

Project Performance Report

Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	6/1/2025 - 5/31/2026
Project Title	Climate Adaptation Innovation Accelerator Programme (CAIAP)
Project Summary	
Database Number	AF00000351
Implementing Entity (IE)	UN World Food Programme
Type of IE	Multilateral Implementing Entity
Country(ies)	Global
Relevant Geographic Points (i.e. cities, villages, bodies of water)	Year 1 - Cohort 1 (Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region): Egypt, Jordan, and Lebanon Year 2 - Cohort 2 (Asia-Pacific region): Philippines, Nepal and Pakistan Year 3 - Cohort 3 (Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) region): Peru, El Salvador, Dominican Republic
Name of Implementing Entity Focal Point	Regina Schmidt

Project Milestones	
AFB Approval Date	10/13/2023
IE-AFB Agreement Signature Date	2/20/2024
Start of Project/Programme	5/23/2024
Actual Mid-term Review Date (if applicable)	4/23/2027
Original Completion Date	5/22/2029
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 - Submitted on June 21, 2024

List the Website address (URL) of project

Project Contacts

National/Regional Project Manager/Coordinator	Name	Email	Date
Implementing Entity	Giorgia Pergolini	giorgia.pergolini@wfp.org	6/10/2026
Implementing Entity	Regina Schmidt	regina.schmidt@wfp.org	6/10/2026

Financial Data

Disbursement of AF grant funds

Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date (\$)	\$4,608,065.00
Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date (\$)	\$2,657,298.00
Project disbursement rate (%)	22.88
Project execution rate (%)	29.16
Add any comments on AF Grant Funds	Apart from the expenditures, we have high overall commitments and pre-commitments for Cohort 2 and 3 reflected in the planned expenditures schedule that will be actualized in the next reporting periods in accordance with the programme timelines. There are several reasons for that: Cohorts are running in parallel and programme timelines exceeding the timeline of the annual tranche and several cohorts are running in parallel. During the first two years the durations of the different cohorts is as follows: > Cohort 2 (Asia-Pacific): Design June-July 2025, Source July-Nov 2025, Boost Jan 2026, Grant March-April 2026, Accelerate April 2026-March 2027, Innovation Ecosystem and Community/MEL/KM April 2026 - March 2027. > Cohort 3 (Latin America and the Caribbean): Design June-July 2026, Source July-Nov 2026, Boost Jan 2027, Grant March-April 2027, Accelerate April 2027 - March 2028, Innovation Ecosystem and Community/MEL/KM April 2026 - March 2028. > Cohort 4 (Region tbc): Design June-July 2027.
Investment Income (\$)	\$0.00
Cumulative Investment Income since inception (\$)	\$0.00

Expenditure Data

Output	Amount (\$)
1.1	\$38,338.80
1.2	\$30,760.46
1.3	\$160,081.11
1.4	\$1,378,229.00
1.5	\$402,027.00
2.1	\$29,624.72
2.2	\$5,356.26
3.1	\$0.00

3.2	\$41,588.34
IE fee (\$)	\$206,386.33
Execution cost (\$)	\$10,631.00

Planned Expenditure Schedule

Output	Projected Cost (\$)	Estimated Completion Date
1.1	\$56,622.00	7/31/2027
1.2	\$32,298.00	11/30/2026
1.3	\$155,000.00	2/28/2027
1.4	\$2,339,880.00	4/30/2027
1.5	\$336,864.00	3/31/2028
2.1	\$123,256.00	3/31/2028
2.2	\$53,100.00	3/31/2028
3.1	\$63,545.00	3/31/2028
3.2	\$62,219.00	3/31/2028
IE fee (\$)	\$315,012.00	
Execution cost (\$)	\$10,000.00	

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
Financial management	Moderate	During the second reporting year, the WFP Innovation Accelerator continued with implementing structured grant management process, financial due diligence, milestone-based disbursement, and capacity-building for grantees, all of which are detailed in the following paragraphs. To reduce the risk of selecting ventures with inadequate financial or operational capacity, a rigorous sourcing and due diligence process was implemented. The programme launched a regional Call for Applications, receiving 278 submissions. These applications went through a thorough qualification and evaluation process, including initial review,

		longlisting, and a final voting session involving the WFP Innovation Accelerator and WFP Country Offices (Nepal, Pakistan, and the Philippines) participating in the second cohort. The process resulted in longlisting 20 ventures and concluded with shortlisting 11 that also received the official invitations to participate in the programme's Bootcamp. As part of the due diligence process legal and financial risk assessments were conducted in adherence to the United Nations operational due diligence standards and WFP's internal procedures, following the same process as for the first cohort. For the first cohort in the MENA region, after reviewing the venture performance, reach and potential, the WFP Innovation Accelerator has extended an invitation to 3 high potential ventures (two in Egypt and one in Jordan) to participate in a second sprint, to expand on work they have achieved during sprint 1. Full sprint application process, including financial and operational due diligence was conducted for all 3 ventures before contracting, using the same process and rules used for the first sprint. The WFP Country Office will continue to provide on-ground support and closely monitor the implementation of activities in line with the agreed workplans to ensure effective delivery and progress of sprint 2. The second cohort follows the same grant management and financial oversight procedures established during the first cohort. Grants continue to be disbursed through a milestone-based structure, with budgets finalized during the boost and contracting phases and funds released in 2–3 tranches linked to predefined outcomes in each venture's project tracker. Tranche payments are made only after the WFP Innovation Accelerator finance team reviews and approves submitted expense reports to confirm compliance with WFP regulations, approved budgets, and demonstrated progress. Financial oversight measures remain unchanged. Innovation Consultants conduct regular weekly or bi-weekly check-ins to review expenditure updates, while WFP Country Office focal points carry out quarterly field monitoring visits and ongoing follow-ups with ventures. Together with the WFP Innovation Accelerator, their role includes verifying implementation progress against agreed timelines and deliverables, supporting coordination with local stakeholders, identifying operational risks and challenges, and ensuring compliance with WFP procedures and donor requirements. Capacity-building arrangements also remain the same: ventures participate in a mandatory Grant Management Onboarding session led by the WFP finance team, covering reporting requirements, tools, and compliance expectations, with all materials shared via email after the session. To ensure adherence to WFP procurement standards and mitigate financial risk, ventures are again required to follow the Sprint Grant Management Guidelines and the Asset and Services Purchase Guidance, both annexed to their grant agreements. These documents outline the procedures for transparent and accountable fund use, including the requirement for prior approval for any fixed-asset purchases.
Programmatic risks	Moderate	The approach to mitigating programmatic risks for the second cohort mirrors the framework established for the first cohort, emphasizing a collaborative and proactive strategy. During the inception workshops for the first cohort in July 2025, stakeholders from government bodies, local innovation ecosystems, academia, youth organisations, NGOs and UN organizations actively participated in co-creating problem statements, ensuring the program's objectives were aligned with local contexts and priorities. This collaborative process was sustained throughout the design phase, enabling the program to remain responsive to stakeholder feedback and evolving needs, particularly in addressing challenges such as reduced productivity of smallholder farmers, water scarcity, insufficient climate information, lack of risk mitigation mechanism towards climate shocks, and interrupted access to market. A comprehensive risk assessment was conducted at the outset of the sprint, with risks documented at

		both the venture and programme levels. This assessment included the development of contingency plans to facilitate swift responses to any emerging risks. To maintain progress and address challenges, weekly or bi-weekly meetings were held with each venture, involving venture representatives, WFP Innovation Consultants, and Country Office Focal Points. These meetings focused on tracking project advancement, validating hypotheses, reviewing work plans, and monitoring key indicators, including environmental, social, and gender-related metrics. Tailored technical guidance and mentoring were provided to support ventures in overcoming operational and scaling challenges, while reinforcing best practices in project management and reporting. This structured approach ensures that the second cohort benefits from the same rigorous risk mitigation measures as the first, while remaining adaptable to its unique context.
Implementation risks	Moderate	The second cohort adopts the same implementation risk mitigation strategy as the first, focusing on resilience and relevance in fragile contexts through a human-centered design (HCD) approach and close coordination with WFP Country Office Focal Points. The program prioritizes adapting solutions to local realities, addressing climate and economic risks, and validating implementation plans through continuous stakeholder engagement and field visits. Recognizing the vulnerability of target geographies to shocks—such as climate change, economic hardships, political instability, and conflicts—the program applied HCD principles during inception workshops to ensure solutions are context-compatible, feasible, and sustainable. Stakeholder consultations, particularly with local governments and innovation ecosystem players, provided a nuanced understanding of challenges faced by smallholder farmers, processors, and consumers, ensuring that solutions remain responsive to country-specific needs. Contingency plans for these risks were documented in the program’s risk register and venture project trackers, aligning with the broader programmatic risk framework. To further strengthen implementation, each venture is supported by a dedicated WFP Country Office Focal Point, who monitors progress and participates in weekly/bi-weekly calls with the ventures and Innovation Consultants. At the start of the sprint, field visits were conducted in collaboration with Country Office Focal Points to review and validate project plans, ensuring readiness for implementation. These visits were carried out in May 2026 in Pakistan and are planned for June and July 2026 in Nepal and the Philippines. There is a specific identified implementation risk for two ventures from the first cohort who are conducting second sprints in Egypt. This is the potential delay in securing government approvals, which could impact timely project implementation and scaling. To mitigate this risk, the WFP Egypt Country Office will maintain close coordination with the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MALR), including early engagement and continuous follow-up. In parallel, preparatory actions such as initial field visits and technical alignment discussions will be initiated ahead of the formal approvals, where feasible. While these measures aim to reduce lead times, the risk of delays remains and will be closely monitored through ongoing engagement and planning. In Jordan, no such delays are foreseen, as the venture registration with the National Agricultural Research Center (NARC) has been established.
Coordination with government agencies	Low	The AFCIA programme has maintained a consistent approach on coordination with government agencies for the second cohort, mirroring the strategy applied in the first. Early engagement with government counterparts was prioritized from the design phase, ensuring their active involvement and alignment with program objectives. WFP Country Office Focal Points sustain regular communication with government participants throughout sprint implementation, providing updates on progress and promptly addressing any emerging challenges. In the first cohort, cooperation with the Egyptian government counterpart (the Ministry

		of Planning, Economic Development, and International Cooperation, or MoPEDIC) was strong at the beginning, including kickoff meetings at the Ministry (attended by the Minister), active involvement in the shortlisting process, and participation in the Bootcamp in Munich. However, during the sprint phase, several reorganizations and mergers with other ministries impacted this engagement and resulted in changes in focal points who were not able to continue with the consistent involvement in the programme activities as initially planned. Despite these challenges, the WFP Egypt Country Office maintained continuous communication with the Ministry, keeping them updated on progress and requesting support for project implementation when needed. In-person ecosystem events serve as additional platforms for engaging government agencies and fostering collaboration. These events facilitate multi-stakeholder discussions, enabling participants to identify synergies, share knowledge, and align efforts toward common goals. For the first cohort, the remaining ecosystem event in Egypt took place in December 2025 and for the second cohort, the ecosystem events are planned later in 2026. By sustaining this approach, the programme ensures effective coordination and strengthens partnerships with government agencies, supporting the successful implementation of cohort activities. Examples of the government counterparts that continued to be regularly informed and engaged throughout the first cohort in Lebanon are Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Environment. In Egypt the government counterparts are the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MALR) and Ministry of Planning & Economic Development and International Cooperation. In Jordan, the WFP Country Office maintained particularly close coordination with government counterparts through a dedicated steering committee involving the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), Ministry of Water and Irrigation (MoWI), National Agricultural Research Center (NARC), and Ministry of Environment (MoE). Regular coordination meetings were held to review implementation progress, strengthen alignment with national priorities, and facilitate engagement between ventures and key public sector stakeholders. For the second cohort, the following government counterparts were engaged during the inception workshop in Nepal: Ministry of Forests and Environment (MoFE) and Ministry of Energy, Water Resources and Irrigation (MoEWRI), National Planning Commission (NPC) and Department of Hydrology and Meteorology (DHM). In Pakistan, National Food Security and Research (MNFSR) ; Ministry of Planning, Development and Special Initiatives (MPD). In Pakistan Council of Research in Water Resources (PCRWR), and Pakistan Meteorological Department (PMD) attended the Inception Workshop. Last but not least, in the Philippines multiple government representatives were involved, mainly Department of Agriculture (DA), Climate Change Commission, Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), Department of Economy, Planning and Development (DEPDev), Department of Finance (DOF), Department of Budget and Management (DBM) and the Ministry of the Interior and Local Government. Importantly, targeted local government units were also involved throughout the process to help ensure national and local ownership, strengthen localization, and promote alignment with subnational planning and implementation priorities.
--	--	---

Critical Risks Affecting Progress (Not identified at project design)

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

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

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
-----------------	----------------	------------------------------

Risk Measures

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

N/A

ESP Compliance

Section 1: Identified ESP Risk Management

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

1.Compliance with the law

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

2.Access and equity

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	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)	Unequal access to innovations and resulting benefits within or across groupings, causing new or exacerbating existing intra- and inter-community

	conflicts.
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.	- Run community consultations prior and during the design of the intervention to ensure implementation in a way that avoids internal and external conflicts. - Keep communities informed about timelines for implementation including small-scale piloting to expansion. - During sourcing, determine whether the country context in which ventures currently operate, include any community conflicts. - Support early-stage ventures to identify pre-existing tensions and conflicts when selecting and entering their markets - Support growth-stage ventures to identify pre-existing tensions and conflicts when scaling their operations and expanding into new markets. - Implement WFP's conflict sensitivity mechanisms in case of an existing or uprising conflict. - Set up Community Feedback Mechanism (CFM)/grievance mechanisms for citizens to complain and achieve redress.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	- Number of consultation reports elaborated (yearly) - Number of conflicts resolution procedures set-up at local level
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	- Number of consultation reports elaborated (yearly): 0 - Number of conflicts resolution procedures set-up at local level: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	For the second cohort in Asia-Pacific we identified two instances of community unrest during the sourcing phase. In Nepal, large-scale anti-corruption protests and demonstrations emerged in September 2025, primarily driven by Generation Z students and young citizens. The unrest followed a nationwide ban on several social media platforms and was further fueled by public frustration over corruption. Similarly, on 4 September 2025, widespread demonstrations took place in the Philippines, centred on anti-corruption grievances linked to an ongoing controversy surrounding flood-control projects. To ensure preparedness and uphold a conflict-sensitive approach during the innovation challenge launch and sourcing process, the following measures were undertaken: 1) The sourcing team closely collaborated with WFP Country Offices, local partners, and community stakeholders to collect updated information on the demonstrations and assess potential risks. In Nepal, given the sensitivity and scale of the protests, several contingency plans were discussed, and a decision was made to postpone the domestic launch of the innovation challenge until the situation stabilised. 2) In the Philippines, the team verified that WFP and other relevant stakeholders were neither involved in nor adversely affected by the protests. These adjustments were thoroughly discussed and validated to ensure that the sourcing activities did not inadvertently amplify existing

community tensions. By embedding this mechanism, the team was able to detect early warning signs and implement timely precautionary measures, thereby maintaining responsible and conflict-sensitive engagement throughout the sourcing phase. In accordance with the safeguard requirement to conduct community consultations during the design and rollout of programme interventions, multiple stakeholder engagements were organised across all three countries as part of the inception workshops. Following these consultations, the innovation challenge was shared directly with workshop participants and broadly disseminated throughout the local innovation ecosystem. More than 180 local innovation enablers and relevant government entities received the information and further circulated it within their networks. The challenge was also promoted through official social media channels and published on the programme website to maximise visibility and accessibility. Throughout this process, particular attention was paid to conflict sensitivity, ensuring that both internal and external tensions, such as those previously identified in Nepal and the Philippines, were carefully monitored and managed. This comprehensive outreach and consultation approach ensured transparent communication with all relevant stakeholders regarding programme timelines, from small-scale pilots through to potential scale-up. Grievance mechanisms for citizens and beneficiaries have been set up to include the AFCIA programme within the existing robust WFP CFM mechanism, developed and coordinated separately by each WFP Country Office (Nepal, Pakistan and the Philippines). This system allows stakeholders to provide feedback, access information, request support, and resolve issues. Stakeholders can reach the team through a dedicated hotline and online support channels as per each WFP Country Office CFM. In addition, each innovation venture will engage in community workshops and training with the beneficiaries informing them about the available feedback and grievance mechanisms later in 2026. For the second sprint of the first cohort Jordan and Egypt WFP Country Offices will ensure accessibility and awareness of the CFM by raising awareness among beneficiaries on available channels, including the hotline and complaint boxes at the CDA level, to facilitate the submission of feedback and grievances. The programme team has also oriented the CFM team and will continue to support hotline agents by sharing relevant complaints and feedback scenarios related to the AFCIA programme to enhance their responsiveness. Additionally, ongoing monitoring and follow-up mechanisms are in place to track and address reported cases in coordination with the

	designated focal points, ensuring timely resolution and accountability.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Based on ongoing monitoring and regular communication with WFP Country Offices and local partners, some residual effects of the protests on local communities in Nepal were identified. One of them was a decreased visibility of the innovation challenge in the local community channels, however no other significant impacts on the AFCIA programme have been identified. The innovation challenge launch was postponed in response, and this did not lead to any long-term negative results for stakeholder engagement or participation. The operational readiness, accessibility, and community sentiment stabilized during and at the end of the sourcing process so there were no negative effects on the further programme stages. In the Philippines, although the innovation challenge launch and selection process proceeded without disruption from the protests, emerging tensions related to corruption narratives have been observed, particularly in the context of ongoing Kalmaegi typhoon-related damage and flooding. The programme team worked closely with the WFP Country Offices in monitoring community dynamics and ensuring that local sensitivities were adequately considered as the programme advanced.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	To address the residual community-level impacts identified in Nepal, the programme team maintained close coordination with the WFP Country Office to ensure early detection of any shifts in community sentiment. The innovation challenge deadline was postponed to allow sufficient time for local teams to apply despite the disruptions. Additional light-touch conflict-sensitivity checks were integrated into the next implementation milestones, and communication with stakeholders was reinforced to prevent misunderstandings or disruptions in case of re-emergence of local tensions. For the Philippines, the team continued to monitor sensitivities surrounding corruption-related issues, especially in areas affected by the typhoon. A cautious approach was applied in the next implementation phase, including regular updates from the WFP Country Office, proactive stakeholder engagement, and readiness to adjust timelines or engagement methods if community tensions intensify. These measures supported a conflict-sensitive programme environment and helped mitigate any emerging residual impacts. While there were no reported community conflicts in Pakistan during the sourcing phase, the team remained proactive and prepared, by monitoring the local news and maintaining open communications with stakeholders.

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

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	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)	Gender-based unequal access to innovation, leading to: a) Women relative to men become disempowered. b) Existing power imbalances are exacerbated or new ones created.
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.	- During sourcing, collect information on target audience and intended beneficiaries as criterion for selection - During sourcing, collect information on women's representation in the ventures' leadership team as criterion for selection - During bootcamp and sprint phase, work with relevant focal points to sensitise ventures on gender equality and adapt their business model to improve gender-inclusivity and targeting.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	- During sourcing - percentage of women in leadership positions. - Number of sensitisation sessions on gender.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	- During sourcing - percentage of women in leadership positions: 0 - Number of sensitisation sessions on gender: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	As part of the sourcing phase, data was collected on the percentage of women in full-time roles (including founders) as well as the gender of each venture lead, enabling systematic monitoring of women's representation and leadership within applicant ventures. The monitoring process provided clear visibility into gender dynamics at the leadership level and confirmed that women's participation was adequately reflected in the applicant pool, while taking into consideration each country's gender contexts. As lessons learned from the first cohort sourcing stage, the application form has incorporated dedicated questions on women's representation in leadership (along with other demographic details) in alignment with ESS Principle 5 – Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. In addition, applicants were required to provide key information about their users and target audience. This information was used to assess and score each solution, ensuring alignment with the needs, relevance and potential impact on the intended beneficiaries. From the second cohort sourcing phase, 66 out of 278 applications (24%) were submitted by a female founder, co-founder or representative in a leadership position. On average, the applied companies indicated 40% of employees in the organisation are female. For each application, there is qualitative information on the gender ratio of leadership positions within the organisation as well.

	From the selected ventures, 4 early stage ventures had 25% female leadership and 6 growth stage ventures had 58%. The Bootcamp curriculum for the second cohort included 3 gender sensitisation sessions, one pre-Bootcamp plenary session (Gender Equality and Innovation in Climate Adaptation Projects) and 2 individual venture working sessions on user /problem articulation, behavior change and human centered design. For both cohorts, after the Bootcamp, one extra session on Gender Considerations for AF projects was delivered, which provided a deep dive into the Adaptation Fund's gender policy, gender continuum framework, gender self-assessment tool and conducting gender analysis. For the first cohort in the MENA region, individual sessions on local gender contexts were conducted in June 2025 either with gender focal points from the respective WFP Country Offices or with the Innovation Consultants from the WFP Innovation Accelerator. The local gender context analyses with recommendations for each venture were shared in a written form with the ventures via email. We followed the same approach for the second cohort in the Asia-Pacific region with local gender analysis and context sessions delivered in May 2026. In addition, during the sprint phase, a session on designing projects using gender lens has been delivered by the Innovators Community.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual impacts were identified
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	No remedial actions are required.
6.Core labour rights	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Violation of labour rights and standards by external innovation ventures would jeopardise wellbeing and health of implicated people.
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.	- Conduct thorough operational and financial due diligence check. - Educate ventures on the importance of labour rights. - Manifest compliance with labour rights through signatures of the sprint agreements. - Conduct visits of ventures' operational sites.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Regular unannounced visits to ventures' sites by WFP staff in country offices.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Regular unannounced visits to ventures' sites by WFP staff in country offices: 0

Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	The same operational and financial due-diligence arrangements used in the first cohort were applied again during the reporting period for the second cohort. This included a structured, multi-step grant award and vetting process consisting of a two-stage application review, operational due diligence, in-depth assessment meetings with shortlisted ventures, and required approvals from the Head of Unit and the Head of the Innovation Accelerator. Financial due diligence was also repeated, including a review of audited or signed financial statements and a risk-level assessment. As in the previous cohort, the process concluded with an Innovation Compliance Committee (ICC) review to confirm that transparency, competition, and segregation of duties were upheld. Operational due diligence again focused on identifying potential reputational risks, while financial due diligence ensured ventures demonstrated sound financial management and stability. The same grant management and due-diligence procedures were also applied to ventures from the first cohort entering their second sprint. Although these ventures had already undergone the full grant award process during their initial sprint, they were required to submit a new sprint application, which was reviewed following the same operational and financial due-diligence steps. This included reassessing operational risks, reviewing updated financial documentation, and completing the process with an Innovation Compliance Committee (ICC) review to ensure continued transparency and compliance. Sprint programme agreements for the second cohort were screened by WFP Headquarters (HQ) legal office for compliance with international and domestic law, including the labor rights. The sprint programme agreements were signed by all the ventures and WFP in May 2026 and upon signature the ventures committed to comply with core labour rights. Unannounced and announced visits of the ventures' operational sites by WFP Country Office focal points and Innovation Consultants (where applicable) are planned for later in the year in all three countries of the second cohort. For the first cohort, further visits were conducted during the sprint programme implementation to ensure compliance with labor laws and project plans as well as ensuring wellbeing and health of the people involved.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual impacts were identified
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	No remedial actions are required.
7.Indigenous people	

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
8.Involuntary resettlement	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
9.Protection of natural habitats	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table	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)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Degradation of natural habitats.
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.	- Adhere to WFP's environmental and social safeguards. - Sensitize ventures on the protection of natural habitats during bootcamps and sprints. - Conduct consultations with local authorities before introducing any innovation that may impact natural habitats.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Number of sensitisation sessions on natural habitats
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Number of sensitisation sessions on natural habitats: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	During the reporting period, the same ESMP-related contractual arrangements and monitoring procedures used in the first cohort were applied again for the second cohort. All sprint programme contracts continued to include an annex outlining each venture's ESMP commitments, along with the required monitoring and reporting obligations. Innovation Consultants maintained regular weekly or bi-weekly check-ins with ventures to track implementation of ESMP actions and ESS measures. As in the previous cohort, none of the ventures' ESMPs identified innovations that posed risks to natural habitats. Consequently, no sensitisation sessions or consultations with government authorities were required, as no activities had the potential to impact natural habitats in either cohort.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual impacts were identified
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	No remedial actions are required.
10.Conservation of biological diversity	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Biodiversity loss
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	- Adhere to WFP's environmental and social safeguards. - Source innovations locally and regionally to prevent introduction of alien/invasive species. - Sensitize ventures on the protection of

safeguard measures by activity.	biological diversity during bootcamps and sprints. - Conduct consultations with local authorities before introducing any innovation that may impact biodiversity.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Number of sensitisation sessions on natural habitats
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Number of sensitisation sessions on natural habitats: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	The same ESMP-related procedures used in the first cohort were applied again during the second cohort. All sprint programme contracts continued to include an annex outlining each venture's ESMP plan along with the required monitoring and reporting obligations. Innovation Consultants maintained their regular weekly or bi-weekly check-ins with ventures to track implementation of ESMP actions and ESS measures throughout the sprint period. Since ventures that posed a risk to biodiversity or introduced alien/invasive species were excluded via a knockout criterion, no negative residual impacts were identified. In practice, we monitored for potential risks by asking applicants to confirm that their solutions would not involve alien or invasive species and would comply with local biodiversity standards. Because all shortlisted ventures met these requirements, the monitoring indicator showed zero instances of biodiversity harm or invasive species introduction. Consequently, no sensitisation sessions or consultations with government authorities were required, as no activities had the potential to impact natural habitats in either cohort. In addition, for the second cohort, 191 out of 278 applications (69%) are home-grown companies in the targeted country (i.e. started and registered locally), an additional 35 applications are foreign companies that already has a local footprint (in the form of e.g., local office).
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual impacts were identified
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	No remedial actions are required.
11.Climate change	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented	

during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
12. Pollution prevention and resource efficiency	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	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)	Pollution or generation of waste as a side-product of an innovation
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.	- Actively minimise the generation of waste by-products by avoiding unnecessary resource use, seeking to prolong their useful life, reusing, recycling and/or recovering materials. - Apply pollution prevention and control principles tailored to specific hazards and consistent with internationally recognized approaches and standards.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Volume of water/fuel used.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Original monitoring indicator: Volume of water/fuel used: 0 Suggested monitoring indicator replacement: - Number of sensitisation sessions on pollution and resource use: 0 - Number of ventures with ESMP risks under this category monitored by the Innovation Consultants: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	For the first cohort, a sensitisation session on pollution prevention and resource efficiency was delivered on 17th December 2025 by WFP experts for waste management and circular economy for two ventures that had identified the specific risk of pollution and resource use in their ESMPs. This session was tailored to the unique environmental context of the implementing country and distinct nature of each venture's innovation. Other ventures from the cohort interested in this topic joined the session as well. From the second cohort, three ventures have identified the ESP risks related to pollution and resource use and outlined corresponding mitigation measures in their ESMPs to be implemented as part of their project activities. Compliance, along with any issues or updates, will be

	monitored and reviewed as needed during the weekly/bi-weekly check-in calls with the Innovation Consultants and a separate sensitisation session on pollution prevention and resource efficiency will be delivered during the sprint phase.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	No residual impacts were identified
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	No remedial actions are required.
13.Public health	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	
14.Physical and cultural heritage	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	
State the baseline condition for each monitoring	

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

Section 2: Monitoring for unanticipated impacts / corrective actions required

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

Section 3: Categorisation

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

Section 4: Implementation arrangements

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?

Capacity-building activities for the core programme implementation team were carried out during the setup and delivery of the first cohort and were reported in detail in the first PPR. Therefore, during the second cohort, the implementing entity focused its capacity-building efforts on the ventures participating in the programme. The first activity was an online plenary session led by the WFP Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) expert from the WFP Nepal Country Office, held prior to the in-person Bootcamp in January 2026. This session introduced the Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and its key components. A second plenary session provided further detail on WFP and AF ESS requirements and safeguard frameworks and explained the ESS screening questionnaire. Ventures completed this questionnaire during the Bootcamp with support from their facilitators and WFP Country Office focal points. Each venture also received an individual coaching session with the ESS expert during the Bootcamp, in which their ESS screening was reviewed and recommendations for adjustments were provided. The ESS screening results informed the sprint programme selection process: only ventures classified as low Category B or Category C were admitted. None of the ventures shortlisted for or participating in the Bootcamp were classified as Category A risk. During the contracting phase, the Environmental and Social Risk Management Plans (ESMPs) were prepared and included in the contract annex. They can be found in the section 5 of this report. For the three ventures that continued with the second sprint from the first cohort, a separate ESS screening has been conducted at the beginning of their sprint to assess the ESS risks and update ESMPs based on the updated project activities. The updated ESMPs are also included in the section 5 of this report. Clear institutional responsibilities for ESS compliance have been maintained throughout the reporting period. The Programme Manager, MEL Consultant, and designated ESS focal persons are responsible for reviewing ESS documentation, monitoring implementation of mitigation measures, and following up on corrective actions where required. ESS compliance has been integrated into venture selection, sprint monitoring, and regular programme review processes. Ventures were also informed of the procedures for reporting safeguard-related incidents, complaints, or concerns during implementation. All ESS screening forms, ESMPs, monitoring records, and risk mitigation actions have been systematically documented and maintained by the implementing entity. In addition, monitoring and evaluation of ESP safeguard measures has been conducted continuously throughout the programme

	by the Programme Manager and the Programme MEL Consultant to ensure compliance. Moreover, the MEL Consultant maintains a separate risk register outlining potential risks, their categories, likelihood, and contingency plans. Quarterly and ad hoc checks are carried out to monitor these risks.
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?	WFP Country Office Focal Points together with the Innovation Consultants do regular ventures' ESMP plan monitoring to ensure the compliance with the ESP. For the first cohort, ESMP monitoring tool remained in the project trackers, however for the second cohort, it has been moved to an online monitoring platform for easier monitoring and aggregation of results. Each venture has their own reporting page where they enter their ESMP monitoring data that is reviewed and monitored by the MEL and Innovation Consultants. For the second cohort, WFP Country Office focal points will also conduct visits of ventures' operational sites to check on implementation of the ESP safeguard measures as well as labour laws. For the first cohort, these checks were already conducted at the start of the sprint as reported in first PPR.
Have the implementation arrangements at the EEs been effective during the reporting period?	Yes

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

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

Identified USPs in the reporting period	Application of ESMP to the USP	ESP risks identified for the USP	Has an impact assessment been carried out?	Consultation held for risks and impacts identification for USP	Gender disaggregation to identify risks and impacts	Safeguard measures identified for the USP	Monitoring indicator(s) for each impact
USP 1: Remer	Yes	12. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	Yes	Yes	No	1. Introduce a refill program offering discounts to	1. Percentage of farmers participating in the refill

		12.5.1 A significant increase in generation of waste that will not be disposed of in an environmentally friendly manner (recycled, re-used, or recovered) by WFP, beneficiaries, or third parties				farmers for reusing containers. 2. Deliver large quantities via tanks to minimize individual packaging needs 3. Transition from liquid to powder form to enable eco-friendly packaging	program 2. Reduction in single-use plastic containers 3. Progress in transitioning to powder form
USP 2: Partners with Sun	Yes	2 Access & Equity 2.3.1 The activity could lead to dissatisfaction due to lack of beneficiary and stakeholder participation consultation and planning. 12. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency 12.5.1A significant increase in generation of waste that will not be disposed of in an environmentally friendly manner (recycled, re-used, or recovered) by WFP, beneficiaries, or third parties 13.	Yes	Yes	No	2.3.1 Risk mitigation measures will be taken where the whole intervention will be coordinated and will be given clearance via the appropriate licenses to set up and operate the solution. Engagement with local stakeholders will be done at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the Sprint. Information on Community feedback mechanisms will be communicated. 12.5.1. Risk	2.3.1 Quarterly monitoring 2.3.1 Indicators: 1. Number and level of feedback gathered from CFM on the intervention 12.5.1. Quarterly monitoring 12.5.1. Indicators: 1. 2 times a year maintenance 2. Guide provided to ensure knowledge on the process post-life of the assets process is clear. 3. Level of understanding on solar panels disposal after end of life 13.1.1

		Public Health 13.1.1The activities could lead to increased community risks from e.g. increased traffic, inappropriate design or use of equipment and materials which would not be handled by following normal Standard Operating Procedures				mitigation measures will be taken where Partners with Sun will provide guidance and support to the bakeries with the management of the solar panels after lifespan. The solar panels will be disassembled, and the parts will be reused and/or recycled following standard procedures. 13.1.1 Fire extinguishers Fire instructions (Arabic, French, and English) SOP delivered and signed Fire detector First aid/kit regular safety training Personal Protective Equipment	Quarterly monitoring and ad-hoc visits to check availability and compliance 13.1.1 Indicators 1. Number of fire extinguishers and fire detector installed and functioning 2. SOP in three languages developed, signed, and implemented 3. Number of first aid kits on-site 4. Number of safety trainings on fire risks conducted
USP 3: PVita (Sprint 1)	Yes	13. Public Health Increased risk to community health and safety from equipment use, materials,	Yes	Yes	No	1. Provide PPE and safety training for workers. 2. Implement ISO 45001 (Occupational Health & Safety). 3.	1. Worker safety reports 2. Incident tracking 3. ISO 45001 compliance audits 4. Road safety monitoring

		transportation, or natural hazards				Allocate a budget for safety trainers. 4. Ensure strict traffic control measures and vehicle maintenance . 5. Engage local authorities to manage risks.	
USP 4: NoorNation (Sprint 1)	Yes	13. Public Health Installation at site and Manufacturing at factory	Yes	Yes	No	1. Engagement of Safety Consultant: A dedicated health, personnel, and equipment safety consultant will oversee all installation stages, ensuring adherence to safety protocols and providing regular audits and training 2. Lightweight and Modular Design of the SIaaS: The system components, including LifeBox, are designed for modularity and ease of assembly, minimizing the need for heavy lifting or complex	Quarterly monitoring by NoorNation's Project Management Team and Health & Safety Consultant and Project/Site/Field Engineers

						equipment during installation 3. Use of Safe Infrastructure: Installation involves simple, unarmored concrete plinths, avoiding extensive groundwork or the use of hazardous materials, ensuring a secure and stable base for the system Standard operating procedures for installation include pre-installation risk assessments, use of personal protective equipment (PPE), and controlled site conditions to prevent accidents 4. Dispatching First-Aid kits being available across all on-site and on-factory locations in addition to first-aid trained personnel	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

USP 5: Adaptive Symbiotic Technologies (AST) (Sprint 1)	Yes	2 Access and Equity 2.3: The target beneficiaries or stakeholders could be dissatisfied due to limited consultation during activity design or implementation (including due to inadequate Complaints and Feedback Mechanisms) 2.3.1: The activity could lead to dissatisfaction or negative impacts due to lack of beneficiary or other stakeholder participation in planning, design, implementation, or general decision-making 5. Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment 5.1.2: The activity could create or amplify conditions for gender-based inequalities	Yes	Yes	No	2.3 AST, in consultation with WFP JOCO and the government of Jordan will prepare a stakeholder engagement and awareness creation plan to solicit key stakeholder input. This stakeholder engagement plan will mitigate risks that all key voices will not be heard through broad awareness raising, focus groups, and incorporating feedback into the design of the interventions. Further, AST and JOCO will institute robust monitoring that will solicit information from all levels, and learning will be fed back into the project during implementation. 2.3.1. The project	2.3. The project will leverage JOCO CFM tool which is robust and is already in place to ensure feedback is monitored and acted upon. Submission of the stakeholder engagement plan to WFP JOCO at inception before implementation and reports on its implementation including minutes of stakeholder engagements completed. 2.3.1. The team will hold stakeholder meetings during the project kick-off, halfway through the project and at the end. The team will also leverage the CFM tool to ensure that complaints are captured and addressed. All engagements with stakeholders will be
--	-----	--	-----	-----	----	--	---

						will include risk mitigation measures and work with WFP JOCO and the government to consult key stakeholders at multiple levels (National, Sub-National, Community and Farm) as per the proposed stakeholder engagement plan . AST will get the word out to stakeholders about the project and provide contact information on online and offline tools for feedback. 5.1.2. The project will apply risk management measures to address gender-based inequalities. The project will include communication to highlight equality goals and leverage WFP JOCO CFM for	documents via meeting minutes. 5.1.2. At least once a month, AST team members will document the involvement of women during visits to farms and farming villages, including during the recruitment phase of the project.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						reporting and addressing inequality issues.	
USP 6: Deploy Tech	Yes	2. Access and Equity 2.2: The activity could create or exacerbate intra- or inter-community conflicts 2.3: The target beneficiaries or stakeholders could be dissatisfied due to limited consultation during activity design or implementation (including due to inadequate Complaints and Feedback Mechanisms) 2.3.1: The activity could lead to dissatisfaction or negative impacts due to lack of beneficiary or other stakeholder participation in planning, design, implementation, or general decision making	Yes	Yes	No	2.2 To address this, the project will include risk mitigation measures to decrease the risk of conflicts. Conduct robust stakeholder consultations. Develop and share transparent eligibility criteria. Raise awareness in communities about opportunities for training and learning. Incorporate community feedback into project design. The project will ensure robust stakeholder consultation and create a stakeholder engagement plan in consultation with WFP JOCO CFM. Eligibility criteria will be established and shared transparently with all.	2.2., 2.3., 2.3.1. Quarterly feedback collection by Deploy Tech leveraging WFP JOCO CFM.

						Awareness Raising will be done with communities where the tanks will be installed, and it will be clear that there are opportunities for the training and learning components associated with this project. Feedback will be gathered from the community on the initial interventions and re-incorporated into the design as the project moves forward. 2.3. Deploy intends to minimize this risk by conducting focus groups, awareness raising sessions and developing a stakeholder engagement. Deploy and WFP will publicize feedback channels so there is a mechanism for feedback during the pilot. This	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						will be through the WFP CFM that anyone in Jordan can use to give feedback on initiatives. 2.3.1. Deploy will ensure continuous consultation and collaboration is essential to avoid misunderstandings, improve adoption, and maximize the positive impact of the project. All external participants will undergo a transparent prescreening process to prevent dissatisfaction. Further WFP has a robust CFM tool that will be used to give feedback on a WFP funded	
USP 7: Responsive Drip Irrigation (RDI)	Yes	2. Access and Equity 2.2.1. The activity could lead to opening up of existing or creating new minor conflicts or disagreements	Yes	Yes	No	2.2. and 2.2.1. To address this, the intervention will promote collaboration and equitable resource distribution,	2.2. and 2.2.1. RDI will conduct monitoring of this risk as they are working with farmers and other stakeholders. Further

		within or between groupings or communities 2.3: The target beneficiaries or stakeholders could be dissatisfied due to limited consultation during activity design or implementation (including due to inadequate Complaints and Feedback Mechanisms) 2.3.1: The activity could lead to dissatisfaction or negative impacts due to lack of beneficiary or other stakeholder participation in planning, design, implementation, or general decision making				minimizing the risk of conflict. The project will work with broad community stakeholders to increase awareness of the benefits of the intervention. Individual farms will be selected through a transparent, advertised opt-in announcement published widely across Jordan. In addition, focus group consultations with farmers and other stakeholders will be conducted. 2.3 and 2.3.1. As a risk mitigation measure, regular surveys, training sessions, focus group discussions, and consultation sessions will be conducted with all stakeholders to ensure their input is collected	WFP's CFM mechanism generates weekly reports which can be shared if there are complaints. 2.3. and 2.3.1. RDI will conduct monitoring of this risk as they are working with farmers and other stakeholders. Further WFP's CFM mechanism generates weekly reports which can be shared if there are complaints.
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	---

						and considered during the project's design, implementation, and monitoring stages. A direct feedback channel to RDI, through the robust WFP CFM, will further ensure that their concerns are addressed.	
USP 3: PVita (Sprint 2)	Yes	12. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency 13. Public Health	Yes	Yes	No	12. Operate within the licensed Luxor facility; comply with EEAA Law 4/1994 and WFP safeguards; segregate and dispose of waste through licensed contractors; maintain an environmental logbook 13. Provide PPE and safety induction; apply ISO 45001 practices; enforce traffic and vehicle controls; coordinate with local authorities via the	12. Quarterly logbook review; waste-diversion %; non-conformance closure. (If needed) 13. Monthly incident reports, PPE issuance log, road-safety checks, and grievances resolved.

						project Feedback Mechanism.	
USP 4: NoorNation (Sprint 2)	Yes	13. Public Health	Yes	Yes	No	13.1 Engagement of Safety Consultant: A dedicated health, personnel, and equipment safety consultant will oversee all installation stages, ensuring adherence to safety protocols and providing regular audits and training 13.2. Lightweight and Modular Design of the SIaaS: The system components, including LifeBox, are designed for modularity and ease of assembly, minimizing the need for heavy lifting or complex equipment during installation 13.3 Use of Safe Infrastructure: Installation involves simple, unarmoured	Quarterly, NoorNation's Project Management Team and Health & Safety Consultant and Project/Site/Field Engineers Indicator: Number of Monitoring Visit, Number of Incident

						concrete plinths, avoiding extensive groundwork or the use of hazardous materials, ensuring a secure and stable base for the system Standard operating procedures for installation include pre-installation risk assessments, use of personal protective equipment (PPE), and controlled site conditions to prevent accidents. Dispatching First-Aid kits being available across all on-site and on-factory locations in addition to first-aid trained personnel	
USP 5: Adaptive Symbiotic Technologies (AST) (Sprint 2)	Yes	5. Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment	Yes	Yes	No	In the context of Jordan, women could potentially face barriers in accessing new agricultural technologies	AST will document the involvement of the number of women trained and incorporating AST products into

						due to existing socio-cultural norms and unequal access to resources. There is a risk that benefits from the intervention may not be equitably distributed unless specific inclusion measures are implemented . AST will customize targeting tools to ensure participation of women, promoting women's representation in decision making processes and work with distribution partners and women NGO's to ensure inclusivity of women and marketing efforts will be directed at all members of the farming communities .	crop production. All marketing and training material will be sex-disaggregated. AST will market directly to women farming Coops and farmers. AST will also obtain feedback from women farmers regarding access to our products.
USP 8: Gham Power	Yes	3. Marginalized and	Yes	Yes	No	3.1. Maintain the freemium	3.1. The percentage of women

		Vulnerable Groups 7. Indigenous Peoples 12. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency				access model so that more than 80% of advisory tools remain accessible to all farmers without payments. 3.2. Prioritize marginalized farmers, women, and less literate groups during local trainings and in-person demonstrations through MFIs, cooperatives, agrovet, and community-based organizations. 3.3. Improve UI/UX design during the sprint phase to support less literate farmers with simplified navigation, audio features, enhanced icons, and visuals. 3.4. Ensure at least 50% participation of women during the pilot activities. 3.5. Align implementation with the	among active users will be monitored monthly with app analytics, Google Analytics, and registration data. 3.2. The percentage of marginalized groups (defined as women, smallholders <0.55 ha, remote farmers, and socially disadvantaged groups) will be monitored quarterly through registration data, partner reports, and field verification. 3.3. User satisfaction and usability feedback from marginalized groups will be collected through surveys, focus group discussions, and user ratings, during mid-sprint and at the end. 7.1. Records of both community
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Nepal Social Inclusion Policy, and AF Guidance. 7.1. Ensure that participation of indigenous farmers is strictly voluntary and there is no coercion involved. 7.2. Apply Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) principles before engaging indigenous communities . Consent will be documented through attendance records, signed or thumbprint consent forms, and meeting reports maintained by trained field staff. At the individual level, farmers enrolling in the Super Krishak app	and individual consent will be maintained and made available for monitoring and verification. 7.2. Quarterly review of culturally appropriate content delivery. 7.3. Feedback mechanism available in local languages. 12.1. The percentage of advisory content promoting IPM/organic practices will be monitored through content review by agri-experts monthly. 12.2. Adverse environmental or health incidents will be monitored through a feedback mechanism and partner reports continuously. 12.3. Farmer-related changes in chemical use
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						will be required to accept a clearly defined consent clause in the Terms and Conditions, available in simple Nepali. 7.3. Ensure advisory content and IoT sensors are culturally appropriate and respect local community practices. 7.4. Consult with indigenous community representatives prior to engagement. 7.5. Provide advisory content in local languages where applicable. 12.1. Ensure that all advisory recommendations are precise, disease-specific, and evidence-based, reducing the likelihood of blanket chemical use. 12.2. Prioritize Integrated Pest	will be monitored continuously through surveys, and in-app comments and messages.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						Management (IPM), organic practices, and environmentally friendly alternatives as first-line recommendations wherever feasible. 12.3. Ensure clear guidance on safe, regulated, and minimal chemical usage, including dosage, timing, and handling practices. 12.4. Align all advisory content with Nepal Environmental Protection Act and relevant national environmental standards.	
USP 9: DV Excellus	Yes	5. Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment 10. Conservation of biological diversity 12. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency 15. Land and soil conservation	Yes	Yes	No	5. Gender-sensitive outreach and training, Digital and financial literacy support for women, Promotion of shared household decision-making, Confidential grievance and feedback	5. % of women registered and actively using services (quarterly), Participation of women in trainings and loans (quarterly), Complaints related to gender issues (quarterly), % of women

						mechanisms, conduct targeted community engagement sessions for male household members and community leaders to address social norms and reduce household tension, ensure gender-responsive facilitation: schedule training at times and locations suitable for women; engage female trainers wherever available 10. Use of certified and government-approved supplier, Supplier compliance checks, Farmer awareness on approved seed varieties, Monitoring of seed sourcing, Alignment with national biodiversity and seed certification regulations, Periodic	in decision-making roles within project-supported groups (target: $\geq 30\%$), % of women reporting control over financial resources received through the programme (post-distribution survey) 10. Supplier compliance records (quarterly), Farmer feedback on seed performance (per season), % of agricultural inputs sourced from certified suppliers (target: 100%), Number of biodiversity-related incidents reported per project period (target: 0 unresolved), Number of government coordination meetings on biodiversity compliance. 12. Reports of improper waste
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						field-level verification of seed use and ecological impacts (minimum once per growing season), Promotion of local, indigenous, and climate-resilient crop varieties in farmer advisory sessions, Coordination with relevant government agencies (e.g., District Agriculture Office) for compliance monitoring, Integration of biodiversity conservation awareness in farmer advisory and extension services. 12. Farmer awareness on waste management , Promotion of recyclable/biodegradable packaging, Guidance on safe disposal practices, Promotion of Integrated Pest Management	disposal (field-verified quarterly by Field Officer), % of farmers demonstrating safe waste disposal practices (target: $\geq 75\%$ by end of Year 1, verified through field visits), Reduction in observed open burning of plastic materials, Number of plastic waste collection points established and operational. 15. Farmer land-use practices and Reports of land conversion
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						(IPM) principles to reduce chemical dependency, Linkage of farmers with local waste collection and recycling systems, Establishment of designated collection points for plastic waste at distribution sites, Encouragement of safe material reuse where technically appropriate, Guidance on responsible agrochemical storage, handling, and disposal 15. Advisory guidance on sustainable land use, Awareness on avoiding cultivation in sensitive areas, Promotion of productivity on existing farmland	
UPS 10: Seed Innovations	Yes	2. Access and Equity 3. Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups 7. Indigenous	Yes	Yes	No	2.1 Conduct pre-enrolment orientation through cooperatives and local field	2.1 Number of orientation sessions completed. 2.2 IEC materials distributed/displayed

		Peoples				channels. 2.2 Provide simple local-language disclosure materials covering eligibility, premium, trigger, payout conditions, exclusions, and complaints channels. 2.3 Display key information and contact details at cooperative offices and other local touchpoints. 2.4 Maintain multiple complaints/feedback channels, including hotline, phone/SMS/WhatsApp and app-based channels where relevant. 2.5 Use mass awareness and local trusted messengers to reach farmers beyond direct cooperative meetings. 3.1 Use inclusive multi-channel outreach, not a single-	2.3 Complaints received, categorized, and resolved within agreed timeframe. 2.4 Evidence of outreach beyond cooperative meetings. 3.1 Sex-disaggregated enrollment data. 3.2 Records of outreach to remote and underserved groups. 3.3 Monthly review of complaints and participation gaps. 3.4 Corrective actions documented where exclusion patterns are detected. 7. Outreach records in relevant communities; complaints reviewed for exclusion patterns; no evidence of adverse cultural or rights impacts.
--	--	---------	--	--	--	---	---

						channel approach. 3.2 Ensure non-smartphone pathways for information, enrolment support, and complaints. 3.3 Use local-language communication and trusted local intermediaries. 3.4 Track participation and complaints using sex-disaggregated data and available proxy indicators of vulnerability. 3.5 Conduct corrective outreach where under-representation is identified. 7. Use culturally appropriate local-language communication through trusted local structures; ensure participation remains voluntary and that refusal carries no penalty; monitor	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						whether Indigenous households are being reached through outreach channels.	
USP 11: aQysta	Yes	2. Access and Equity 2.1. Creation or exacerbate intra- or inter-community conflict 2.2. Dissatisfaction due to limited consultation during activity design or implementation 2.3. Risk that not all relevant stakeholders, and especially marginalised or vulnerable groups, have been identified and consulted or that they have been exposed to internal or external pressure or coercion or not able to comprehend the consultations 3. Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups 3.1	Yes	Yes	No	2.1 Transparent communication, community engagement, clear criteria, and robust dispute resolution mechanisms. 2.2. Clear information about the planning process, criteria setting, and achievable goals within the sprint programme timeline, in a transparent manner. Stakeholder and farmer consultation in project design using a participatory decision-making process to reduce dissatisfaction risks. Both farmers and stakeholders will be selected to ensure inclusivity, representing diverse	2.1 - 2.3. Data disaggregated per location: % of farmers located in remote areas, Data disaggregated per ethnicities/caste: % of farmers from marginalized or indigenous communities, Data disaggregated per gender and age: % female farmers, % youth farmers Number of farmer onboarding and stakeholder workshops, periodic farmer satisfaction survey, number of grievance cases received The mechanism will operate through multiple accessible channels: - Continuous, in-person

		Demographics left out of project benefits or participation due to gaps in targeting or outreach 3.2. Vulnerable groups are defined as women, youth, from rural areas, from marginalized and indigenous communities, and from low income groups indigenous 5. Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment 5.1. risk if some women farmers are excluded due to prevailing gender roles or social norms 7. Indigenous Peoples 7.1 Involvement of indigenous crops and marginalized communities, integrating their traditional knowledge and cultural practices into project interventions			gender groups, age ranges, and ethnic or caste backgrounds , rural communities 2.3. The activity will also adopt feedback mechanisms, through on-field officers and easily accessible telephone numbers to get to aQysta. Project will incorporate UN guiding principles on business and human rights 3.1. - 3.2 - Clear, transparent and proactive process on targeting and selection of beneficiaries is applied - Participatory approach in the design of activities and regularly monitor inclusion metrics - Transparent mechanism for sharing resources and benefits will be applied 5.1. Training and interventions are designed	engagement through agri-field staff who reside within the farming communities they serve - Structured feedback collection through surveys, community consultations, and focus group discussions - A dedicated telephone line, accessible at any time, with contact details displayed on farmers' cards - Digital systems to record grievances, feedback, and transaction data in a centralized database All grievances will be formally documented, including details of the complaint, actions taken, and resolution status Escalation procedures: In the event that a dispute escalates,
--	--	---	--	--	--	---

						to be easily accessible to women farmers including through appropriate and feasible scheduling, and by prioritizing of women facilitators/field staff in women's groups 7.1. Local crop varieties and practices will be preserved and promoted The activity is expected to support and enhance their participation, knowledge, and livelihoods in a culturally sensitive manner. Ask for their consent to participate in project and for collection of their data	the agri-field officer will report the issue to the aQysta management team. The case will then be reviewed, and appropriate corrective action will be taken in a timely manner. 3.1. - 3.2. -% of farmers located in remote areas -% of farmers from marginalized or indigenous communities Tracking and reporting frequency: Tracking is conducted continuously in the field as agri-field staff enter farmers' profiles into the GROWN ERP system. Monthly tracking can be performed by extracting data from the GROWN ERP, which is then used to provide updates during check-up calls. Final
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

							results will be compiled and presented in the comprehensive report in December 2026. 5.1 % of female farmers onboarded in the project
USP 12: Seyrab Water Systems	Yes	2. Access and Equity 2.1 Limited stakeholder consultation and risk of exclusion 5. Gender Equity and Women's Empowerment 5.1 Risk of unequal participation in decision-making 11. Climate Change 11.1. Minor GHG emissions during construction 12. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency 12.1. Pollution risks during construction and operation 13. Public Health 13.1 Community health and safety risks during construction 15. Land and	Yes	Yes	No	2.1. Inclusive consultations; gender-responsive stakeholder mapping; accessible CFM; transparent communication 5.1. Ensure women's inclusion; document and integrate inputs; establish feedback loops 11.1. Minimize construction footprint; use solar-powered/low-energy systems 12.1. Dust/noise control; waste management; keep recharge closed during construction; real-time sensors; automated diversion/sh	2.1 # consultations; participation (gender-disaggregated); CFM records/resolution 5.1 % women participation; evidence of inputs reflected in decisions 11.2. Confirmation of solar systems installation for system operation 12.1 Sensor logs; water quality compliance; shutdown/diversion records 13.1. Site inspections; incident logs; compliance checks 15.1. Water quality data; inspection reports; site rehabilitation status

		soil conservation 15.1. Soil disturbance and groundwater quality risks				utoff; routine inspection 13.1. Site fencing; signage; controlled access; traffic and equipment safety protocols; contractor OHS compliance 15.1. Erosion/sediment control; multi-stage filtration; continuous monitoring; automatic diversion; site rehabilitation; technical validation	
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

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? No
--

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

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

Gender-responsive element	Level	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Rated result for the reporting period
Output: 1.2 High potential early stage and high potential growth stage innovations that address the prioritised climate adaptation innovation gaps in identified regions are identified and selected to participate in an innovation acceleration programme.	Output	1.2b) Number of high potential early stage innovations sourced (disaggregated by gender (male/female/other) and youth status (youth/non-youth))	0	16	Good
Output: 1.2 High potential early stage and high potential growth stage innovations that address the prioritised climate adaptation innovation gaps in identified regions are identified and selected to participate in an innovation acceleration programme.	Output	1.2c) Number of high potential growth stage innovations sourced (disaggregated by gender (male/female/other) and youth status (youth/non-youth))	0	16	Good
Output: 1.3 A five-day high-intensity bootcamp experience, including; workshops led by humanitarian, climate, and	Output	1.3a) Number of innovation teams attending the bootcamp (disaggregated by gender (male/female/other) and youth status (youth/non-	0	32	Good

innovation experts, mentoring sessions, and networking opportunities, is designed, delivered, and managed.		youth))			
Output: 1.3 A five-day high-intensity bootcamp experience, including; workshops led by humanitarian, climate, and innovation experts, mentoring sessions, and networking opportunities, is designed, delivered, and managed.	Output	1.3c) Number of gender sensitive learning opportunities provided to innovators.	0	12	Good
Output: 1.4 Grant funding is received by innovators that have undergone a thorough due diligence process to implement projects testing key elements of new innovations (early-stage) or scaling already proven (growth stage) innovations.	Output	1.4a) Number of innovation teams that pass through due diligence and receive grant funding.(disaggregated by gender (male/female/other) and youth status (youth/non-youth))	0	32	Good

Section 2: Quality during implementation and at exit

List gender equality and women's empowerment issues encountered during implementation of the project/programme. For each gender equality and women's empowerment issue describe the progress that was made as well as the results.

Gender equality and women's empowerment issues	Rated result for the reporting period	Provide justification of the rating provided
--	---------------------------------------	--

Section 3: Implementation arrangements

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP

During the reporting period, the implementing entity continued to apply the same gender-responsive arrangements established during the first cohort to ensure full compliance with the Gender Policy. These measures remained embedded across all programme components, including communications, sourcing, Bootcamp, and the sprint programme. Communications and outreach materials continued to reflect diverse and inclusive representation, and as mentioned in the ESP section of this report, the implementing entity has integrated the learning from the first cohort into the second, by revising the sprint application and ensuring both gender- and age-related data were collected from the outset. As in the first cohort, more detailed gender integration work was carried out during the sprint phase for the second cohort, where ventures received tailored guidance to strengthen their gender strategies and apply the gender self-assessment tool. The Bootcamp for the second cohort maintained its gender-responsive structure, with facilitators briefed on inclusive communication and several sessions dedicated to gender-sensitive learning, notably one plenary sessions explicitly focused on Gender-Responsive Programming (as a part of the pre-Bootcamp learning sessions), another session during the Bootcamp covered Human-Centered Design (HCD) and community based approach, and two additional gender-informed sessions took place during team working sessions on user mapping and behavioral change. These exercises were designed to help ventures understand and work with diverse user groups in ways that are both contextually relevant and gender-responsive. Just like in the first cohort, the female leadership remained strongly represented among facilitators (63%) and speakers (66%). During the sprint programme for both cohorts, ventures received targeted capacity-building on gender integration, including training on the Gender Continuum Framework and support in conducting gender analyses and integrating gender indicators into their project trackers. After completing their self-assessments, ventures took part in targeted sessions with WFP gender experts from HQ and the relevant Country Offices, which helped them address context-specific challenges and strengthen their gender mainstreaming approaches. In addition, WFP gender experts delivered country-specific sessions outlining the local gender context and providing tailored recommendations for each venture based on their project plan. The local gender context analysis has been shared with the ventures in PDF format via email as well. Further capacity-building sessions

	during the sprint of the first cohort included two mentoring sessions for female entrepreneurs. These sessions were delivered in October 2025 and focused on breaking barriers and building resilient leadership, partnerships and networks; and leading in male-dominated industries. The first session was delivered by the Head of the WFP Innovation Network and the second by Netlight with a cumulative satisfaction rate of 93% from the participants. The programme design for both cohorts also maintained its commitment to accessibility and inclusion by offering hybrid events, sharing recordings of capacity-building sessions, and accommodating participants across time zones. Ventures continued to collect gender-disaggregated data where relevant and to integrate gender considerations into their project design and monitoring frameworks. Throughout the implementation, the programme remained attentive to the risk of unintentionally reinforcing gender inequalities and continued to mitigate this through close monitoring, technical support, and tailored mentorship to promote equitable participation and benefits for all genders.
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?	For the second cohort, the same gender-integration process used in the first cohort was applied. Ventures completed a gender self-assessment, followed by one-on-one coaching sessions with Innovation Consultants and WFP gender experts, who introduced and explained the gender diagnostic tool. This tool helped identify each venture's position along the gender continuum and highlight any capacity gaps requiring strengthening to meet Gender Policy requirements. Based on the assessment, the Innovation Consultant and WFP gender experts outlined the arrangements needed for effective GP implementation throughout the sprint. Each venture's project tracker also include a gender monitoring tool to track progress and compliance during implementation. Where needed, WFP gender experts reviewed these arrangements and monitoring plans and provided additional guidance for improvement.
Have the implementation arrangements at the EE(s) been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
Have any capacity gaps affecting GP compliance been identified during the reporting period and if so, what remediation was implemented?	Yes Comments: The ventures from the first cohort developed plans to counter identified GP gaps including enhancing outreach through female extension agents and women's cooperatives, expanding participation across the agricultural value chain, improving feedback mechanisms, and refining M&E frameworks to include gender-specific indicators and disaggregated data. The ventures from

	the second cohort identified capacity gaps affecting gender policy compliance span product design, data systems, staff training, and community engagement, with a focus on ensuring inclusivity and accessibility for women and marginalized groups. Key gaps include the need for more gender-responsive design (e.g., tailored content, language, and accessibility features), structured gender sensitivity training for staff, and stronger collection and analysis of gender- and age-disaggregated data. Additionally, there are challenges in documenting how women's feedback shapes product development, adapting digital services for low-literate users or those with limited access, and formalizing partnerships with women-led organizations. In Pakistan, gaps were also noted in women's participation in natural resource governance and access to climate-related information, with plans to address these through female-only sessions in local languages like Pashto and robust gender-disaggregated monitoring systems. Remediation efforts in the next reporting period should prioritize embedding gender inclusion in all phases, from design to implementation, by strengthening staff capacity, adapting training and feedback mechanisms, and ensuring systematic integration of gender considerations in monitoring, reporting, and decision-making.
--	---

Section 4: Grievances

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

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

Comments

Rating

Implementing Entity

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

Project Objective 1:Identify and support high potential climate innovations addressing prioritised challenges to advance towards scale	Outcome 8	ER1 Early stage innovations and risk taking are encouraged and accelerated in the Programme. ER2 Growth stage innovations are replicated and scaled up.	Ontrack		Highly Satisfactory
Project Objective 2: Promote new local and global collaborations to strengthen local climate change adaptation capacities and networks.	Outcome 2, Outcome 3	ER3 Access and capacities enhanced for designing and implementing innovation.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
Project Objective 3:Increase the knowledge, and evidence-base related to climate innovation in selected regions.	Outcome 8	ER4 Evidence base generated and shared	Ontrack		

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

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

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

Executing Entity / Project Coordinator

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
Project Objective 1:Identify and support high potential climate innovations addressing prioritised challenges to advance towards scale	Outcome 8			
Project Objective 2: Promote new local and global collaborations to strengthen local climate change adaptation capacities and networks.	Outcome 2, Outcome 3			
Project Objective 3: Increase the knowledge, and evidence-base related to climate innovation in selected regions.	Outcome 8			

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

Name	Email	Institution
------	-------	-------------

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

Other

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

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

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

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

Overall Rating

Overall rating

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

Project Indicators

List of indicators

Type of Indicator (indicators towards Objectives, Outcomes, etc...)	Indicator	Baseline	Progress Since Inception	Target for Project End
Outcomes	1a) Number of early stage innovations that have moved along their pathway to scale by testing and iterating key parts of their solutions addressing climate adaptation challenges	0	4	16
Outcomes	1b) Number of growth stage innovations that have moved along their pathway to scale by iterating, replicating, and or scaling their already proven solution addressing climate adaptation challenges	0	5	16
Outputs	1.1a) A call for applications drafted and disseminated through WFP global channels	0	2	4

Outputs	1.1b) Relevant climate or innovation experts engaged as an innovation committee	0	26	56
Outputs	1.2a) Number of eligible applications received from the call for applications	0	657	1200
Outputs	1.2b) Number of high potential early stage innovators sourced (disaggregated by gender (male/female/other) and youth status (youth/non-youth))	0	8 teams (25% of the leadership is female and 6% fall within the youth category (ages 15-24))	16
Outputs	1.2c) Number of high potential growth stage innovations sourced (disaggregated by gender (male/female/other) and youth status (youth/non-youth))	0	13 teams (50% of the leadership is female and none fall within the youth category (ages 15-24))	20
Outputs	1.3a) Number of innovation teams attending the bootcamp (disaggregated by gender (male/female/other) and youth status (youth/non-youth))	0	21 for two cohorts (approx 2 team members per venture) 41% female, 59% male, 2,5% youth, 97,5% non- youth (youth ages 15-24)	44
Outputs	1.3b) Percentage of innovators reporting improved knowledge of innovation topics and increased clarity of their business or solution after the bootcamp.	0	100%	100%
Outputs	1.3c) Number of gender sensitive learning opportunities provided to innovators.	0	6	12
Outputs	1.4a) Number of innovation teams that pass through	0	18	36

	due diligence and receive grant funding.(disaggregated by gender (male/female/other) and youth status (youth/non-youth))			
Outputs	1.4b) Total funds disbursed to the innovation teams	0	1,681,570 USD (representing the advance payments of the cohort 1 and cohort 2 ventures)	USD 4,905,000
Outputs	1.5a) Number of coaching and mentoring sessions delivered	0	398	1000
Outputs	1.5b) Percentage of innovators reporting that the coaching sessions were valuable	0	Cohort 1: 100% Innovators reporting coaching sessions were valuable (to various degree, extremely, significantly or moderately). Noone reported they were not valuable Cohort 2 survey Survey for rating the coaching sessions will be sent out mid and at the end of the programme. Hence this data is not yet available.	100%
Outputs	1.5c) Number of innovators reaching at least 80% of project milestones for innovation testing during the acceleration phase.	0	9 (all ventures from Cohort 1)	32
Outcomes	2) Number of local ecosystems or community groups with increased capacity for innovation.	0	1 (cohort 1 ventures)	4
Outputs	2.1a) Number of relevant local external stakeholders engaged in innovation ecosystem events	0	73	120
Outputs	2.1b) Number of	0	5	20

	networking events with relevant local stakeholders facilitated by the WFP innovation accelerator			
Outputs	2.1c) Percentage of innovators reporting they were satisfied or very satisfied with networking events during the sprint phase	0	77%	100%
Outputs	2.1d) Number of local stakeholders with increased capacity for climate adaptation by adopting innovative solutions to climate adaptation.	0	71 (cohort 1)	200
Outputs	2.2a) Number of networking or peer-to-peer learning sessions facilitated through the community.	0	13	20
Outputs	2.2b) Percentage of innovators reporting they were satisfied or very satisfied with community events during the sprint phase	0	96%	100%
Outcomes	3) Number of KM products, impact reports, and communications/events showcasing innovations	0	104	140
Outputs	3.1a) Number of innovations with comprehensive MEL plans that (1) effectively measure their impact and progress, (2) incorporate metrics for gender mainstreaming, environment and social performance, and (3) utilise the adaptation funds	0	18	36

	core impact indicators and methodologies.			
Outputs	3.1b) Number of innovations that have successfully evaluated key elements of their project, either through a WFP country office or internal evaluation	0	9	32
Outputs	3.1c) Number of Progress and Impact reports generated and shared	0	9	36
Outputs	3.1d) Number of WFP accelerator general performance and impact review processes innovations are included in	0		8
Outputs	3.2a) Number of lessons learned and best practices submitted per innovation	0		20
Outputs	3.2b) Number of knowledge management products relating to the programme disseminated (blogs, reports, videos, articles etc.) through WFP channels.	0		24
Outputs	3.2c) Number of communication materials showcasing innovations (social media posts, newsletter mentions, website mentions)	0		40
Outputs	3.2d) Number of relevant participants at online showcase events	0		400

Comments

Lessons Learned

Implementation and Adaptive Management		
Describe any changes undertaken to improve results on the ground or any changes made to project outputs (i.e. changes to project design)	Opportunities	To enhance venture capacity-building and improve on-the-ground results, the AFCIA programme introduced targeted investor readiness initiatives as a core component of the sprint programme. For the first cohort, this included the delivery of two investor roundtable sessions in September 2025, designed to strengthen investment-readiness by connecting ventures with investors. These sessions combined targeted investor mapping and direct outreach, ensuring ventures were matched with funders based on clear alignment with investment theses. The roundtables provided structured exposure to relevant investors, including Kalys Ventures, Globinvest, Afanar, A-Typical Ventures, EBRD, and Plug and Play, while facilitating concrete pathways for follow-on discussions and potential catalytic capital. Beyond direct introductions, the investor readiness activities supported strategic engagements such as connections to the Islamic Development Bank (IsDB) and Jordan’s National Microfinance Bank, as well as sharing relevant funding opportunities like IFAD/ADB’s Moonshot for Development. Ventures also received practical guidance on building investment-ready, scalable businesses, reinforcing their ability to attract and secure funding. Building on these outcomes, the second cohort’s sprint program will feature an expanded investor readiness curriculum, including three dedicated sessions

		covering the investment landscape, fundraising preparations (such as dataroom management, financial modeling, and projections), and investor communication strategies. Additionally, the WFP Innovation Accelerator's innovative finance team will provide personalized pitch feedback ahead of two planned investor roundtables in September 2026. These refinements reflect a deliberate shift toward deeper investor engagement and venture preparedness, ensuring that ventures not only refine their solutions but also develop the financial acumen and investor networks critical for long-term scalability and impact. This evolution in project design underscores the programme's commitment to bridging the gap between innovation and investment, ultimately strengthening ventures' ability to transition from pilot to sustainable growth. In the Philippines, WFP built on its existing resilience and climate adaptation initiatives to strengthen venture acceleration and deliver concrete results on the ground. Rather than introducing ventures as standalone actors, WFP integrated two out of three AFCIA ventures into three local ecosystem workshops and one national workshop already convened under its resilience portfolio in April and May 2026. One venture was not able to attend due to the team not being present in country during the workshop dates. These workshops brought together national government agencies, local ministries and institutions, private sector and financial institutions, and provided an early opportunity to introduce ventures to stakeholders, align
--	--	---

		expectations, and jointly design implementation pathways. Through this process, WFP supported ventures to co-design activities that layered and sequenced engagements with farmers, ensuring solutions were tested, refined, and scaled in line with seasonal cycles, local capacities, and existing programmes. WFP also brokered linkages between ventures and a wider ecosystem of partners, including national and local government agencies, academia and research institutions, farmer organizations, and other development and private-sector partners. This approach strengthened local ownership, reduced duplication, and embedded innovations within ongoing systems and investments, enabling ventures to move beyond pilots toward more sustainable, locally grounded impact. While Nepal and the Philippines successfully advanced their planned number of innovations (four and three, respectively), Pakistan presented a unique case within the second cohort: only two of the four shortlisted ventures met the selection criteria after the Bootcamp. To address this gap and ensure Pakistan's innovation pipeline remained robust, the AFCIA program introduced a streamlined, country-specific sourcing and selection process, enabling the identification and inclusion of 1 or 2 additional high-potential solutions. During the streamlined process, the program leveraged the Climate Bootcamp, organized by WFP Pakistan in collaboration with the Regional Bureau and Climate and Resilience Division HQ, to reassess priorities and refine sourcing criteria for the additional
--	--	---

		innovations. This Bootcamp also included Nepal and the Philippines, but the additional sourcing and selection process was applied exclusively to Pakistan. Following the Climate Resilience Bootcamp in May 2026, a targeted review of applications and engagement with the local innovation ecosystem to identify a longlist of potential solutions is planned for June 2026. A shortlist of ventures will participate in a one-day online workshop, receiving capacity-building sessions on gender responsiveness, community-based programming, and environmental and social safeguards. Selected ventures will then proceed to the grant phase, submitting detailed sprint applications and undergoing the standard grant management process. This approach ensures that additional ventures in Pakistan will receive the same rigorous preparation and support as those selected through the standard process. Beyond Pakistan, grant amounts were strategically reduced and reallocated to strengthen technical support from WFP Country Office staff during the Accelerate phase. This decision was driven by clear evidence from previous cohorts that direct, hands-on support from WFP staff is critical to project success. Their role in facilitating government engagement and local permits, connecting ventures to local stakeholders, and providing real-time advice on ground realities has proven indispensable. Without this support, ventures would face significant challenges in implementation, and the quality and impact of results would be compromised. By reinforcing
--	--	---

		staff capacity, the programme ensures ventures receive the guidance and operational assistance necessary to navigate complexities, comply with safeguards, and achieve sustainable outcomes. Additionally, the venture support duration and cohort approach was adjusted based on lessons from the first cohort. The number of ventures increased slightly (from 8 to 9) and 3 top-performing ventures from the first cohort were selected for a second sprint, leveraging reallocated grant funds from the second cohort. This shift was driven by a key insight: ventures thrive with extended technical and operational support, not larger grants. By formalizing this approach, the program ensures most promising innovations from the future cohorts benefit from prolonged, targeted assistance, maximizing their potential for sustainable scale. These changes aim to enhance on-the-ground results, ensure alignment with national priorities, and improve the programme's overall effectiveness.
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts?	Challenges & Opportunities	The environmental and social safeguard (ESS) measures implemented during this reporting period have proven effective in mitigating potential negative impacts while enhancing the quality and sustainability of project implementation. At the project level, the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) played a critical role in identifying key safety measures, necessary training, and essential equipment required to protect farmers and workers involved in project activities. These measures not only ensured compliance with safeguard standards but also

		strengthened the ventures' capacity to implement solutions responsibly. Moving forward, ventures have committed to integrating similar safeguard protocols into their scaling strategies, ensuring the continued safety and well-being of all stakeholders involved. Overall, the ESS framework has successfully minimized risks while fostering a more inclusive, safe, and environmentally conscious approach to project execution.
How have gender considerations been taken into consideration during the reporting period? What have been the lessons learned as a consequence of inclusion of such considerations on project performance or impacts? List lessons learned specific to gender, detailing measures and project/programme-specific indicators highlighting the role of women as key actors in climate change adaptation.	Challenges & Opportunities	The integration of gender considerations on the programme level during the reporting period has provided critical insights into how intentional gender-inclusive practices enhance both project performance and impact. One of the lessons learned is that systematic monitoring of gender representation, such as tracking women's roles in leadership and workforce composition, creates accountability and transparency. By incorporating dedicated questions on gender representation in the application process, aligned with ESS Principle 5 on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, the programme ensured that gender dynamics were explicitly addressed from the outset. This approach not only improved the visibility of women's participation but also reinforced their role as key drivers of climate adaptation solutions. Another key lesson is the importance of targeted capacity-building in strengthening gender integration. The inclusion of gender sensitization sessions in the Bootcamp curriculum, along with workshops on user articulation, behavior change, and human-centered design, equipped ventures with the

		tools to develop gender-responsive solutions. Follow-up sessions on the AFCIA gender policy, gender continuum framework, and self-assessment tools further deepened their understanding, enabling ventures to embed gender considerations into their project designs. To further strengthen this capacity-building, targeted mentoring sessions for female entrepreneurs were introduced during the sprint phase, focusing on breaking barriers, building resilient leadership, and navigating male-dominated industries. They achieved a high satisfaction rate, highlighting their usefulness in empowering women leaders. Additionally, the use of context-specific gender analyses has proven essential for designing relevant and effective interventions. By delivering localized gender context sessions for both the MENA and Asia-Pacific cohorts, the programme provided ventures with local context; and actionable, venture-specific recommendations to adapt their strategies to better engage women as both beneficiaries and leaders in climate adaptation. Lastly, the integration of gender-specific feedback mechanisms into WFP's Community Feedback Mechanisms (CFM) allowed for real-time monitoring of gender-related impacts, enabling timely adjustments to interventions. At the project level, a recurring challenge identified across multiple ventures was the difficulty of effectively engaging women farmers. In the MENA region, the proportion of women in the farming population is significantly lower than in other target geographies, making
--	--	---

		originally defined gender participation targets more difficult to achieve. As a result, several ventures fell short of their intended outreach goals for female farmers. A key lesson emerging from this experience is that gender integration strategies and associated targets must be firmly grounded in the local cultural context. Applying uniform gender targets across regions, without accounting for socio-cultural dynamics, can lead to unrealistic expectations and reduced impact. In addition, venture experiences highlighted the importance of culturally informed engagement approaches. Ventures that were more successful in onboarding female farmers adopted practices such as proactively designing gender-sensitive engagement strategies, partnering with women field agents or local female leaders, and organizing women-only onboarding sessions, training, and workshops. These tailored approaches help build trust, improve accessibility, and create more inclusive pathways for women's participation in agricultural activities. In Lebanon, early evidence from ventures such as Greener Herd and Remer demonstrates that prioritizing women's inclusion in training and implementation not only broadens project reach but also enhances outcomes. Women's active involvement has emerged as a critical factor in innovation adoption and community resilience, highlighting the need to design interventions that intentionally create opportunities for women's leadership and engagement. Additionally, in Jordan, early-stage engagement with the Women Farmers Union played an important role
--	--	---

		in strengthening gender inclusion within project implementation. The introduction of this network to the ventures enabled direct participation of women farmers in training sessions and field-level activities, ensuring that women were not only beneficiaries but also active contributors to climate adaptation solutions. This engagement improved outreach to female farmers, enhanced adoption of climate-smart practices, and demonstrated that leveraging established women-led networks significantly increases both the relevance and impact of interventions at community level. An essential lesson learned is that early integration of women-focused institutions is crucial for ensuring meaningful participation of women in agricultural innovation and for improving the effectiveness of solution uptake on the ground. Ultimately, these lessons reinforce that gender-inclusive design is not merely a compliance requirement but a strategic necessity for achieving sustainable and equitable climate adaptation outcomes. Moving forward, the programme will continue to prioritize gender analysis, capacity-building, and context-specific strategies to ensure that women remain central to the success of climate resilience efforts.
Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays?	Challenges	During the second reporting period, project implementation faced several delays, primarily due to administrative, operational, and external factors. Contracting and review processes for the second cohort required almost two months to complete, ensuring compliance with all legal, financial, and

		procedural requirements. While this did not directly delay project or program implementation, it impacted internal timelines. To mitigate similar delays in the future, the team will incorporate this timeline into planning phases, ensuring all processes are followed systematically without rushing. The ventures of the first cohort experienced delays, needing an extension of the original 9-month sprint to nearly 12 months for most ventures. This adjustment allowed solutions to be implemented throughout the full agricultural season, ensuring comprehensive monitoring and impact assessment over the complete project cycle. The extension was managed within existing rules and regulations, without additional funding, and all reporting and monitoring requirements remained unchanged. Additionally, further implementation delays for the first cohort are outlined below in separate paragraphs per each country (Egypt, Lebanon and Jordan). In Egypt, two out of three ventures experienced implementation delays. For Noornation, a five-month delay occurred in securing necessary approvals from local authorities, such as the Agriculture and Irrigation Directorates, to obtain an official reference number for implementation in Eqllet and Fares. As a result, installation of units was completed only in mid-December 2025, leaving limited time for impact assessment before project closure. WFP and its partner, the Ministry of Agriculture, provided significant support throughout this process. VAIS encountered a three-month delay due to challenges in
--	--	--

		identifying suitable farmer groups for the sprint. Since the initial profile requirements couldn't be fully met, adjustments were made to ensure a robust and representative pool of participants. This also provided extra time to gather detailed product requirements directly from users. As a result, a large group of sugarcane farmers missed the opportunity to receive VAIS advice at the start of the cultivation period, which temporarily limited the product's full impact. Similarly, P-Vita experienced delays related to obtaining the necessary licensing for bio-fertilizer products, highlighting regulatory constraints for agri-input innovations. This underscored the importance of adopting adaptive measures, such as exploring partnerships with universities or certified research laboratories, to facilitate testing, validation, and faster compliance with regulatory requirements. WFP and its partner, the Ministry of Agriculture, consistently recognized and addressed these challenges, taking proactive steps to resolve issues and accelerate the process wherever possible. Secondly, in the case of Lebanon, the regional war, agricultural season and imports impacted the timelines for final deliverables and milestones for two ventures. In the case of Remer, the project timeline was extended due to the agricultural season, requiring additional months to complete monitoring activities and finalize endline data collection. Consequently, the agreement was extended until March 2026 to facilitate comprehensive monitoring and ensure the collection of all necessary data for the project closure report. In addition,
--	--	---

		Ministry of Agriculture requested a continued support for its national awareness campaign targeting smallholder farmers, which would have been included in the second sprint for Remer, however an implementation of this second sprint was placed on hold due to evolving government priorities and a shift in UN focus areas amid the escalating regional war. The WFP Innovation Accelerator remains in close coordination with WFP Lebanon Country Office to resume support for the venture when conditions improve, with the aim of contributing to a potential recovery phase in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture. In the meantime, after finalizing the sprint as part of AFCIA programme, Remer continues its operations in Northern Lebanon, delivering its solutions in areas unaffected by the conflict, while also focusing on research and development for new products. The second venture implementing in Lebanon, Partners with Sun, encountered delays primarily due to challenges with equipment suppliers, particularly regarding the import of key components required to finalize the implementation. Additionally, the venture was forced to suspend activities for several weeks when attacks across Lebanon intensified in March/April, which further extended the timeline for hydrogen cell integration and postponed the launch event, with a new date yet to be confirmed. Despite these challenges, the venture has successfully received the remaining equipment in-country and is now positioned to complete the hydrogen
--	--	---

		system set-up. As a mitigation measure, the venture identified alternative delivery routes to ensure operational continuity, and the sprint agreement was extended until March 2026. Despite the mentioned challenges, the programme implementation in Lebanon adapted to ensure continuity and progress. In Jordan, a key challenges arose in contracting with the National Agricultural Research Center (NARC), as national registration and in-country representation are mandatory requirements that some ventures did not possess. This issue was addressed by fostering partnerships between the ventures and national entities, thereby ensuring compliance and enabling further upscaling within Jordan. To address these challenges, the program has taken several steps. Proactive planning now includes incorporating realistic timelines for administrative processes to avoid internal delays. Stakeholder coordination has been strengthened, particularly with local authorities and partners like the PMU in Egypt, Ministry of Agriculture in Lebanon and NARC in Jordan, to expedite approvals and support ventures in navigating bureaucratic hurdles. Flexibility in implementation has been emphasized, such as revising participant criteria or sourcing alternative suppliers, to maintain progress despite unforeseen challenges. Additionally, contingency planning has been developed to respond to external disruptions, such as conflicts or supply chain issues, ensuring ventures can pivot operations as needed. These measures aim to minimize future delays and enhance the resilience of
--	--	---

		project implementation.
What implementation issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected progress?	Challenges & Opportunities	During this reporting period, several positive lessons emerged that supported progress in program implementation. Early and sustained engagement with government agencies, close collaboration with WFP Country Offices, and active involvement of local ecosystems were critical to the successful rollout and execution of projects. For the first cohort in the MENA region, ecosystem events held in Jordan and Lebanon were previously reported in the first Progress Performance Report (PPR). The event in Egypt, conducted at the end of the sprint programme in December 2025, brought together over 35 participants from local and international organizations, government entities, and the private sector—including GIZ, VNV, Engazaat, Mahaseel, Flat6Labs, Egypt Project Management Unit (PMU), Anara Capital, Agritech Accelerator, and Climate Resilience Africa Fund (CRAF). This event facilitated knowledge sharing, partnership building, and alignment of efforts, contributing to the local visibility of the innovations. One valuable insight was recognizing the importance of dedicating sufficient time to effectively market innovative products and services to the right audiences. Since these offerings are new, they require creating demand within target communities. This experience highlighted the need for deeper engagement, such as market appraisal, trust-building, and refining marketing strategies, to ensure success. Moving forward, this understanding will help future cohorts plan and budget more effectively. WFP

		Egypt Country Office is in discussions with some of the local private sector companies for potential future collaboration in terms of digital transformation.
--	--	---

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

No

Climate Resilience Measures	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing climate adaptation measures that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	
What is the potential for the climate resilience measures undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	
Readiness Interventions (Applicable only to NIEs that received one or more readiness grants)	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in accessing and implementing climate finance readiness support that would be relevant to the preparation, design and implementation of future concrete adaptation projects/programmes?	
How have the outputs (such as manuals, guidelines, procedures or the experience from providing peer support, etc) from employing readiness grants been used to inform institutional capacity needs, gender issues, and environmental and social aspects in developing and implementing concrete projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	
Concrete Adaptation Interventions	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing concrete adaptation interventions that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes implementing concrete adaptation interventions?	
What is the potential for the concrete adaptation interventions undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	
Knowledge Management	
How has existing information/data/knowledge been used to inform project development and implementation? What kinds of information/data/knowledge were used?	
Has the existing information/data/knowledge been	

made available to relevant stakeholder? If so, what channels of dissemination have been used?	
Please list any knowledge products generated and include hyperlinks whenever possible (e.g. project videos, project stories, studies and technical reports, case studies, training manuals, handbooks, strategies and plans developed, etc.)	
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	
Describe any difficulties there have been in accessing or retrieving existing information (data or knowledge) that is relevant to the project. Please provide suggestions for improving access to the relevant data.	
Has the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	
Innovation	
Describe any innovative practices or technologies that figured prominently in this project.	
Complementarity/ Coherence with other climate finance sources	
Has the project been scaled-up from any other climate finance? Or has the project build upon any other climate finance initiative?	
If you answered yes, kindly specify the name of the Fund/Organization.	

Results Tracker

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

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

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

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

Core Indicator: No. of beneficiaries

		Total	% of female beneficiaries	% of Youth beneficiaries
Baseline information	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	0	0.00	0.00
Baseline information	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	0	0.00	0.00

Baseline information	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0.00	0.00
Target performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	64	66.00	10.00
Target performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	9600	40.00	20.00
Target performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	9664	53.00	15.00
Performance at mid-term	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at mid-term	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at mid-term	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0.00	0.00
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	0.00	0.00

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
--	---	--	--	-----------------------

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
--	--------------------------------------	-------------------	--------	-----------------------	--------------------------

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	0.00	Multi-sector	3: Medium capacity
Target performance at completion	64	66.00	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			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

	Type	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information	Private	Regional	Multi-sector	2: Low capacity
Target performance at completion	Private	Regional	Multi-sector	3: Medium capacity
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

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

	Number of beneficiaries	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level

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

Indicator 3.1: Increase in application of appropriate adaptation responses

	Percentage of targeted population applying adaptation measures	Sector

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

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

	No. of targeted beneficiaries	% of female participants targeted	Level of awareness

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

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

	No. of technical committees/associations	% of women represented in committees/associations	Level of awareness
Baseline information	0	40% to 60%	3: Partially aware
Target performance at completion	4	40% to 60%	4: Mostly aware
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

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

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

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

	Project/programme sector	Geographical scale	Response level
--	--------------------------	--------------------	----------------

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
--	------------------------------------	--------	------

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
--	-----------------------------------	--	------	--

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
--	-------------------------------	------------	---------------

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

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

	Sector of innovative practice	Geographic Scale	Type
Baseline information	Food Security	Sub-National	Innovation accelerated
Target performance at completion	Food Security	Regional	Innovation accelerated
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

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

	No. of innovative practices/ tools technologies	Sector	Status	Effectiveness
Baseline information	0	Multi-sector	Undertaking innovative practices	3: Moderately effective
Target performance at completion	32	Multi-sector	Completed innovation practices	5: Very effective
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

	No. of key findings generated	Type	Effectiveness
Baseline information	0	Innovative	3: Moderately effective
Target performance at completion	20	Innovative	5: Very effective
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			