of project	750, 50% women
Goals	Anticipated number of beneficiaries Guatemala, Indirect	0	To be measured at the end of project	14,000, 50% women.
Goals	Anticipated number of beneficiaries Honduras, direct	0	To be measured at the end of project	1,100, 35% Women
Goals	Anticipated number of beneficiaries Honduras, Indirect	0	To be measured at the end of project	21,000, 35% women.
Goals	Belize: Early Warning Systems	0	To be measured at the end of project	Original target: One Flooding Early Warning System. Proposed change in target by the end of the Project: One multi-hazard Community Early Warning System (CEWS) Comment 1: In Belize, climate-driven threats have shifted from a focus on flooding to forest and landscape fires. As it is not feasible to alter the focus of the Early Warning Systems (EWS) proposed in the project document, which primarily addresses hydrometeorological hazards, these EWS will be approached as multi-hazard systems in line with UNDRR guidelines. Additionally, synergies will be pursued with other relevant projects or programs, such as SERVIR Central America, to support the design and implementation of fire-specific EWS.
Goals	Guatemala: Early Warning Systems	0	To be measured at the end of project	Original target: One Flooding Early Warning System;

				<p>one landslide early warning system.</p> <p>Proposed change in target by the end of the Project: One multi-hazard Community Early Warning System (CEWS) Comment 2: Flooding in the lower watersheds and landslides in the upper and middle watersheds are related hazards, and a multi-hazard EWS approach is more efficient and allows different responses.</p>
Goals	Honduras: Early Warning Systems	0	To be measured at the end of project	<p>Original target: One Flooding Early Warning System; one landslide early warning system.</p> <p>Proposed change in target by the end of the Project: One multi-hazard Community Early Warning System (CEWS). Comment 3: Flooding in the lower watersheds and landslides in the upper and middle watersheds are related hazards, and a multi-hazard EWS approach is more efficient and allows different responses.</p>
Outputs	1.1 One set of adjusted regulation per country and these sets are shared between countries.	<p>No consideration of restoration as an adaptation measure. Land planning does not consider land restoration as a solution to Climate and Non-Climate drivers of landslides.</p>	<p>As part of the policy review process, the project management team conducted multiple engagements and coordinated activities with authorities to highlight the relevance of restoration policies in achieving adaptation goals. In</p>	<p>Countries have reviewed applicable regulations. local authorities and communities are made aware of trends and implications.</p>

			<p>parallel, the proposal of Nature-Based Solutions (NBS) as key adaptation measures and risk management actions was promoted. As a result of the work carried out in Year 1, a Report on the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Promoting Ecosystem Restoration as an adaptation and climate risk management measure in Belize, Guatemala, and Honduras was developed. The report identifies key regulatory instruments in each country to support restoration actions for adaptation and risk reduction in an inclusive manner, and highlights opportunities for improving these instruments. Additionally, workshops conducted simultaneously in Guatemala initiated the exchange of information on regulatory approaches between the three countries, establishing a foundation for regional collaboration on restoration policies. The Trinational Political Committee (CPT) of the project has been established with representatives</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			from the government agencies of the three countries and from CCAD/SICA, thus setting up the regional and national coordination bodies for REFORES. This committee has served as the baseline for consolidating the CPT, with active participation from the Central American Commission on Environment and Development (CCAD) of the Central American Integration System (SICA).	
Outputs	1.2 NAPs include the adaptation benefits of land restoration	NAPs NDCs do not include restoration as a meaningful measure.	<p>A progress report was delivered on "The Status of Adaptation in countries' NDCs and the use of Nature-Based Solutions (NbS) at the national level and within regional adaptation policies under the SICA framework." The report identifies opportunities for the consolidation or improvement of each topic (adaptation, restoration, and climate risk reduction), which will be key for designing workshops, meetings, and other processes for updating the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs).</p>	<p>Original target: NAPs and NDC if applicable reflect land use as a climate measure in the three countries. Proposed change in target by the end of the Project: NAPs, and where relevant, NDCs and other prioritized policy instruments by national entities, integrate the adaptation benefits of land restoration, drawing on bottom-up experiences at the community, local, and landscape scales."</p>
Outputs	2.1 Original indicator: Number of	0	WRI – Began the compilation of a	Original Target: One Regional



	<p>Regional information system in operation. Proposed change in indicator by the end of the Project: Number of Community Early Warning Systems validated by national emergency management organizations.</p>		<p>geospatial layer's database to assess climate vulnerability and establish a baseline for monitoring adaptation measures through Nature-Based Solutions (NBS). CATIE – Conducted a risk assessment and developed a design proposal for three Multi-Hazard Community Early Warning Systems (CEWS), one in each of the project's target landscapes. This process combined participatory assessments with technical analysis. As part of this activity, a Report on Extreme Events in the Project's Area of Influence was developed, including a preliminary description of potential sites for the development of Community EWS. The report, supported by the analysis of primary and secondary data, robustly defines four areas of interest for the implementation of Community EWS. This report will be complemented in Year 2 of the project with an analysis of the effectiveness of restoration actions in reducing risks from hydrometeorological disasters. The design process enabled the collection of diagnostic</p>	<p>information system is designed and is operated by CCCCC. Proposed change in target by the end of the Project: Three (3) Community Early warning systems in operation (1 in each country). Three Community Early Warning Systems validated by national emergency management organizations Comment 4: The proposed change corrects an error in the formulation of the results framework. The original indicator does not align with the output it was intended to measure. Specifically, this indicator corresponds to Output 4.3, which is not included in the current framework. To ensure better alignment with the actual output, both the indicator and target have been adjusted. This adjustment ensures consistency between the indicator and the relevant output, providing a more accurate and measurable result that is aligned with the project's objectives.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			information, facilitating the development of implementation plans tailored to the current needs of designated authorities and government representatives on disaster risk management. The proposal also integrates input from GESI specialists and will be validated together with local leaders in the communities located in the priority sites identified by the REFORES project.	
Outputs	3.1 Number of roundtable/networks	No roundtable/networks in existence	With the aim of achieving Nature-Based Solutions (NBS) readiness in Year 3, activities in the first year focused on conducting assessments to define project sites within the broader area of interest. These activities included reviewing the existing capacity and experience on NbS in each country's area of interest, a vulnerability assessment, the development of a results framework on the resilience expected from NbS, and the creation of a methodology for the participation of Indigenous peoples and local communities in the project. CATIE: A restoration roundtable was	Three roundtable/networks in operation, 50% of participants are women.

			<p>reactivated in Belize (National Restoration Roundtable), a local restoration network was created in Guatemala (Restoration Network in the Caribbean of Guatemala), and another in Honduras (Restoration Network of the San Idelfonso Microbasin), in addition to supporting another network in Honduras (Restoration Network of the Manchaguala Sub-basin). 38% of participants in the activation or creation workshops were women. The call for the reactivation and creation of these spaces was supported by governmental entities. In all cases, the newly established networks include representatives from governmental agencies, non-governmental organizations, local governments, academic centers, and the private sector. Community-based organizations and women's committees will be integrated into the networks in 2025. WRI: Defined the terms of reference for three independent consultancies (one</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			per country), aimed at providing information on the completeness of the necessary information for decision-making on restoration investments for adaptation.	
Outputs	3.2 Number of pilots implemented	Zero adaptation pilots on the ground. No projects available for financing.	To be measured at the mid-term and end of project	<p>Original Target: Three (3) adaptation projects implemented in the target areas.</p> <p>Adaptation activity in: - Belize includes Total area: 500 ha restored, two seed collection centers, one nursery. - Guatemala includes, total area 1800 ha, 3 seed collection centers and two nurseries - Honduras includes, 1800 ha, 4 seed collection centers, four nurseries. - 50% of all beneficiaries are women - At least one youth group is involved in implementation and maintenance in each country. Proposed change in target by the end of the Project: Three (3) adaptation projects implemented in the target areas.</p> <p>Adaptation activity in: - Belize includes a total area of 500 ha restored, two seed collection centres (either strengthening existing facilities or supporting new centers in the target landscapes), one nursery or other</p>

				<p>equivalent facilities or techniques in accordance with sites diagnostics; - Guatemala includes, total area 1,800 ha restored, three (3 ) seed collection centers (either strengthening existing facilities or supporting new centers in the target landscapes) and two nurseries or other equivalent facilities or techniques in accordance with sites diagnostics, - Honduras, 1,800 ha restored, 4 seed collection centers (either strengthening existing facilities or supporting new centers in the target landscapes), four (4) nurseries or other equivalent facilities or techniques in accordance with sites diagnostics. - 50% of all beneficiaries are women - At least one youth group is involved in implementation and maintenance in each country. Comment 5. Restoration for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation ranges from techniques that facilitate natural forest regeneration (passive restoration) to techniques such as forest plantations (active restoration). Restoration experiences</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				documented in the three countries through participatory workshops facilitated by REFORES include examples of passive and active restoration. It should be noted that the decision on the type of restoration depends on the site diagnosis, which includes the objectives and resources of the local populations (e.g. access to existing nurseries of governmental and non-governmental organizations) as well as their ecological conditions (e.g. availability of seeds, soil condition, exposure to fire).
Outputs	3.3 - Replicability potential for the use of land restoration as an adaptation measure assessed. - Number of cost benefit analysis completed. - Pipeline of potential adaptation projects are generated with at least 3 projects.	Zero assessments for replicability No projects available for financing.	To be measured at the mid-term and end of project	- Three assessments completed based on data generated through the implementation of the pilots. - Three cost/ benefit analysis completed one in each pilot area. - One pipeline of potential adaptation projects is generated with at least 3 projects.
Outputs	4.1 - Number of trained individuals. - Number of institutions involved.	0 0 - Number of institutions involved	To be measured at the mid-term and end of project	Original Target: 100, 50% of trainees are women. 9 - Number of institutions involved
Outputs	4.2 - Original indicator: Number of women lead organizations involved. Proposed change in indicator by the end of the	0 - Number of institutions led by women 0 - Number of women trained 2 - Number of impact funds participating	To be measured at the mid-term and end of project	3 - Number of women lead by or with management structures incorporating women. 50 - Number of women



	Project: Number of women lead by or with management structures incorporating women. - Number of women trained. - Number of impact funds participating			trained 4 - Number of impact funds participating
Outputs	<p>4.3 Original indicator: Number of Regional information system in operation. Proposed change in indicator by the end of the Project: One Regional Information System is designed to be operated by a collaborative regional network.</p>	0	To be measured at the mid-term and end of project	<p>Original target: One Regional information system is designed and is operated by CCCCC. Proposed change in target by the end of the Project: A regional exchange information scheme for provision of information and exchange of experiences on responses and results of CEWS is designed and socialized among beneficiary countries. Comment 6: Within the project results framework, the target and indicator for Output 4.3 are included under Output 2.1, as previously mentioned. This correction aligns the project's results framework to ensure consistency. Additionally, a change in both the target and the indicator is proposed based on the following considerations: - Alignment with Activity 4.3.1: The original proposal includes the design of a regional information</p>

				<p>exchange scheme for the provision of relevant information.</p> <p>- Modification of the hosting mechanism for the regional scheme: This mechanism should involve national emergency management organizations from the three beneficiary countries (Belize, Guatemala, and Honduras) instead of the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC), for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Absence of regional platforms operating Community Early Warning Systems (CEWS): According to the information collected during Year 1 of the project, no regional platforms or Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) organizations operate CEWS across all three involved countries. While the CCCCC collaborates with meteorological institutes and academic entities in the Caribbean, its reach does not extend to Central American nations such as Guatemala and Honduras. Furthermore, the CCCCC primarily focuses on promoting information exchange and providing technical and scientific</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>advisory services on DRR but does not engage in the direct implementation of CEWS. 2. National authorities responsible for CEWS operations: Based on the results obtained during Year 1 of project implementation, the government agencies responsible for CEWS operations in each beneficiary country—CONRED ("Coordinadora Nacional para la Reducción de Desastres") in Guatemala, COPECO ("Secretaría de Gestión de Riesgos y Contingencias Nacionales") in Honduras, and NEMO (National Emergency Management Organization) in Belize—do not participate in regional information exchanges at the level anticipated by the original indicator. Consequently, the target must be adjusted to reflect the roles and capacities of these national entities, ensuring an approach that aligns with the operational frameworks and capabilities of each country. The proposed change aims to design a flexible scheme that allows national</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				CEWS institutions to define its operation based on their national capacities and regulations, promoting the effective collection and exchange of information at the regional level. This approach strengthens local ownership and fosters regional collaboration without imposing external structures that may not be sustainable in the long term.
--	--	--	--	---

## Comments

Based on the review of indicators and the results achieved in Year 1 of the project, adjustments to the final targets of some indicators are proposed. It is important to note that at the end of this report, in the Supporting Documents section, Progress summary REFORES Year 1 CATIE and WRI is included, detailing the activities planned for each output and providing a summary of the tangible results achieved. The Executing Entities (EEs) have prepared these documents in Spanish. Should further details on any specific deliverable are required by the AF, these will be translated into English for better understanding.

## Lessons Learned

Implementation and Adaptive Management		
Describe any changes undertaken to improve results on the ground or any changes made to project outputs (i.e. changes to project design)	Challenges & Opportunities	1. About policies: • Strengthen technical capacity and promote the integration of nature-based solutions (NbS) into national and regional policies, ensuring that the benefits of restoration for adaptation and risk reduction are considered: It was identified that the cycles of updating policies and regulatory frameworks in the NAP and NDC strategies did not allow for the integration of data and information in a meaningful way during the first year of the project. To improve results, the project has proposed ongoing technical assistance to government authorities to facilitate the implementation and monitoring of its targets.

		<p>This technical support is aimed at effectively integrating the benefits of adaptation to land restoration, based on bottom-up approaches, using successful experiences at the community, local and landscape levels. 2. About early warning systems (EWS):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that early warning systems are validated and coherent across different levels of governance, allowing for faster and more effective responses to extreme weather events: To ensure that the establishment of EWS are effective at the local level, it was defined that the National Coordinator for Disaster Reduction (CONRED) in Guatemala, the Secretariat for Risk Management and National Contingencies (COPECO) in Honduras and the National Emergency Management Organization (NEMO) in Belize, are the key entities responsible for authorizing the operation of the EWS in their respective countries. The change consisted of improving the integration capacity of the EWS at the community level, ensuring that the designs of the systems can effectively connect the community levels with the higher levels of management (municipal and national).</li> <li>• Encourage greater integration of TSS in regional management, ensuring that alerts and strategies provide effective responses and are adapted to the specific needs of each country, allowing for better cross-border cooperation: It was proposed to promote and reflect the effort to establish regional TSS within the CCAD (Central American Commission for Environment and Development), which is the technical-political body attached to the Central American Integration System</li> </ul>
--	--	---

		<p>(SICA), instead of continuing to use the CCCCC platform, to strengthen cooperation between countries through a more regional approach in direct coordination with the CCAD. This change seeks to promote a more inclusive and collaborative approach among the countries involved, facilitating a better exchange of information and experiences. 3. About the restoration: • Strengthen local institutional capacities, providing municipal governments and NGOs with the necessary resources to effectively manage restoration and adaptation processes to climate change: Municipal governments and some NGOs demonstrated that they have a minimum structure to accompany restoration processes. It was decided to strengthen local capacity in terms of natural resource management and restoration, with the aim of strengthening local governments and encouraging them to assume additional responsibilities in ecosystem restoration, disaster risk reduction and the review of local public policies. • Ensure that restoration activities are more sustainable, adapted to the specific conditions of each site and adjusted to the resources available from local communities, ensuring an approach based on ecological and social resilience: The extent of restoration activities depends on the results of ecological assessments carried out by CATIE. This change seeks to define, based on the diagnosis of the sites, the most appropriate type of restoration, considering the local ecological conditions and the resources of the communities (such as access to nurseries and seeds). This implies a more detailed</p>
--	--	--



		<p>and flexible assessment of the conditions for adjusting interventions. 4. About knowledge management and capacity building: • Improve access to information and strengthen local capacity to implement climate change adaptation measures effectively, ensuring that all stakeholders (including youth, women and indigenous people) can understand and actively participate in the project: Improved the capacity to manage knowledge and strengthen local capacities through the creation of information networks that serve as spaces for the exchange of experiences, data, monitoring of goals and coordination of efforts. These networks will allow the integration of productive and community groups, as well as private companies. In addition, communication strategies were adjusted to translate the technical concepts of nature-based solutions (NbS) and resilience into an accessible and culturally acceptable and understandable language. 5. Use of GESI approaches: • Ensure gender equity and social inclusion in the implementation of the project, promoting meaningful empowerment of women as key actors in climate change adaptation: The GESI (gender equality and inclusive social approach) approach began to be introduced to ensure that women and other vulnerable groups have an active and balanced participation in all stages of the project. The project's indicators were adjusted to ensure that measures of women's participation are included at all levels.</p>
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been	Challenges	Safeguarding measures have been established and have been

<p>effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts?</p>		<p>effective during the start-up and implementation stage of the project, as no negative impacts have been experienced to date. It is expected that these measures will continue to be effective in preventing possible future impacts, considering their potential. Training is planned with the team of the technical unit of the executing entities during year 2, with the aim of strengthening the implementation and monitoring of safeguards throughout the project, including the active participation of local and community organizations in each of the beneficiary countries.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Challenges &amp; Opportunities</p>	<p>Specific safeguards for; (a) gender equality and women's empowerment, and (b) indigenous and native peoples, have been developed and implemented during the reporting period. Since the beginning of the implementation stage of the project, these safeguards have guided the project's activities from the beginning and ensure the integration of the gender approach throughout its implementation. So far, no negative impacts have been reported. Investment in gender safeguards has made it possible to (a) assess the level of integration of these considerations into stakeholders' policies and activities, and (b) improve the team's capacity to reflect on and analyze the influence of gender on the initial assessment. The project team constantly monitors gender issues and beneficiaries of project activities, initially ensuring women's active participation and engagement, as well as including women's contribution in the design phase. Lessons Learned:</p>

		<p>Lesson 1: The integration of gender-responsible institutions in each of the countries has been key to recognizing and capturing the ongoing institutional efforts of the countries in relation to women's issues, while strengthening these efforts through the incorporation of gender-sensitive policies into sustainable development processes (e.g., SEMUJER in Honduras). Lesson 2: It is vitally important to continue to review and integrate GESI principles into all project activities, as well as to redesign participant lists and tools to properly measure indicators, continue to adjust presentations and events to communicate the project's commitment to compliance with these principles. Lesson 3: Take into account the appropriate times, places and means to convene and seek participation in conditions of equity, providing opportunities to vulnerable groups (women, indigenous peoples and youth).</p>
<p>Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays?</p>	<p>Challenges &amp; Opportunities</p>	<p>During the initial implementation of the project, there were some administrative and coordination challenges inherent to the magnitude and complexity of the project, as well as the involvement of several implementing entities. However, these challenges were effectively managed, allowing a solid foundation to be established for successful execution in the short, medium and long term. The main factors contributing to the initial delays were as follows: 1. Formalization of contractual agreements with Executing Entities (EEs): The signing of the subsidiary agreements between CABI, CATIE and WRI required more time than expected due to the need to</p>

		<p>align administrative procedures and ensure compliance with CABEI regulations. While this process was longer than expected, it allowed for the establishment of a strong legal and operational relationship, which will benefit the implementation of the project in the long term. 2. CABEI's internal adjustments: CABEI's internal restructuring, carried out in a timely manner, contributed to a process of adaptation in internal procedures to comply with the specific requirements of this project. This adjustment made it possible to optimize the management of future projects, ensuring more efficient execution. 3. Compliance with pre-disbursement conditions and detailed planning for implementation: As this was the first time that the EEs (WRI and CATIE) have a contractual relationship with CABEI, additional time was required to comply with the conditions prior to the first disbursement, such as the validation and submission of key documents, such as work plans and deliverables, Procurement plan, terms of reference for external hiring, Operating Manual and the disbursement plan. This phase, although extended, has made it possible to establish a clear structure and a solid framework for the effective and sustainable implementation of the project. Measures taken to reduce delays: 1. Hiring of a Regional Project Manager: To streamline coordination and optimize review processes, a Regional Project Manager was hired by CABEI, who facilitated inter-institutional management and improved communication between CABEI and the Executing Entities (EEs). This key role</p>
--	--	--

		<p>has made it possible to efficiently address challenges and keep the project on track. 2. Implementation of a detailed supervision plan: A supervision plan was designed and implemented that ensures constant monitoring of activities, allowing the necessary adjustments to be made in a timely and efficient manner. This plan also ensures that any deviations are identified and corrected quickly to keep the project on pace. 3. Use of EEs' own resources for initial activities: In recognition of the delays in disbursements, the use of EEs' own resources was approved, which would be reimbursed later with the Project Funds. These resources allowed key activities to be carried out, such as national workshops and the participation of CATIE and WRI staff for the development of Terms of Reference (TOR) and other fundamental products for the first year. This allowed essential activities to continue to move forward without significant delays. 4. Accelerated Implementation Strategy: To ensure that the first-year goals were met despite initial delays, an accelerated implementation strategy was implemented, which made it possible to meet the intended results without compromising the quality of activities. This strategy ensured that the project maintained its continuous progress and the expected milestones were reached. 5. Training on CABEI procedures: The Executing Entities were trained on CABEI procedures, particularly in administrative/financial management of financed projects. This training made it possible to accelerate the implementation of activities</p>
--	--	---

		and establish a clear understanding of CABEI's processes, which contributed to reducing future delays and improving operational efficiency.
What implementation issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected progress?	Challenges & Opportunities	<p>1. The time required to comply with the conditions prior to the first disbursement caused a delay in the start of project activities. These processes were essential to ensure compliance with CABEI's regulations. As a lesson learned, administrative management was strengthened through the hiring of a Regional Project Manager, which made it possible to streamline coordination and ensure compliance with the established goals and deadlines.</p> <p>2. The requirements of CABEI's procurement procedures exceeded the internal processes of the Executing Entities (EEs), which caused delays in external hiring. The learning curve of EEs in these procedures generated additional obstacles to the timely execution of some activities. As a lesson learned, it is crucial to continue to further train EE staff and, in some cases, hire additional staff with procurement experience to improve efficiency and effectiveness in order to streamline the required procedures.</p> <p>3. It was identified that there are additional technical and capacity needs needed to develop and build Early Warning Systems (EWS) in each country. Existing capacities depend on institutional strength, which has been affected by low budgets, institutional transitions, previous storms that affected equipment, theft, and technical failures. The development of these technical and capacity needs is beyond the scope of this project but remains a key element in achieving the</p>



		<p>expected results. 4. The formation of roundtables to focus on restoration as an adaptation measure at the local level has been challenging, as the broader goals of restoration and its integration, together with the support of local actors, have not yet been developed at this scale. As a result, the project is focusing on strengthening existing roundtables and then building or introducing knowledge and strengthening the rationale and capacities for restoration as an adaptation measure, specifically. 5. The cultural differences between Belize, Honduras and Guatemala are reflected in the response to our engagement efforts and in the differences in the progress of activities. The case for synergies is therefore more complex and will require detailed management to fully capture and integrate experiences and lessons learned between countries, ensuring better coordination and mutual understanding. 6. The high potential for development during the hurricane season (September-October) should be considered in the planning of field activities, in order to reduce risks to field staff and implementing partners throughout the project implementation period.</p>
--	--	--

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

No

<b>Climate Resilience Measures</b>	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing climate adaptation measures that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	
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?	
<b>Readiness Interventions (Applicable only to NIEs that received one or more readiness grants)</b>	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in accessing and implementing climate finance readiness support that would be relevant to the preparation, design and implementation of future concrete adaptation projects/programmes?	
How have the outputs (such as manuals, guidelines, procedures or the experience from providing peer support, etc) from employing readiness grants been used to inform institutional capacity needs, gender issues, and environmental and social aspects in developing and implementing concrete projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	
<b>Concrete Adaptation Interventions</b>	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing concrete adaptation interventions that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes implementing concrete adaptation interventions?	
What is the potential for the concrete adaptation interventions undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	
<b>Knowledge Management</b>	
How has existing information/data/knowledge been used to inform project development and implementation? What kinds of information/data/knowledge were used?	
Has the existing information/data/knowledge been made available to relevant stakeholder? If so, what channels of dissemination have been used?	
Please list any knowledge products generated and include hyperlinks whenever possible (e.g. project videos, project stories, studies and technical reports, case studies, training manuals, handbooks, strategies and plans developed, etc.)	
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	
Describe any difficulties there have been in accessing or retrieving existing information (data or knowledge) that is relevant to the project. Please provide suggestions for improving access to the relevant data.	
Has the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	
<b>Innovation</b>	
Describe any innovative practices or technologies	

that figured prominently in this project.	
<b>Complementarity/ Coherence with other climate finance sources</b>	
Has the project been scaled-up from any other climate finance? Or has the project build upon any other climate finance initiative?	
If you answered yes, kindly specify the name of the Fund/Organization.	

## Results Tracker

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

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

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

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

**Core Indicator: No. of beneficiaries**

		<b>Total</b>	<b>% of female beneficiaries</b>	<b>% of Youth beneficiaries</b>
Baseline information	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	0	0	0
Baseline information	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	0	0	0
Baseline information	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0	0
Target performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	2050	50	0
Target performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	35500	50	0
Target performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	37550	50	0
Performance at mid-term	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at mid-term	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at mid-term	Total (direct +	0	0	0

term	indirect beneficiaries)			
Performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0	0

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

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

	Number of targeted stakeholders - Total	Number of targeted stakeholders - % of female targeted	Hazards information generated and disseminated	Overall effectiveness
Baseline information	0	0	Inland flooding	1: Ineffective
Target performance at completion	35500	50	Other	4: Effective
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

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

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

### 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	Inland flooding	Local	0
Baseline information	0	2: Monitoring and warning service	Inland flooding	Local	0
Baseline	0	2: Monitoring	Inland flooding	Local	0

information		and warning service			
Target performance at completion	1	2: Monitoring and warning service	Other	Local	2
Target performance at completion	1	2: Monitoring and warning service	Other	Local	2
Target performance at completion	1	2: Monitoring and warning service	Other	Local	2
Performance at mid-term					
Performance at completion					

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

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

	Number of staff targeted - Total	Number of staff targeted - % of female targeted	Sector	Capacity level
Baseline information	0	0	Multi-sector	2: Low capacity
Target performance at completion	100	50	Multi-sector	4: High capacity
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

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

	Total staff trained	% of female staff trained	Type
Baseline information	0	0	Public
Target performance at completion	100	50	Public
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

	Type	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information	Public	National	Multi-sector	1: No capacity
Target performance	Public	National	Multi-sector	4: High capacity

at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

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

	<b>Number of beneficiaries</b>	<b>Scale</b>	<b>Sector</b>	<b>Capacity Level</b>

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

### **Indicator 3.1: Increase in application of appropriate adaptation responses**

	<b>Percentage of targeted population applying adaptation measures</b>	<b>Sector</b>
Baseline information	0	Multi-sector
Target performance at completion	25	Multi-sector
Performance at mid-term		
Performance at completion		

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

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

	<b>No. of targeted beneficiaries</b>	<b>% of female participants targeted</b>	<b>Level of awareness</b>
Baseline information	0	0	1: Aware of neither
Target performance at completion	2050	50	4: Mostly aware
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

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

	<b>No. of technical committees/associations</b>	<b>% of women represented in committes/associations</b>	<b>Level of awareness</b>



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

#### 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

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

	Sector	Targeted asset	Changes in asset (quantitative or qualitative)

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

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

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

	Natural resource improvement level	Sector	Type
Baseline information	1: Ineffective	Multi-sector	Land
Target performance at completion	2: Partially effective	Multi-sector	Land
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

Core Indicator 5.1: Natural Assets protected or rehabilitated

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

Baseline information	Catchment area/Watershed/Aquifer	0	ha rehabilitated	1: Ineffective
Baseline information	Catchment area/Watershed/Aquifer	0	ha rehabilitated	1: Ineffective
Baseline information	Catchment area/Watershed/Aquifer	0	ha rehabilitated	1: Ineffective
Target performance at completion	Other	500	ha rehabilitated	2: Partially effective
Target performance at completion	Other	1800	ha rehabilitated	2: Partially effective
Target performance at completion	Other	1800	ha rehabilitated	2: Partially effective
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

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

	No. of targeted households	% of female headed households	Improvement level
--	----------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------

### 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
--	----------------------------	-------------------------------	---	------------------

## 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
--	------------------	----------------	--------	---------------------

### 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)
--	---	---------------	--------------------

## 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
--	-------------------

### 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
--	--	--------	-------	------

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

	No. of Development strategies	Regulation	Effectiveness
Baseline information	0	1: Not enforced (No elements implemented))	1: Ineffective
Target performance at completion	3	3: Partially enforced (Some elements implemented)	3: Moderately effective
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

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

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

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

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

	No. of innovative practices/ tools technologies	Sector	Status	Effectiveness
--	---	--------	--------	---------------

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

	No. of key findings generated	Type	Effectiveness
--	-------------------------------	------	---------------