



ADAPTATION FUND

Project Performance Report

Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	4/1/2025 - 1/31/2026
Project Title	AFCIA-UNEP II in Support of Innovation for Adaptation
Project Summary	
Database Number	AF00000362
Implementing Entity (IE)	UN Environment Programme
Type of IE	Multilateral Implementing Entity
Country(ies)	Global
Relevant Geographic Points (i.e. cities, villages, bodies of water)	Global
Name of Implementing Entity Focal Point	Jessica Troni

Project Milestones	
AFB Approval Date	4/19/2024
IE-AFB Agreement Signature Date	7/2/2024
Start of Project/Programme	4/1/2025
Actual Mid-term Review Date (if applicable)	10/1/2027
Original Completion Date	1/4/2030
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 17 June 2025

List the Website address (URL) of project

<https://www.ctc-n.org/technical-assistance/afcia-ii-programme-continues-collaboration-between-unep-ctcn-and-adaptation-fund-boost-innovation>

Project Contacts

National/Regional Project Manager/Coordinator	Name	Email	Date
Implementing Entity	Jessica Troni	jessica.troni@un.org	2/19/2026
Implementing Entity	Eva Comba	eva.comba@un.org	2/19/2026
Executing Agency	Ariesta Ningrum	ariesta.ningrum@un.org	2/19/2026
Executing Agency	Nadège Trocellier	nadege.trocellier@un.org	2/19/2026

Financial Data

Disbursement of AF grant funds	
Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date (\$)	\$1,023,637.00
Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date (\$)	\$1,023,637.00
Project disbursement rate (%)	9.26
Project execution rate (%)	11.26
Add any comments on AF Grant Funds	<p>As of 31st December 2025, a total of USD 1,023,637 has been disbursed and spent/committed, leading UNEP CTCN in requesting this early disbursement. Between 01st April 2025 and 31st December 2025, 18 projects have been selected under AFCIA II out of which :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 projects have already been contracted for a total value of 770,050 USD. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Burundi Resilient Karusi: Smart Irrigation and Rainwater Harvesting (Component 1) 1project. o Mongolia EbA and digitalized risk mitigation insurance solutions also (C1&3), with the identification of reliable EbA solutions and the deployment of insurance products considered as a NSI, 2 projects. o Liberia Blue-Green Infrastructure for Urban Resilience, (C1) 1 project. o Saint Kitts GIS-based monitoring system for non-revenue water reduction, (C1) 1 project. • 13 projects are under bidding process for a total value of 1,099,000 USD <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Togo with the piloting of NbS for mangroves protection (C1) 1 project o Côte d'Ivoire AI and APP to monitor crop disease (C2) 1 project o Gambia sustainable cooling to reduce post-harvest losses in agriculture, fisheries, and poultry sectors (C1)1 project o Tanzania with the establishment of Tanzania Climate Innovation Centre (TCIC), (C3) 1 project o Lesotho with its adhesion to EWS4All initiative (C1&3) 2 projects o Senegal with a prefeasibility of solar floating panels to support women -led fishing processing (C1) 1 project o Fiji with National policies on climate resilient agriculture, (C3) 1 project. o Madagascar with an improvement of water management for the agriculture sector in water-scarce South region (C1&2) 2 projects o Sierra Leone, with aquaculture & GIS-Based Decision-Support Tool (C1) -> 1 project o Chile Ai for water management (C1) 1 project o Cuba Observatorio agroambiental y gestion de ecosistemas (C1) 1 project

Investment Income (\$)	\$0.00
Cumulative Investment Income since inception (\$)	\$0.00

Expenditure Data

Output	Amount (\$)
1.1	\$10,000.00
1.2	\$0.00
1.3	\$726,819.00
2.1	\$0.00
3.1	\$0.00
3.2	\$0.00
3.3	\$0.00
IE fee (\$)	\$181,818.00
Execution cost (\$)	\$105,000.00

Planned Expenditure Schedule

Output	Projected Cost (\$)	Estimated Completion Date
Output 1.1	\$71,819.00	4/1/2027
Output 1.2	\$0.00	4/1/2027
Output 1.3	\$4,633,181.00	4/1/2027
IE fee (\$)		\$181,818.00
Execution cost (\$)		\$215,000.00

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 ?	Yes
How much of the total co-financing as committed in the Project Document has actually been realized? (\$)	\$103,000.00
Estimated cumulative actual co-financing as verified during Mid-term Review (MTR) or Terminal Evaluation (TE). (\$)	
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.	The CTCN is providing in-kind co-funding by allocating time and resources from its regional technology specialists in the different regions. This includes 1 person in Africa, one person in Asia, one person in LAC working with the countries in screening their requests, improving them when needed, developing the Response Plan, preparing the bidding documents and supervising the projects.

Risk Assessment

Identified Risks

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

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
Delays in screening and communication process	Low	During the reporting period, 20 requests were screened, of which 18 were deemed eligible for support under AFCIA II. Screening of requests is carried out by CTCN on a rolling basis, allowing for early engagement with National Designated Entities (NDEs) and other national stakeholders. This approach has improved stakeholder satisfaction, as early consultations and iterative discussions help clarify country priorities and strengthen the quality of submitted requests. Improved request quality has, in turn, contributed to greater efficiency in downstream processes, particularly in reducing the time between receipt of signed requests and the signature of Response Plans. As a result, the average processing time between receipt of signed requests and Response Plan signature has decreased from approximately six months under AFCIA I to around 2.5 months under AFCIA II. On average, three to five coordination calls are organized per request during this process: one following request prioritization to better capture country expectations, and at least two during the Response Plan development stage—up to four where necessary—to ensure full integration of stakeholder feedback. While this iterative process requires sustained engagement, it has proven effective in improving communication, strengthening ownership, and minimizing delays during implementation.
Delays in contracting Network Members may slow implementation	Moderate	The use of UNON's two-stage bidding process corresponds to the modalities of the CTCN and are used to recruit the Implementing Partners (CTCN Network Members) of UNEP CTCN AFCIA programme. The average time required between the launch of the Request for Expression of Interest (REOI) and the signature of the AFCA I contracts has been of 392.5 days (thus 1 year, and 1 month) with the faster process being of 167 days (5.5 months) and the longest of 858 days (2 years and 4 months). Under AFCIA I only 3 (12%) were awarded within 6 months after the launch of the REOI, 10 (40%) within a year, 6 (24% within 1 year ½) and still 6 (24%) in more than 1-year 1/2. These unpredictable delays can be justified by different reasons from digital technical problems with UNON platform, to low quality of the bids received, discrepancies on the financial proposals of eligible bidders, or tax issues between the UN and the awarded partner's country of registration. So far out of the 5 projects awarded under AFCIA II, the average timeline has been of 4.75 months which is very efficient. This can probably certify that the new focal point created by both UNON and CTCN and both working from Nairobi with bi-weekly meeting is having a positive impact on the processes. Consequently, it is estimated that this risk level remain Medium.
Challenges in coordination between NDEs and NIE/DAs may impact the quality of submissions	Low	Strengthening the collaboration between NDE and DAs/NIE was a recommendation of AFCIA I Mid Term Review. Thus, since 2024 CTCN is engaging more consistently with the NDEs and the NDAs since the very early design stage of an idea. This cooperation has resulted in an increased ownership of the Technical Assistances and better sustainability of the projects. The CTCN continued to apply this best practice with AFCIA II by requesting the signature of both the Adaptation Fund´s focal point as well as the NDE in each Response Plans which is the case of the 18 projects currently selected, and 13 under bidding. Nonetheless this matchmaking process can have impact in the design of the Response Plan as more stakeholders are involved and time to reach approval on the document could be increased but in the greatest majority of the cases so far the collaboration demonstrated to be easy. This risk remains low
The lack of enabling	Low	Of the 18 projects selected for implementation under AFCIA II, four are directly aligned with Component 3, which focuses on strengthening national

<p>environment to encourage and support innovation limits national buy-in</p>		<p>innovation systems and fostering stronger interactions among the networks of actors, institutions, and linkages that drive technological change. The involvement of the government—primarily through the NDE and DAs—in every project ensures direct alignment with national strategies and priorities, including the NDC, TNAs, and NAP, among others. In addition, all 18 projects include, within their Response Plans, a comprehensive mapping of national stakeholders and their respective roles in project implementation. The Response Plans also detail a clear exit strategy, outlining expected outcomes and continuity mechanisms following the completion of the technical assistance. Furthermore, each project includes an assessment of the baseline enabling environment, covering relevant regulations, laws, frameworks, and policies, as well as previous, ongoing, and planned initiatives that are complementary to or supportive of project objectives. Overall, the programme seeks to demonstrate how strengthened policy coherence, standards and certification systems, transparent data frameworks, targeted financing mechanisms, and catalytic intermediaries—such as incubators and accelerators—can collectively de-risk investments and accelerate the diffusion of climate technologies, thereby contributing to a more enabling environment for innovation.</p>
<p>Not enough high quality requests are received</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>To mitigate the risk of receiving an insufficient number of high-quality requests, AFCIA II applies a rolling-basis sourcing system. This approach enables the CTCN to work closely with countries and project proponents throughout the request development, review, and approval process. Through this co-funded technical support, the CTCN provides early guidance to improve the technical quality of requests, strengthen their alignment with AFCIA II objectives, and, where relevant, reformulate concepts into eligible and well-structured submissions. Out of the 18 selected projects, 9 (so 50%) were supported by the CTCN at design stage. These are Mongolia, Liberia, Togo, Cote Ivoire, Gambia, Lesotho, Sierra Leone, Chile and Cuba. In some cases the CTCN supported the definition of the scope to make it feasible under CTCN AFCIA funding threshold. This was the case of Sierra Leone and Cuba. In some cases, CTCN supported the identification of the correct technology that could probably help to solve the problem identified by the country. This was the case for Cote ivoire as well as for Chile. In other cases, CTCN supported countries in thinking bigger to increase the impact but also the sustainability of the initiatives. This was the case of Lesotho as well as Mongolia. In some cases the support aimed at understanding from a metling pot of concepts, what was the ones that were really needed, prioritized as per the NDC, TNA, NAP, partners. This was the case of Liberia, Togo, Gambia. In total, these in-kind co-funding represented 3% of 3 CTCN technology Specialists based in Africa, LAC and Asia thus an estimated value of USD 10k. Targeted outreach and capacity-building activities were also conducted during the reporting period to broaden and diversify the pipeline of requests. Specific webinars were organized for non-conventional stakeholders, including the Women and Gender Constituency to encourage participation by women-led NGOs, as well as in collaboration with the United Nations University to promote engagement from universities and research centres. In addition, programme presentations were delivered at regional level during NDE Forums, at CTCN Advisory Board meetings, and during COP 30 in Belém. As a result of these efforts, 20 requests were received during the period, of which 18 were approved for implementation. Two requests were rejected as they fell outside the CTCN mandate (waste management and carbon credits). 50% of requests were submitted by governmental entities, 39% by NGOs and cooperatives, and 11% by universities. Furthermore, 80% of the prioritized requests originate from LDCs and SIDS, confirming strong</p>

		engagement from AFCIA II priority countries.
Transformational change cannot be achieved through micro-grants	Low	The MTR of AFCIA I highlighted that transformational change cannot be achieved through isolated micro-grants alone. While small-scale interventions are necessary to test adaptation technologies, they must be embedded within a pathway that enables scaling and systemic change. AFCIA II was therefore designed as an integrated programme linking technology testing, scaling, and enabling environments. Component 1 (40 projects) focuses on testing innovative and locally led adaptation technologies; Component 2 (10 projects) supports the scaling-up of successfully tested technologies; and Component 3 (10 initiatives) strengthens national systems of innovation by addressing policy, institutional, financial, and knowledge barriers and by leveraging additional financing through concept notes and partnerships. Under AFCIA I, around 40% of technical assistance interventions mobilised follow-on investment, mainly from international public partners, but not from domestic financial institutions and private sector, highlighting a remaining structural constraint. Given ongoing challenges related to domestic and private finance mobilisation, the risk is assessed as medium. To address this, AFCIA II places strong emphasis on Component 3 to ensure sustainability and replication beyond pilots and is currently recruiting a strategic advisor whose mandate is to strengthen coherence across components, enhance partnerships, mobilize private and domestic finance and ensure that tested and scaled technologies contribute to transformational and systemic change.
Gender considerations are not adequately taken into account during the design and implementation of innovation grant.	Low	Mandatory gender integration measures were introduced by the CTCN to all TAs initiated in 2024, including the requirement for a Gender Assessment and Action Plan (GAAP) and the allocation of at least 5% of the budget to gender mainstreaming activities. To support this, the CTCN launched the Climate Technology Gender Roster, a comprehensive database of gender and climate technology experts, aimed at facilitating collaboration and improving access to specialized expertise for network partners. These templates were improved in 2025 by defining core indicators. Overall, UNEP CTCN-AFCIA1 programme has reached 41% of women among its direct and indirect beneficiaries. Efforts need to continue and be strengthened to reach the target defined under AFCIA II of having 1500 direct beneficiaries with at least 30% of women and 50% of indirect beneficiaries will be women. Specific indicators and targets are defined in the GAAP and will vary from one project to another, but all Technical Assistance need to reflect on the gender context (analysis of gender roles, norms, and dynamics in the target region/sector, barriers to involve women in the deployment of the project-specific technology-product-tool), develop a gender assessment table (with an analysis on the access and use, leadership, participation and role for the scale up), a plan , and detailed gender responsive activities as well as a post implementation gender impact assessment. Thus, so far, the risk can be defined as Low.
Funding for scaled-up implementation is not available	Moderate	The gap between countries' climate adaptation needs and available financing for scaled-up implementation remains significant. Securing scale-up funding—particularly from national financial institutions—continues to be a challenge; therefore, the overall risk is assessed as medium. To mitigate this risk, AFCIA II promotes the early engagement of financial actors during the ideation stage. Through the Response Plan stakeholder mapping, national banks, private-sector actors, UN agencies, and philanthropic organisations are identified to support investment in technologies successfully tested through the programme. The CTCN also facilitates matchmaking within its global network, including pro bono and in-kind support from technology providers to demonstrate performance and viability in the context of technical assistance. To support transition beyond the TA phase, dedicated post-

		implementation budget lines have been established within CTCN, allowing countries to access up to USD 5,000 per project in 2025, and providing for up to two post-implementation supports in 2026 (up to USD 40,000 each) as potential co-financing opportunities. In addition, the recruitment of a strategic advisor and the organization of two regional hubs by the AFCIA coordination services, will strengthen engagement with private and financial stakeholders, improve alignment with investment pipelines, and enhance AFCIA II's capacity to catalyse sustainable and transformational scale-up beyond grant-based funding.
Innovations trigger mal-adaptation	Low	Micro-grant requests are screened against climate change risks and soundness of adaptation solution in the given country. All the SRIFs of the 5 projects under implementation have been approved by UNEP safeguard officer and no risks of maladaptation were identified or flagged. SRIF, M&E, closure report and Adaptation Fund result tracker are used to monitor this risk and put in place the appropriate measures to manage the risk and ensure it remains low during the implementation.

Critical Risks Affecting Progress (Not identified at project design)

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

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

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
Political Risks	Low	For countries facing significant risks—such as those prone to instability or those with presidential elections scheduled in the current year—the CTCN will conduct a country-by-country assessment. Depending on the situation, the ideation process may be temporarily paused until greater clarity and stability are restored. This has been the case of Central African Republic that has election planned on Dec 28th, 2025. the decision was taken in consensus between the NDE, the project proponent and the CTCN to wait until elections are over before moving ahead with the definition of the Response Plan. The elections resulted in the re-election for the 3rd consecutive term of president Faustin-Archange Touadéra thus no important changes are expected to take place in the ministries and UNEP CTCN will be able to proceed with the project.
Financial Risks	Moderate	Average budget allocations under AFCIA II are relatively modest, with indicative ceilings of approximately USD 150,000 for Component 1, USD 100,000 for Component 2, and USD 80,000 for Component 3. While under AFCIA I the CTCN co-funded in cash around USD 1.8 million across projects to support piloting, under AFCIA II the available co-financing is more limited, potentially resulting in smaller project budgets. During this first reporting period, budgets were prioritised to ensure successful implementation of selected projects. Under Component 1, 12 projects (out of 40) were prioritised with an average value of USD 164,943 per project, above the initially planned USD 154,000, implying an average of USD 149,310 for the remaining 28 projects. Under Component 2, 2 projects (Côte d'Ivoire and Madagascar) were prioritised at USD 100,000 per project, fully aligned with planned allocations. Under Component 3, 4 projects were prioritised with an average value of USD 127,250, exceeding the planned USD 80,000, requiring the remaining 6 projects to be implemented with an average of USD 48,500 per project. Overall, while budget pressures require careful financial management across components, allocations remain consistent with AFCIA II objectives. The coordination services proposal includes a concept to create regional innovation hubs involving R&D institutions as well private sector to promote investment facilitation. Nonetheless, the financial risk is therefore assessed as medium.

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?

During the reporting period, implementation started for five projects, with Mongolia including 2 components, and all these 5 projects started relatively recently. In addition, thirteen other projects were selected. The identification of high-quality projects and coordination with AF Designated Authorities were handled effectively, and procurement processes progressed smoothly. This is likely attributable to the establishment of focal points within both CTCN and UNON. These focal points, based in Nairobi, convene biweekly to review ongoing activities, discuss potential challenges, identify recurring issues, and propose mitigation actions from both sides. As a result, no major challenges were encountered at this stage. Nonetheless, several targeted actions were undertaken proactively to minimize identified risks. All Safeguards and Risk Identification Frameworks (SRIFs) for projects under implementation were developed and approved by the UNEP Safeguards Officer prior to the commencement of activities. The AFCIA Safeguards and Risk Identification Framework will continue to be enhanced to avoid maladaptation with the support and advice from the UNEP Safeguard office. In parallel, the grievance mechanism will be broadly communicated to technical assistance beneficiaries, ensuring that any potential adverse impacts are identified early and addressed in a transparent and inclusive way. To mitigate coordination risks between National Designated Entities (NDEs) and Designated Authorities (DAs) under AFCIA II, formal endorsement from both entities was made a mandatory requirement. This measure enhances institutional coherence and coordination from the early stages of project preparation through implementation. Consequently, all Response Plans developed to date have been endorsed by both the DA and the NDE, as well as by project proponents where they differ from the NDE, and by CTCN. To enhance the quality of project requests and reduce the likelihood of weak project design, the project intake process was shifted to a rolling submission format. This change allows additional time for stakeholder engagement and provides greater technical support to requesting countries. With regards to “enabling environment” challenges, AFCIA II requests each response plan to map relevant stakeholder and actively fosters stronger collaboration among identified networks of actors and institutions, that contribute to technological innovation and change. To address gender-related risks, CTCN introduced a Gender Assessment and Action Plan (GAAP), which has been applied to all CTCN projects since 2025. This initiative strengthens the systematic integration, monitoring, and reporting of gender considerations across project activities. In terms of transformational impact, and in alignment with the recommendations of the AFCIA I Mid-Term Review, AFCIA II seeks to embed adaptation innovation within broader national innovation systems (component 3). This strategy aims to move beyond stand-alone interventions and achieve more durable and systemic change. A strategic advisor is in process of being recruited to enhance transformational impact of the programme. Although mobilizing finance for scaling up remains a challenge, Coordination Services are expected to reduce this risk by capitalizing on synergies with Implementing Entities that maintain strong links with the private sector, particularly UNIDO and UNDP.

ESP Compliance

Section 1: Identified ESP Risk Management

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

1. Compliance with the law

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	No
---	----

During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified.	
--	--

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 2: Monitoring for unanticipated impacts / corrective actions required

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

Section 3: Categorisation

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

Section 4: Implementation arrangements

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	During the reporting period, UNEP and the CTCN maintained established arrangements to implement and monitor ESP safeguard measures across the AFCIA portfolio. The SRIFs from the 5 contracted projects have been developed and approved by UNEP safeguard experts during this reporting period. All 5 projects under implementation have been assessed as low risk and fully aligned with the Adaptation Fund's ESP requirements. The safeguards will be monitored throughout project execution via the AF Results Tracker, CTCN M&E systems, and closure reports to ensure continued compliance.
Have the implementation arrangements been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	The risk will be monitored at project level through a Steering Committee created for each project that will meet once a month or 6 weeks to discuss challenges, solutions, the workplan, the next steps. These steering Committees have already been created for Burundi and Saint Kitts and Nevis as well as Liberia,

	not yet by Mongolia (x2 projects) as the project was contracted only very recently.
Have the implementation arrangements at the EEs been effective during the reporting period?	Yes

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

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

Identified USPs in the reporting period	Application of ESMP to the USP	ESP risks identified for the USP	Has an impact assessment been carried out?	Consultation held for risks and impacts identification for USP	Gender disaggregation to identify risks and impacts	Safeguard measures identified for the USP	Monitoring indicator(s) for each impact
USP 1: [Burundi] Burundi, Resilient Karusi: Smart Irrigation and Rainwater Harvesting.	Yes	P1: Compliance with the Law (equivalent to UNEP Guiding principle: Accountability) Low risk. The project is implemented by a legally constituted cooperative of farmers (700+ members) supervised by the Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock and the Burundi	Yes	Yes	Yes	P1: Compliance with the Law Avoidance: The project is piloted by a legal cooperative of 70 families that is legally created and supervised by Governmental entities. The cooperative has submitted its letter of legal constitution as part of the Response Plan. NDE oversight	P1: Compliance with the Law Indicator: Letter of constitution of the cooperative. Confirmed legal status of cooperative verified at project inception. Compliance status reported in annual PPR and closure report. P2: Access and Equity Will be monitored through AF core

		<p>Geographic Institute. All water management and cooperative activities are subject to Burundian national law. The NDE co-signed the Response Plan confirming regulatory compliance. [Source: Burundi SRIF GP1, Cleared] P2: Access and Equity (equivalent to UNEP principle: Leave no one behind) Low risk. The IoT-based water management system serves 24 cooperatives (720 families) and provides real-time, transparent data on water availability and allocation — directly addressing equity in distribution. The digital dashboard reduces community conflicts</p>				<p>ensures ongoing compliance with national water management regulations throughout implementation. P2: Access and Equity This project aims at empowering rural community of farmers in a LDC, targeting and improving resilience of the most vulnerable. The collectivity is the project proponent; it is part of the Steering Committee and has nominated a representative to raise expectations and concerns during quarterly Steering Committees and monthly Technical Committees. The project is structured around an existing cooperative of 720 farming families operating through 24 sub-</p>	<p>indicator "n&#186; of beneficiaries disaggregated by women and youth". Number of cooperative members with access to IoT water data and allocation system. % of water allocated via objective data-driven dashboard vs. manual decisions. Reported at midterm and closure through implementing partner technical report. P3: Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups Will be monitored through AF Outcome 6 indicator "Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas". Number of women and youth cooperative members engaged in</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	---	---

		<p>over water access (estimated 70–80% reduction). The requesting cooperative is both beneficiary and project proponent, ensuring community ownership. [Source: Burundi SRIF GP1–GP2, rated L] P3: Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups (equivalent to UNEP principle: Leave no one behind) Low risk. The project targets smallholder farming families in Karusi, Burundi — an LDC context where rural cooperatives represent an intrinsically vulnerable population. Participation is designed to include women, youth and elderly members. The collectivity is the project</p>				<p>cooperatives, meaning the beneficiary group is pre-defined and collectively self-selected — reducing the risk of exclusion. Within the cooperative, equitable access to the IoT-based irrigation and water distribution system is ensured through three mechanisms: (i) the digital dashboard provides real-time, objective data on water availability and allocation visible to all cooperative members, replacing discretionary decisions that historically drove community conflict; (ii) the automated distribution system allocates water based on pre-agreed rules rather than individual</p>	<p>training and governance activities. % of beneficiaries from most water-insecure households. Reported via GAAP implementation report and annual PPR. P4: Human Rights No specific AFRT indicators for human rights. UNEP grievance mechanism available to all stakeholders. Steering Committees (quarterly) and Technical Committees (monthly) serve as reporting channels. Zero human rights grievance filed through UNEP mechanism during reporting period. Confirmed through grievance register reviewed at each Steering Committee. Reported in</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

		<p>proponent ensuring community-driven inclusion. [Source: Burundi SRIF GP2, rated L] P4: Human Rights (equivalent to UNEP principle: Human rights and gender equality) Low risk. The project is community-led: the cooperative is the project proponent, has signed the Response Plan, and participates actively in project governance. No activity involve land acquisition, displacement, or labour rights concerns. No human rights concern were raised during stakeholder engagement. [Source: Burundi SRIF GP3 — no concern raised] P5: Gender</p>				<p>negotiation, ensuring each member family receives its equitable share; and (iii) governance of the allocation rules is managed by the Steering Committee in which the cooperative has a formal representative — ensuring the community itself defines and monitors equity criteria. Training activities explicitly target all 24 sub-cooperative groups to ensure no subset of the membership monopolises knowledge or access to the technology. P3: Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups The cooperative structure of this project means that the most vulnerable farming families are</p>	<p>annual PPR. P5: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Will be monitored through AF core indicator "n&#186; of beneficiaries disaggregated by women and youth". % of women and youth among direct beneficiaries (target: ≥40% women). GAAP delivered at inception. ≥5% budget on gender mainstreaming confirmed in financial report at closure. Reported in annual PPR and closure report. P11: Climate Change As defined in the signed proposal, CC will be monitored through AF RT indicators: Core indicator: Increased resiliency at community, national, and regional levels to climate</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Equality and Women's Empowerment (equivalent to UNEP principle: Human rights and gender equality) Low risk. Project design explicitly incorporates gender-balanced representation in governance structures, trainings, and stakeholder consultations. The implementing team includes a mandatory gender expert (1 of 7 experts). The cooperative includes women and youth members who participate actively in governance. [Source: Burundi SRIF GP4–GP5, rated L] P11: Climate Change (equivalent to UNEP principle: Climate change and</p>				<p>targeted by design rather than by selection — the project was requested by and will be implemented for an existing cooperative of smallholder farmers in Karusi, one of Burundi's most food-insecure provinces. Within this group, four specific measures ensure that the most vulnerable members are not left further behind in practice: (i) Governance inclusion: The cooperative's Steering Committee representative is mandated to raise concerns from all 24 sub-cooperative groups — including the smallest and most marginalised families — during quarterly Steering</p>	<p>variability and change. Outcome 1: Reduced exposure to climate-related hazards and threats. Output 2.1: Strengthened capacity of national and sub-national centers and networks to respond rapidly to extreme weather events. Output 7: Improved integration of climate-resilience strategies into country development plans. % reduction in water-related crop losses compared to baseline. Number of farming families with improved access to climate-resilient irrigation (target: 720). IoT system operational uptime and data quality reported in quarterly technical reports. P12: Pollution Prevention</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Disaster Risks — UNEP ESS Standard SS2, rated 2,2,L) Low-medium risk (SS2 rated 2,2,L). Climate change is the core rationale for this TA. Increasing rainfall variability and water scarcity in Karusi, Burundi threatens agricultural productivity and water security for the cooperative. The project directly addresses this through IoT-based rainwater harvesting and irrigation optimisation. Risk that climate hazards could disrupt implementation is acknowledged and managed through adaptive implementation protocols. [Source: Burundi SRIF SS2, rated 2,2,L]</p>				<p>Committees and monthly Technical Committees. The implementing partner will document attendance and participation disaggregated by sub-cooperative unit. (ii) Training design: Practical training on the IoT system and water management dashboard will be delivered to all 24 sub-cooperatives separately rather than centrally, ensuring that families who are geographically remote within the cooperative area, have lower literacy, or face mobility constraints (including elderly and disabled members) can participate in their own sub-group setting. (iii) Allocation</p>	<p>& Resource Efficiency Water quality parameters (pH, turbidity, nitrate levels) reported against baseline at midterm and closure. No increase in high-risk agro-input use documented by implementing partner in technical reports. P13: Public Health Zero water-borne illness incidents attributable to project infrastructure, documented through community health records and Steering Committee minutes. Tank-cleaning protocol compliance verified in quarterly Technical Committee reports. P15: Lands and Soil Conservation Soil moisture levels and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---

		<p>P12: Pollution Prevention & Resource Efficiency Low risk. IoT-based water management includes water quality sensors (pH, turbidity, nitrates) monitoring both drinking water and irrigation supply. Risk of increased agro-chemical use from higher yields is low and manageable with guidance. Water use efficiency optimisation is a core project objective. [Source: Burundi SRIF SS3, rated 1,1,L]</p> <p>P13: Public Health Low risk. Water storage infrastructure (tanks, reservoirs) presents a low risk of vector breeding if not properly maintained. Water quality sensors</p>				<p>rules review: The cooperative's water allocation rules — governing who receives water, in what quantity and at what time — will be reviewed at inception by the implementing partner with the Steering Committee to ensure they do not systematically disadvantage the smallest landholdings or most water-insecure families. Any identified bias in existing allocation rules will be flagged for revision as part of the governance component of the TA. (iv) Inception vulnerability mapping: At project start, the implementing partner will produce a simple socio-</p>	<p>absence of salinisation sign documented in midterm technical report by implementing partner. Soil quality assessment included in closure report.</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	---	---

		<p>address waterborne disease risk through real-time monitoring. [Source: Burundi SRIF SS4, rated 1,1,L] P15: Lands and Soil Conservation Low risk. Intensified irrigation enabled by the new system could, if unmanaged, lead to soil salinisation or compaction. Soil moisture sensors and automated irrigation scheduling are integral to the system design and directly mitigate this risk. [Source: Burundi SRIF SS1+SS3, rated 1,1,L]</p>				<p>economic profile of the cooperative's membership identifying the most water-insecure and climate-vulnerable households (typically female-headed, smallest landholding, most remote). This profile will be used to prioritise outreach and training for those sub-groups. P4: Human Rights UNEP grievance mechanism will be used for all AFCIA II projects. UNEP grievance mechanism is available to all project stakeholders. The cooperative representative participates in quarterly Steering Committees and monthly Technical Committees providing a formal channel for any</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>concerns. No human rights incident has been reported to date. P5: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment The project will ensure gender and youth participation during the implementation phase through trainings and stakeholder consultations. Since 2024, all CTCN projects must provide a mandatory Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan (GAAP) and the implementing partner must demonstrate that at least 5% of the budget is used on gender mainstreaming activities. In the case of Burundi, a high percentage of farmers are women: During the 1st</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>stakeholders consultation s, the conditions that need to be met to ensure that women can participate to meetings, trainings will be discussed, listed and implemented throughout the implementat ion phase.</p> <p>P11: Climate Change CC is the core focus of this TA. The objective is to increase the resilience of the targeted population (750 families of farmers) in rural Burundi, an LDC. To minimize the risk of maladaptatio n, the project promotes climate-responsive and resource-efficient irrigation practices, including automated irrigation scheduling based on real-time soil moisture</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>and water availability data. This approach helps avoid over-extraction of water resources and ensures alignment with local hydrological conditions, thereby reducing vulnerability to rainfall variability. In addition, water quality monitoring systems will provide early warning for drought conditions or contamination risks, supporting timely and informed decision-making. The intervention will be complemented by capacity building of users and local institutions to ensure appropriate use, maintenance, and adaptation of technologies to local contexts.</p> <p>P12: Pollution</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>Prevention & Resource Efficiency Implementing partner to confirm no high-risk agro-inputs are introduced as part of the project. Water quality parameters monitored by IoT dashboard and reported in technical reports. Farmer training includes guidance on responsible agrochemical use compatible with precision irrigation. P13: Public Health System design to include covered storage and protocols for regular tank cleaning. Water quality monitoring sensors to flag contamination in real time. UN contractor safety standards to be applied during</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>infrastructure installation. UNEP grievance mechanism available to all stakeholders. P15: Lands and Soil Conservation Farmer training to include soil conservation practices compatible with the new system. Implementing partner to document any observed soil quality changes in midterm and closure reports.</p>	
<p>USP 2: [Saint Kitts and Nevis] Non revenue water resources</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>P1: Compliance with the Law (equivalent to UNEP Guiding principle: Accountability) Low risk. The project is implemented directly by Saint Kitts Water Services Department (WSD) and Nevis Water Department (NWD) — national government bodies. NDE</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>P1: Compliance with the Law NDE oversight and government-to-government implementation structure ensures ongoing regulatory compliance. All DMA field access arrangements documented with formal permissions from relevant authorities.</p>	<p>P1: Compliance with the Law Indicator: Statement by the governmental institution. Governmental statement confirming regulatory compliance reported at project inception. Any regulatory changes noted in annual PPR and addressed through</p>

		<p>(Department of Environment, Ministry of Environment and Cooperatives) co-signed the Response Plan. All activities are subject to existing national water management legislation and government procurement rules.</p> <p>[Source: SKN SRIF GP1, Cleared] P2: Access and Equity (equivalent to UNEP principle: Leave no one behind) Low risk. The GIS-based NRW system covers the entire water distribution networks of both islands, benefiting all water users in SKN. Project description explicitly notes the need to identify areas and vulnerable groups most</p>				<p>P2: Access and Equity The beneficiary population for this TA is the entire population of Saint Kitts and Nevis served by the national water network — equitable access is therefore structurally embedded in the project design, as the GIS system covers the full distribution network of both islands. To further ensure that efficiency gains from NRW reduction reach all consumers equitably rather than disproportionately benefiting the tourism sector or wealthier urban areas, the following measures are included in the mitigation approach: (i) the DMA pilot areas</p>	<p>NDE consultation. P2: Access and Equity Will be monitored through AF core indicator "n&#186; of beneficiaries disaggregated by women and youth". % of DMA pilot areas covering low-income or water-vulnerable service zones (defined at inception). GIS system configured to enable service-zone equity reporting. Reported at midterm and closure. P3: Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups Number of stakeholder consultations including water-vulnerable groups, disaggregated by type. Reported in implementing partner reports and Steering Committee minutes. P4: Human Rights % of</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	---	--

		<p>susceptible to water supply shortages. Equitable service delivery is embedded in the DMA design methodology. [Source: SKN SRIF GP1–GP2, rated L] P3: Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups Low risk. Project description explicitly identifies areas and vulnerable groups most susceptible to water supply shortages, including smallholder farmers and tourism sector workers. GIS data model can reveal and address service inequities affecting low-income and rural communities. [Source: SKN SRIF GP2, rated L] P4: Human Rights Low risk. Equitable access to</p>				<p>will be selected to include at minimum one zone serving low-income households or smallholder agricultural users, as identified in the inception-stage stakeholder mapping; (ii) the GIS data model will be configured to track service delivery equity by zone, enabling WSD and NWD to identify and prioritise areas with the highest water loss and the most vulnerable consumer groups; and (iii) the strategic decision-making framework developed under the TA will include an equity-of-access criterion, ensuring that future investment decisions</p>	<p>DMA pilot coverage including low-income service zones. GIS equity reporting functionality documented in system design report. Reported at midterm and closure. P5: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Will be monitored through AF core indicator "n&#186; of beneficiaries disaggregated by women and youth". % of WSD/NWD training participants who are women (target: ≥40%). GAAP delivered at inception. Reported through AF core indicator and CTCN gender tracking. P8: Involuntary Resettlement No incident of involuntary land access. All DMA</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>water is a recognised human right. The GIS monitoring system enhances transparent, data-driven decision-making that supports non-discriminatory service provision. All activities implemented by and for government water authorities. [Source: SKN SRIF GP3, rated L] P5: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (equivalent to UNEP principle: Human rights and gender equality) Low risk. WSD and NWD staff training activities will ensure gender-balanced participation. Mandatory GAAP to be delivered at inception as per CTCN AB decision. Project SRIF confirmed gender-</p>				<p>based on GIS data explicitly consider distribution fairness alongside technical efficiency. P3: Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups This TA is technical capacity-building for government water utilities, so the primary direct beneficiaries are WSD and NWD staff rather than a community group. However, the ultimate purpose of reducing Non Revenue Water (NRW) is improved water supply service for all residents — and the risk flagged under P3 is that efficiency gains disproportionately benefit wealthier consumers and the tourism</p>	<p>field access arrangements documented with landowner consent records. Reported in implementing partner GAAP and progress reports. P11: Climate Change As defined in the signed proposal, CC will be monitored through AFRT indicators: Core indicator: Increased resiliency at community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change. Outcome 1: Reduced exposure to climate-related hazards and threats. Output 2.1: Strengthened capacity of national and sub-national centers and networks to respond rapidly to extreme weather events. Output 7: Improved</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	---

		<p>balanced design and implementation approach. [Source: SKN SRIF GP4–GP5, rated L] P8: Involuntary Resettlement (equivalent to UNEP principle: Displacement — UNEP ESS Standard SS6, rated 2,1,L) Low risk. DMA pilot establishment and field work for NRW detection may require access to private or community land for metering equipment installation. SRIF rates impact at 2 reflecting the field access component, but probability at 1. No permanent displacement anticipated; access-only arrangements planned. [Source: SKN SRIF SS6, rated 2,1,L] P11: Climate Change</p>				<p>sector rather than the most vulnerable households. Specific mitigation measures to ensure vulnerable groups benefit in practice: (i) Vulnerability mapping in GIS baseline: The stakeholder mapping and GIS data structure developed at inception will include a spatial layer identifying the most water-insecure service zones — defined as areas with highest frequency of supply interruptions, highest water-related health incidents, and highest concentration of low-income households. This layer will be used to prioritise the DMA pilot location. (ii)</p>	<p>integration of climate-resilience strategies into country development plans. NRW reduction achieved in pilot DMA zone (baseline vs. closure). Groundwater salinity monitoring layer operational in GIS system by closure. Climate risk data layer integrated in GIS by midterm. Reported in annual PPR and closure report. P12: Pollution Prevention & Resource Efficiency Zero significant environmental incident (spills, contamination) during field activities. NRW reduction achieved in pilot DMA zone reported through AF Output 2.1 indicator. P13: Public Health Groundwater salinity</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	---	---

		<p>(equivalent to UNEP principle: Climate change and Disaster Risks — UNEP ESS Standard SS2, rated 2,2,L) Low-medium risk (SS2 rated 2,2,L). Climate change is the core rationale for this TA. SKN faces increasing drought frequency, sea level rise threatening groundwater salinity, and intensifying rainfall variability — all compounding existing water scarcity. The GIS-based NRW system directly builds climate resilience by maximising efficiency of already-limited freshwater resources. [Source: SKN SRIF SS2, rated 2,2,L] P12: Pollution Prevention & Resource</p>				<p>DMA pilot site selection criterion: At least one of the pilot District Metered Areas will be located in a zone identified as serving a concentration of vulnerable or low-income water users, ensuring that the practical learning from the pilot — reduced NRW, more reliable supply — directly benefits this group first rather than defaulting to technically easier zones. (iii) Training inclusion: WSD and NWD training sessions will include a module on using GIS data to identify and address service inequities — building institutional capacity to ensure that future investment decisions</p>	<p>monitoring layer incorporated in GIS data model by project closure. Reported in final technical report.</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	---	--

		<p>Efficiency Low risk. Improved NRW management directly supports water resource efficiency. Field activities (pipe inspection, meter installation) carry a low risk of accidental spills. [Source: SKN SRIF SS3, rated 1,1,L] P13: Public Health Low risk.</p> <p>Improved water system reliability directly supports safe public water supply. Groundwater salinity from sea level rise (flagged in SKN SRIF SS2) is a public health concern the GIS system will help detect and monitor. [Source: SKN SRIF SS4, rated 1,1,L]</p>				<p>guided by the GIS system are equity-informed, not only efficiency-driven. (iv) Results disaggregation: NRW reduction data will be tracked and reported per DMA zone, enabling WSD and NWD to demonstrate that improvements in water availability are reaching underserved areas and not only the better-served parts of the network. P4: Human Rights GIS data model and DMA design to explicitly identify areas serving low-income and vulnerable water users. Strategic decision-making framework to include equity-of-access reporting. UNEP grievance mechanism available to</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>all stakeholders. P5: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment The project will ensure gender and youth participation during the implementation phase through trainings and stakeholder consultations. Since 2024, all CTCN projects must provide a mandatory Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan (GAAP) and the implementing partner must demonstrate that at least 5% of the budget is used on gender mainstreaming activities. Gender-balanced participation targeted in WSD/NWD staff training (target: $\geq 40\%$ women among trainees). GAAP to assess</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>differential impacts of water scarcity on women and female-headed households. Minimum 5% of budget allocated to gender mainstreaming. P7: Indigenous Peoples Implementing partner to confirm at inception that no project activity affect areas with indigenous communities . UNEP grievance mechanism available to all stakeholders. P8: Involuntary Resettlement DMA and field work to use access agreements rather than land acquisition. Any access to private or community land to be documented with written consent of landowner. No permanent metering</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>infrastructure to be installed without formal permission from relevant authorities. Implementing partner to confirm no displacement required at inception.</p> <p>P11: Climate Change CC is the core focus of this TA. The objective is to increase the resilience of the targeted population of SKN to climate-related water stress. GIS data model to incorporate climate scenario data (projected drought frequency, sea level rise, rainfall variability) for climate-resilient infrastructure planning. Staff training includes interpretation of climate risk data for long-term water system planning. Groundwater</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>r salinity monitoring layer incorporated in GIS model. P12: Pollution Prevention & Resource Efficiency Field activities to follow UN contractor health and safety standards to prevent spills or contamination. NRW reduction methodology to include water balancing to avoid over-extraction. Implementing partner to document any environmental incidents. P13: Public Health Groundwater salinity monitoring layer to be incorporated into GIS data model as a public health indicator. Improved NRW data to be shared with public health authorities as a planning tool. UNEP</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						grievance mechanism available to all stakeholders.	
USP 3: [Liberia] Blue-Green Infrastructure for Urban Resilience	Yes	<p>P1: Compliance with the Law (equivalent to UNEP Guiding principle: Accountability) Low risk. The project is requested and led by the Ministry of Environment (NDE). All activities are subject to Liberia's Environmental Protection Agency requirements and national urban planning legislation. Community site selection is undertaken in consultation with local government authorities. [Source: Liberia SRIF GP1, Cleared] P2: Access and Equity (equivalent to UNEP principle: Leave no one behind) Low risk. The project</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>P1: Compliance with the Law Avoidance: The project has been requested by a governmental institution and will be led by a governmental institution. Thus, the risk of non-compliance to the law is weak. NDE oversight and government-led implementation ensures regulatory compliance throughout. Site selection and rain garden installation to comply with EPA requirements and local planning permissions. P2: Access and Equity The technology introduced (rain gardens) is site-specific urban infrastructure whose</p>	<p>P1: Compliance with the Law Indicator: Statement by the governmental institution. Governmental statement confirming regulatory compliance reported at project inception. EPA and local planning permissions documented for each pilot site. P2: Access and Equity Will be monitored through AF core indicator "n&#186; of beneficiaries disaggregated by women and youth". % of rain garden sites located in most flood-vulnerable/underserved neighbourhoods (target: 100% in priority flood zones identified in baseline study).</p>

		<p>targets the most flood-exposed and underserved communities in Monrovia and Paynesville informal settlements. Extended stakeholder consultations across districts are included in the Response Plan. Six months of capacity building to district inhabitants is embedded in the RP, ensuring broad access to project benefits. [Source: Liberia SRIF GP1–GP2, rated L] P3: Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups (equivalent to UNEP principle: Leave no one behind) Low risk. Project explicitly targets vulnerable communities including youth and residents of flood-prone informal settlements</p>				<p>benefits — flood reduction, runoff filtration, urban greening — are inherently local and community-level. To ensure equitable access to these benefits, the following selection process is applied: (i) pilot city - raingarden sites will be identified through participatory community consultations across multiple districts of Monrovia and Paynesville, with site selection criteria explicitly prioritising the most flood-exposed and underserved neighbourhoods as identified in the baseline hydrological mapping and risk assessment (Output 1); (ii) the baseline</p>	<p>Reported at midterm and closure. P3: Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups Will be monitored through AF Outcome 6 indicator "Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas". % of project beneficiaries from targeted vulnerable communities (youth, flood-exposed residents), disaggregated by age and gender. Reported through AF core indicator and CTCN M&E system. P5: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Will be monitored through AF core indicator "n&#186; of beneficiaries disaggregated by women</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	---

		<p>— a population highly exposed to health risks from inadequate grey infrastructure and climate change. Educational component (Output 4) specifically oriented towards the youngest and most vulnerable populations. [Source: Liberia SRIF GP2, rated L] P5: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (equivalent to UNEP principle: Human rights and gender equality) Low risk. Gender-balanced participation is planned for all stakeholder consultations, site selection, and capacity building (an expected 25% of women is targeted)Mandatory GAAP to be formulated at inception</p>				<p>study will include an equity mapping documenting which areas and population groups are most severely affected by flooding and least served by existing grey infrastructure, and this mapping will drive the site selection decision; (iii) community members — including youth and women — participate in site identification workshops, ensuring local knowledge of the most vulnerable locations is incorporated; and (iv) the educational component (Output 4) is delivered across all target districts, not only in raingarden pilot sites, ensuring knowledge of the</p>	<p>and youth". % of women among training and capacity building participants (target: ≥40%). GAAP delivered at inception. ≥5% budget on gender mainstreaming confirmed in closure financial report. P7: Indigenous Peoples No specific AF RT indicators for indigenous peoples. UNEP grievance mechanism available to all stakeholders. No incidents of project activities in areas with indigenous communities. Confirmed in inception report and implementing partner progress and GAAP reports. P9: Protection of Natural Habitats No net loss of urban green cover documented through site</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	---

		<p>stage per CTCN AB decision. Liberia SRIF confirmed gender-balanced design and implementation approach. [Source: Liberia SRIF GP4–GP5, rated L] P7: Indigenous Peoples (equivalent to UNEP principle: Indigenous Peoples — UNEP ESS Standard SS7, rated 1,1,L) Low risk. Project implemented in urban areas (Monrovia and Paynesville). No indigenous territory or community has been identified in these urban project areas. All consultations involved local government and community stakeholders in an urban context. [Source: Liberia SRIF SS7, rated 1,1,L] P9: Protection of</p>				<p>technology and its climate adaptation benefits is accessible to the broader population regardless of physical proximity to pilot sites. P3: Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups The project context — informal urban settlements in Monrovia and Paynesville — means the entire target population is structurally vulnerable. The specific challenge under P3 is ensuring that within this already-vulnerable population, the most marginalised sub-groups (women, youth, elderly, disabled residents, non-Liberian communities) are actively included rather than passively assumed to benefit.</p>	<p>survey at inception and closure. Reported in midterm and closure reports. P11: Climate Change As defined in the signed proposal, CC will be monitored through AFRT indicators: Core indicator: Increased resiliency at community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change. Outcome 1: Reduced exposure to climate-related hazards and threats. Output 2.1: Strengthened capacity of national and sub-national centers and networks to respond rapidly to extreme weather events. Output 7: Improved integration of climate-resilience strategies into country development</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>Natural Habitats (equivalent to UNEP principle: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Resource Management — UNEP ESS Standard SS1, rated 1,2,L) Low risk. Raingarden installations are designed as urban green infrastructure with positive ecological co-benefits (improved stormwater management, urban biodiversity support). Project description confirms use of degraded urban sites with no clearance of natural vegetation or wetland areas anticipated. [Source: Liberia SRIF SS1, rated 1,2,L] P11: Climate Change (equivalent to UNEP principle: Climate change and Disaster</p>				<p>Specific mitigation measures: (i) Sub-group identification in baseline: The baseline study (Output 1) will include a social vulnerability mapping exercise within the target districts, identifying which neighbourhoods and population sub-groups experience the highest flood exposure combined with the lowest adaptive capacity (lowest income, weakest housing structure, least access to health services). This mapping will directly inform site prioritisation. (ii) Targeted community engagement: Stakeholder consultations will not rely solely on general</p>	<p>plans. Raingardens functioning as designed after at least one major rainfall event ($\geq 50\text{mm/hour}$) documented in wet-season monitoring report. Number of community members benefiting from reduced flood risk. Reported in annual PPR and closure report. P12: Pollution Prevention & Resource Efficiency Water quality parameters (pH, turbidity, faecal coliforms) measured in raingarden outflow at midterm and closure. No significant increase in contamination compared to baseline. Reported in wet-season pilot monitoring report. P13: Public Health No vector-related</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

		<p>Risks — UNEP ESS Standard SS2, rated 1,2,L) Low risk. Climate change (increased flooding, storm surge, sea level rise, heavy rainfall) is the core driver of this urban resilience project. Rapid urbanisation in Monrovia and Paynesville has created informal settlements with high flood exposure and no green spaces. Raingardens directly address this by managing stormwater and reducing flood risk. [Source: Liberia SRIF SS2, rated 1,2,L] P12: Pollution Prevention & Resource Efficiency Low risk. Inadequate grey infrastructure in Monrovia and Paynesville can lead to groundwater</p>			<p>community meetings — which systematically under-represent women, youth, disabled people and recent migrants. The implementing partner will conduct separate focus groups with these sub-groups at inception and midterm to ensure their specific flood risk experiences and priorities are captured in project design and monitoring. (iii) Educational component targeting: Output 4 (educational/capacity building component) is explicitly oriented towards the youngest and most vulnerable populations per the Response Plan. The implementing partner will document</p>	<p>health incidents attributable to project infrastructure, documented through community health records and Steering Committee reporting. Drainage time within 24 hours verified during wet-season pilot monitoring.</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

		<p>contamination during flooding (noted in project description). Raingardens are specifically designed to filter urban runoff and reduce contamination pathways. [Source: Liberia SRIF SS3, rated 1,1,L] P13: Public Health Low risk. SRIF identified slightly elevated probability (1,2,L) due to flood-related health risks including contaminated floodwater and vector breeding in standing water. Raingarden design addresses this by managing water infiltration and preventing standing water accumulation. [Source: Liberia SRIF SS4, rated 1,2,L]</p>				<p>that at least two of the planned educational sessions are held in the most vulnerable neighbourhoods identified in the baseline social mapping, and that participation is tracked disaggregated by age, gender, and neighbourhood. (iv) Maintenance governance inclusion: Raingarden maintenance protocols will be co-designed with community members, including representatives of the most marginalised groups, ensuring that the long-term benefits of the technology are not captured by better-organised community groups. Community maintenance committees will be established</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>with explicit representation requirements . (v) Grievance mechanism accessibility: The UNEP grievance mechanism will be communicated proactively in local languages and formats accessible to low-literacy community members. The implementing partner will document outreach to vulnerable sub-groups confirming awareness of and access to the grievance channel. P5: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment The project will ensure gender and youth participation during the implementation phase through trainings and stakeholder consultations. Since 2024, all</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>CTCN projects must provide a mandatory Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan (GAAP) and the implementing partner must demonstrate that at least 5% of the budget is used on gender mainstreaming activities. Gender expert mandatory in implementing team. GAAP delivered at inception. At least 5% of project budget allocated to gender mainstreaming. Gender-balanced participation in site selection and community consultations actively ensured. P7: Indigenous Peoples The project is not planning activities located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>peoples. UNEP grievance mechanism will be used for all AFCIA II projects. Implementin g partner to confirm at inception that no project activity take place in or near areas with indigenous communities . UNEP grievance mechanism available to all stakeholders. P9: Protection of Natural Habitats Sites to be selected on degraded urban land. Implementin g partner to confirm no clearance of existing urban green cover or wetland areas in site selection report. If any removal of existing vegetation is required, replanting with native species to be included in raingarden design</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>specification . P11: Climate Change CC is the core focus of this TA. The objective is to increase the resilience of the targeted population (communities in flood-prone urban areas of Monrovia and Paynesville) in Liberia, an LDC. Hydrological mapping (Output 1) to consider projected climate scenarios including sea level rise and intensification of rainfall. Sites validated during both dry and wet seasons to test viability under current and projected conditions. In case climate hazards disrupt implementation, adaptive measures defined jointly with CTCN, NDE and</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>implementing partner.</p> <p>P12: Pollution Prevention & Resource Efficiency Raingarden design to include appropriate filtration layers to reduce runoff-borne contamination. No chemical treatments to be applied to substrate without prior environmental review.</p> <p>Pilot monitoring to include water quality testing of raingarden outflow.</p> <p>P13: Public Health Raingarden design to ensure no standing water accumulation between rainfall events (maximum 24-hour drainage criterion).</p> <p>Community maintenance protocols to include mosquito vector control checks. UN contractor</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						health and safety standards to be applied during installation. UNEP grievance mechanism available to all stakeholders.	
USP 4: [Mongolia] EbA and digitalized risk mitigation insurance solutions	Yes	<p>P1: Compliance with the Law (equivalent to UNEP Guiding principle: Accountability) Low risk. The project is implemented under governmental supervision in Dundgobi and Uvurkhangai provinces. NDE comprises the Ministry of Environment and Tourism and the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Light Industry — both co-signed the Response Plan. All activities subject to Mongolian agricultural, environmental and insurance</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>P1: Compliance with the Law Avoidance: The project has been requested by governmental institutions and will be implemented under governmental supervision in 2 provinces: Dundgobi and Uvurkhangai. The risks of non-compliance with the law are restricted. NDE oversight and government-supervised implementation ensures ongoing regulatory compliance. Insurance product design will comply with Mongolia's financial services</p>	<p>P1: Compliance with the Law Indicator: Governmental statement. Governmental statement confirming regulatory compliance from both NDEs at project inception. Insurance product design reviewed for regulatory compliance documented in technology assessment report. P2: Access and Equity Will be monitored through AF core indicator "n&#186; of beneficiaries disaggregated by women and youth". % of beneficiary farmers with access to the</p>

		<p>legislation. [Source: Mongolia SRIF GP1, Cleared] P2: Access and Equity (equivalent to UNEP principle: Leave no one behind) Low risk. EbA technologies and digitalized insurance target smallholder vegetable farmers in two remote provinces facing significant climate risks. Digital insurance product design carries a risk of excluding farmers without smartphones or digital literacy — addressed through accessibility requirements in the technology assessment. [Source: Mongolia SRIF GP1–GP2, rated L] P3: Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups (equivalent</p>				<p>regulatory framework. Implementing partner to confirm regulatory compliance at inception. P2: Access and Equity Both technology streams in this project — EbA practices and the digitalized crop insurance product — carry specific equity-of-access risks for remote smallholder farmers that the mitigation approach must address. For EbA technologies (solar irrigation, greenhouses, agroforestry) : (i) participating farmers are selected through a transparent, government-supervised process coordinated by the NDEs (Ministry of Environment and Tourism; Ministry of</p>	<p>insurance product without requiring a smartphone (via agent or offline system). Reported at closure through implementing partner report. P3: Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups Will be monitored through AF Outcome 6 indicator "Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas". Number of women-headed farm households engaged in insurance co-design consultations and training. Reported through GAAP delivery milestone and AF core indicator (beneficiaries disaggregated by gender). P4: Human Rights No</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

		<p>to UNEP principle: Leave no one behind) Low risk. Smallholder farmers in remote Mongolian provinces are the primary target group. Mongolia SRIF notes that explicit engagement of disabled or marginalized farmers is limited and flags this for attention at inception stage. Women-headed farm households face specific barriers to insurance access and climate finance. [Source: Mongolia SRIF GP2, rated L] P4: Human Rights (equivalent to UNEP principle: Human rights and gender equality) Low risk. No human rights concerns were raised during stakeholder</p>				<p>Food, Agriculture and Light Industry) prioritising the most climate-vulnerable smallholder households in Dundgobi and Uvurkhangai provinces; (ii) the technology assessment (Output 1) will include an affordability analysis for each technology, ensuring that recommended options are accessible to smallholders at typical income levels in the two provinces rather than only to better-resourced farmers; and (iii) where upfront costs represent a barrier, the assessment will recommend financing or subsidy mechanisms to ensure access is not limited to wealthier farmers within the</p>	<p>specific AF RT indicators for human rights. UNEP grievance mechanism available to all stakeholders. Steering Committees (quarterly) and Technical Committees (monthly) serve as reporting channels. Zero human rights grievances filed through UNEP mechanism during reporting period. Training materials produced in Mongolian confirmed in inception report. P5: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Will be monitored through AF core indicator "n&#186; of beneficiaries disaggregated by women and youth". % of women among direct project beneficiaries</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	---	--

		<p>engagement. Project specifically targets vulnerable farming communities and integrates human rights principles through inclusive design, gender-sensitive approaches, and grievance mechanisms. [Source: Mongolia SRIF GP3, no concerns raised] P5: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (equivalent to UNEP principle: Human rights and gender equality) Low risk. Project integrates gender-sensitive approaches to finance, training and technology adoption. Women farmers are specifically identified as key beneficiaries. Mandatory GAAP at inception per</p>				<p>beneficiary group. For the digitalized insurance product: (iv) the product design process will include a digital access audit — identifying what proportion of target farmers have smartphone access and what proportion would require an intermediary agent or offline channel — with the product design adapted accordingly; and (v) insurance enrolment criteria will be reviewed to ensure that women-headed households, elderly farmers, and farmers without formal land title are not structurally excluded by eligibility conditions. P3: Marginalize d and</p>	<p>(target: ≥40%). GAAP delivered at inception. ≥5% budget on gender mainstreaming confirmed in closure financial report. P7: Indigenous Peoples No specific AF RT indicators for indigenous peoples. UNEP grievance mechanism available to all stakeholders. No incidents of project activities in areas of nomadic or indigenous land use. Confirmed in inception report and implementing partner progress reports. P8: Involuntary Resettlement No specific AF RT indicators for involuntary resettlement. UNEP grievance mechanism available to all stakeholders. Zero</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

		<p>CTCN AB decision. Mongolia SRIF confirmed gender-balanced design approach. [Source: Mongolia SRIF GP4–GP5, rated L] P7: Indigenous Peoples (equivalent to UNEP principle: Indigenous Peoples — UNEP ESS Standard SS7, rated 1,1,L) Low risk. The project focuses on vegetable farmers in Dundgobi and Uvurkhangai. No activities are planned on lands of nomadic or indigenous communities. However, given that Mongolia has significant nomadic herding populations in rural provinces, the SRIF notes that a proximity check at inception is warranted.</p>				<p>Vulnerable Groups This project serves smallholder vegetable farmers in two remote provinces — a group that is already climate-vulnerable and economically marginalised. However, within this group, further gradations of vulnerability exist (female-headed households, farmers without formal land rights, herder-to-farmer transitions, elderly farmers) that standard outreach can miss. Specific mitigation measures to ensure the most vulnerable are reached in practice: (i) Vulnerability profile at inception: At project start, the implementing partner</p>	<p>displacement or land access complaints documented. Confirmed in inception report and implementing partner progress reports. P9: Protection of Natural Habitats No specific AF RT indicators for natural habitats. Status of natural habitats in project areas documented in technology assessment report. No conversion of natural habitats documented. Technology assessment report confirms EbA options are habitat-neutral or habitat-positive. Reported at midterm. P10: Conservation of Biological Diversity No specific AF RT indicators for biodiversity. Status documented</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

		<p>[Source: Mongolia SRIF SS7, rated 1,1,L] P8: Involuntary Resettlement (equivalent to UNEP principle: Displacement — UNEP ESS Standard SS6, rated 1,1,L) Low risk. The project is predominantly knowledge-intensive TA (feasibility studies, technology assessment, insurance design, capacity building). No land acquisition or displacement activities planned. All field activities conducted on existing agricultural land with farmer consent.</p> <p>[Source: Mongolia SRIF SS6, rated 1,1,L] P9: Protection of Natural Habitats (equivalent to UNEP principle: Biodiversity,</p>				<p>will produce a socio-economic profile of smallholder farmers in Dundgobi and Uvurkhangai, identifying the most climate-exposed and economically marginalised sub-groups. The profile will draw on data from the two NDEs (Ministry of Environment and Tourism; Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Light Industry) and local agricultural extension offices. This profile will be used to set targeting priorities for training and technology piloting. (ii) Insurance eligibility review: The digitalized crop insurance product design process will include an explicit eligibility review to</p>	<p>in technology assessment report. No impacts on biodiversity or protected areas documented. Technology assessment confirms recommended options are biodiversity-neutral or beneficial. Reported at midterm and closure. P11: Climate Change As defined in the signed proposal, CC will be monitored through AF RT indicators: Core indicator: Increased resiliency at community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change. Outcome 1: Reduced exposure to climate-related hazards and threats. Output 2.1: Strengthened capacity of national and sub-national centers and networks to</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	---	--

		<p>Ecosystems and Natural Resource Management — UNEP ESS Standard SS1, rated 1,1,L) Low risk. EbA activities (agroforestry, greenhouse systems, soil moisture management) actively promote ecosystem health rather than threatening it. No conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats is planned. Project activities are confined to existing agricultural land.</p> <p>[Source: Mongolia SRIF SS1, rated 1,1,L] P10: Conservation of Biological Diversity (equivalent to UNEP principle: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Resource Management — UNEP ESS Standard</p>				<p>ensure that farmers without formal land titles, those with the smallest landholdings, and women-headed households are not structurally excluded by standard insurance underwriting criteria. Where standard eligibility rules would exclude the most vulnerable, the product design team will propose adapted eligibility conditions or group insurance mechanisms.</p> <p>(iii) Technology accessibility for the most marginalised: The technology assessment (Output 1) will include an affordability and accessibility analysis for each EbA technology option (solar irrigation, greenhouses,</p>	<p>respond rapidly to extreme weather events.</p> <p>Output 7: Improved integration of climate-resilience strategies into country development plans. Number of climate adaptation technologies assessed and recommended in technology assessment report. Number of farmers trained in climate-resilient technologies. Reported at midterm and closure through implementing partner reports. P12: Pollution Prevention & Resource Efficiency Water use efficiency benchmarks documented in technology assessment report. No increase in high-risk agro-input use attributable to project,</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>SS1, rated 1,1,L) Low risk. Project activities (agroforestry, greenhouses, solar irrigation) are confined to existing agricultural land and have no planned impact on identified or protected biodiversity areas. EbA approaches by design support biodiversity co-benefits. [Source: Mongolia SRIF SS1, rated 1,1,L] P11: Climate Change (equivalent to UNEP principle: Climate change and Disaster Risks — UNEP ESS Standard SS2, rated 1,1,L) Low risk. Climate change (water scarcity, extreme temperatures, increased frequency of extreme weather events) is the core rationale for this TA.</p>			<p>agroforestry) assessing what upfront investment is required and what proportion of the most vulnerable farming households could realistically adopt it without additional financial support. Technologies that are accessible only to better-resourced farmers within the target group will be flagged, and the assessment will recommend complementary financing or subsidy instruments. (iv) Differentiated training delivery: Training sessions will not be delivered solely at provincial capitals. The implementing partner will conduct at least two training sessions per</p>	<p>documented through farmer training records and field visit notes. P15: Lands and Soil Conservation Soil health indicators included in technology assessment report for recommended agroforestry and irrigation options. No negative change in soil health metrics observed at closure, documented in closing report.</p>
--	--	---	--	--	---	---

		<p>Smallholder farmers in Dundgobi and Uvurkhangai face increasing threats to food security from these impacts. The project directly tests and pilots climate adaptation technologies including solar irrigation, greenhouses, agroforestry, and crop insurance. [Source: Mongolia SRIF SS2, rated 1,1,L] P12: Pollution Prevention & Resource Efficiency Low risk. Introduction of solar irrigation and agricultural technologies could, if poorly designed, lead to increased water extraction or agro-chemical use. Technology assessment (Output 1) must evaluate</p>				<p>province at sub-district (soum) level in locations identified as serving the highest concentrations of climate-vulnerable and economically marginalised farmers, and will provide transport or in-kind support to enable participation by farmers who cannot travel. (v) Monitoring disaggregation: Beneficiary data will be collected and reported disaggregated not only by gender and youth but also by farm size, land tenure status, and ethnicity where relevant — enabling CTCN and the NDEs to assess whether the most marginalised groups are in fact being reached by project activities or</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>water use efficiency and responsible input management. [Source: Mongolia SRIF SS3, rated 1,1,L] P15: Lands and Soil Conservation Low risk. EbA activities (agroforestry, greenhouses, soil moisture management) are broadly positive for soil health. However, solar irrigation enabling intensification beyond sustainable water abstraction limits could increase soil salinisation risk over time. Technology assessment to include soil health indicators. [Source: Mongolia SRIF SS1+SS3, rated 1,1,L]</p>				<p>whether uptake is concentrated among better-resourced farmers. . P4: Human Rights UNEP grievance mechanism will be used for all AFCIA II projects. UNEP grievance mechanism available to all project stakeholders. Steering Committee (quarterly) and Technical Committee (monthly) provide formal channels for any concerns. All communications and training materials to be produced in Mongolian. P5: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment The project will ensure gender and youth participation during the implementation phase</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>through trainings and stakeholder consultations. Since 2024, all CTCN projects must provide a mandatory Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan (GAAP) and the implementing partner must demonstrate that at least 5% of the budget is used on gender mainstreaming activities. Women farmers to be specifically engaged in insurance product co-design consultations. Financial inclusion mechanisms to address gender-specific barriers (land titling, mobile money access). GAAP delivered at inception. Minimum 5% of budget allocated to gender</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>mainstreaming. P7: Indigenous Peoples The activities of the project are not going to be implemented in a protected area. UNEP grievance mechanism will be used for all AFCIA II projects. Implementing partner to confirm at inception that no project activity take place on or near lands used by nomadic or indigenous communities . If any overlap is identified, stakeholder consultation to be conducted in accordance with UNEP ESSF. UNEP grievance mechanism available to all stakeholders.</p> <p>P8: Involuntary Resettlement The project is not planning any activities involving</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>displacement. It is requested and supervised by governmental institutions. UNEP grievance mechanism will be used for all AFCIA II projects. No land acquisition or displacement required. All field activities conducted with explicit consent of participating farmers. Implementing partner to confirm no resettlement is needed at inception.</p> <p>P9: Protection of Natural Habitats The project does not convert or degrade critical natural habitats. Instead, it promotes agroforestry and ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) to enhance land resilience. Steering Committees</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>and Technical Committees will be organised quarterly and monthly respectively. Technology assessment to confirm all recommende d EbA measures are compatible with natural habitat protection. Implementin g partner to avoid recommendi ng land-use changes that would encroach on steppe or wetland habitats. P10: Conservatio n of Biological Diversity The project does not convert or degrade critical natural habitats. The project activities will have no negative impact on identified and protected areas. Steering Committees and Technical</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Committees will be organised quarterly and monthly respectively. Technology assessment to confirm that all proposed technologies and agroforestry practices are compatible with biodiversity conservation in the two provinces. No activities planned in or near Mongolian protected areas (Nature Reserves, National Parks). P11: Climate Change CC is the core focus of this TA. The objective is to increase the resilience of farmers in Mongolia by developing and implementing an integrated EbA solution. Technology assessment to evaluate climate risk exposure of proposed</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>technologies under more extreme drought scenarios. Capacity building activities to include climate risk literacy for farmers and extension officers. In case climate hazards disrupt implementation, adaptive measures defined jointly with CTCN, NDE and implementing partner.</p> <p>P12: Pollution Prevention & Resource Efficiency Technology assessment to include water efficiency benchmarks and compare proposed technologies against current water use. Assessment to include guidance on responsible agro-input use compatible with digitalized insurance to avoid moral hazard of</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						increased chemical use with insured crops. P15: Lands and Soil Conservation Agroforestry and greenhouse technology assessments to include soil health indicators. Implementing partner to avoid recommending technologies requiring drainage modifications affecting wetland or pasture soils in the two provinces.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L): All risk / potential impacts were assessed as low through the UNEP Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) 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. [5]: All risks / potential impacts were assessed as low through the UNEP Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) thus no safeguard measures were identified nor implemented. List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified. [6]: All risks / potential impacts were assessed as low through the UNEP Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) thus no specific indicators were defined

accordingly. However all projects are monitored through the AF Results tracker as well as CTCN M&E and Closure report. Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period [7]: No safeguards measures implemented during the reporting period.

GP Compliance

Section 1: Quality at entry

Was an initial gender assessment conducted during the preparation of the project/programme's first submission as a full proposal? No

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

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

Gender-responsive element	Level	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Rated result for the reporting period
Mandatory Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan (GAAP)	Output	A GAAP template with mandatory core indicators and sub-indicators have been approved during CTCN AB 24 and shared with all Implementing Partners that have started to implement projects in 2025. All AFCIA II projects have to use this template. This template should help the IPs in considering gender gaps more proactively, by defining quantitative indicators on gender at the beginning of the projects. The gender assessment is also very helpful to better understand the	Defined at USP level	Defined at USP level	Satisfactory

		<p>context in which the project will be implemented, cultural aspects to be considered and supports the continuous monitoring of what has worked, what could have worked better. Finally, UNEP CTCN is looking for an external consultant to design and operationalize AFCIA II Monitoring & Evaluation framework providing gender responsive indicators to enhance impact measurement and alignment across the AFCIA programme</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

Section 2: Quality during implementation and at exit

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

Gender equality and women's empowerment issues	Rated result for the reporting period	Provide justification of the rating provided
Lack of consistency of gender integration and monitoring at technical assistance level across the programme	Satisfactory	<p>During this reporting period, the CTCN has created with the support from WECF (CTCN Gender Constituency) a Gender Assessment and Action Plan (GAAP) with mandatory core indicators and sub-indicators that has been approved during CTCN AB 24 and is being since then implemented on a systematic basis to all new AFCIA technical assistances. This gender assessment and action plan helps to diagnose gender roles and the involvement of women (and youth) in adaptation technologies. It helps to identify mitigation measures and recommendations for addressing gender disparities and designing effective and meaningful gender responsive interventions. In addition, CTCN included a mandatory threshold of at least 5% of the budget to gender mainstreaming activities for all its technical assistances. UNEP CTCN is currently recruiting an external consultant to design and operationalize AFCIA II Monitoring & Evaluation framework providing coherent indicators, systems, and capacity-building tools as well as gender responsive approaches to</p>

		enhance impact measurement and alignment across the AFCIA programme.
--	--	--

Section 3: Implementation arrangements

<p>What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP</p>	<p>The AFCIA 2 programme is being implemented in full accordance with UNEP’s gender-related rules and guidelines. Gender equality is a guiding principle of UNEP’s safeguard screening checklist (SRIF). Gender considerations are mainstreamed throughout the safeguards and are also the focus of three dedicated questions in the first section of the SRIF. Through the review and clearance of the SRIF for each TA, UNEP’s safeguards and gender officers ensure that projects do not generate unintended negative impacts on gender equality. Together, the Adaptation Fund and UNEP promoted the importance of women’s empowerment at COP 30 in Belém through an event titled “Women Entrepreneurs Driving Climate Innovation and Adaptation”, held on 14 December 2025 with the participation of Mirey Atallah, UNEP Chief of the Adaptation and Resilience Branch, Climate Change Division.</p>
<p>Have the implementation arrangements at the IE been effective during the reporting period?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP?</p>	<p>A template for the Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan has been approved during CTCN AB 24. This template includes core and mandatory indicators as well as sub-indicators that can more easily be adapted according to the relevance with the project. This GAAP has been designed in collaboration with the Women Engage for a Common Future (WECF) the Women Constituency of the CTCN. All AFCIA II projects have to use this template. 5 projects have been contracted out of which 3 have already a GAAP approved and under implementation. Mongolia (x2 projects) only signed its contract recently and has not yet submitted this assessment and action plan. This gender assessment and action plan helps to diagnose gender roles and the involvement. It has to be submitted at the inception phase of the projects with clear diagnosis of the risks, challenges identified, mitigation measures and the action plan. It will also be reviewed at closure of the project to compare the expectations with the achievement. This GAAP is reviewed by CTCN Gender Specialist as well as CTCN project manager and the Steering Committee of each project.</p>
<p>Have the implementation arrangements at the EE(s) been effective during the reporting period?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Have any capacity gaps affecting GP compliance been identified during the reporting period and if so, what remediation was implemented?</p>	<p>No</p>

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
Component 1: Innovative, transformative, and locally-led climate adaptation technologies are identified, assessed and tested in developing countries. Outcome 1: Technology development capacities are strengthened through the incubation process of innovative, locally-led climate adaptation technologies	Outcome 8	Outcome indicator: Degree to which capacity of project proponent is strengthened through the incubation process. Target : 20 proponents scoring "High".	Ontrack		Satisfactory
Component 2: Innovative, transformative, and locally-led climate adaptation technologies are scaled up. Outcome 2.: 10 successful innovative locally-led climate adaptation technologies are benefitting a greater number of people through additional funding	Outcome 8	Outcome indicator: Number of beneficiaries from the 10 scaled-up adaptation technologies and innovations among which % of women and youth. Target: at least 3 projects are verified as "very effective" and 7 as "effective. 1,500 direct beneficiaries with at least 30% women. 50% of indirect beneficiaries will be women and 20% youth.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
Component 3: Innovative, transformative, and locally led adaptation technologies are	Outcome 8	Outcome indicator: Number of improved policies and regulations	Ontrack		Satisfactory

<p>leveraged through the establishment of enabling environments (NSI), finance and knowledge Outcome 3: Innovative, transformative, and locally-led climate adaptation technologies are promoted through strengthened environments (NSI).</p>		<p>that promote new adaptation technology uptake. Amount of additional fund leveraged to support adaptation innovation Target: 10 improved policies or regulations that enforce resilience. USD 10,000,000 through 3 CN.</p>			
---	--	--	--	--	--

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

Name	Email
Eva Comba. UNEP Task Manager. Climate Change Adaptation Unit	eva.comba@un.org

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

Overall programme performance to date is assessed as satisfactory, as the 3 outcomes have been initiated. As a result of targeted outreach and the rolling-basis submission process, 20 requests were received during the reporting period, of which 18 were approved for implementation. Two requests were rejected as they fell outside the CTCN mandate (waste management and carbon credits). The approved portfolio demonstrates strong quality, diversity, and alignment with AFCIA II objectives. Outcome 1 is progressing satisfactorily, with 12 projects selected and 5 already under implementation. The rolling-basis approach has enabled close collaboration between the CTCN, countries, and project proponents to strengthen project design and ensure that innovative, transformative, and locally led adaptation solutions are well aligned with programme objectives. Outreach beyond National Designated Entities (NDEs) to universities, research institutions, private-sector actors, NGOs, and local authorities—implemented in partnership with organisations such as the Women and Gender Constituency and the United Nations University—has broadened participation and improved proposal quality. The selected portfolio reflects both sectoral and geographic diversity. Projects span buildings and infrastructure, the Water–Energy–Food (WEF) nexus, energy systems, and innovation ecosystems, with several initiatives integrating multiple AFCIA components (e.g. Mongolia, Lesotho, and Madagascar). 50% of requests were submitted by government entities, 39% by NGOs and cooperatives, and 11% by universities. This shows that efforts put in place to reach the wider knowledge helix have started to pay off. Geographically, Africa accounts for the majority of prioritised projects (8 of 12, noting that three countries cover multiple components), followed by Latin America and the Caribbean (3 projects) and Asia (1 project) while 80% of prioritised requests originate from LDCs and SIDS, confirming strong engagement from priority countries. With 12 projects out of 20 being in Africa, the CTCN plan to focus his efforts for the next reporting period in supporting the SIDS and the LAC region in supporting high quality requests to maintain the geographical balance. Outcome 2 has been initiated, with 2 projects selected out of 10 (Côte d’Ivoire and Madagascar), both currently under bidding and focused on scaling up successfully tested technologies. Outcome 3 has also been initiated, with 4 projects selected, including one contracted project (Mongolia) and three under bidding (Tanzania, Fiji, and Lesotho), laying the groundwork for strengthening national systems of innovation and enabling environments. Key Next Steps and Recommendations - Accelerate contracting and implementation under Outcomes 2 and 3, particularly to support technology scale-up and systemic change. - Continue targeted outreach and technical support to reach project proponents beyond NDE, improve regional balance and ensure focus on LDCs and SIDS. - Enhance coherence across components, strengthen innovation ecosystems, and improve financing pathways through the recruitment of the strategic advisor and the organization of the regional hubs (AFCIA coordination services) - Maintain close monitoring of implementation progresses through the review and strengthening of AFCIA M&E framework to ensure timely delivery and maximize sustainability and transformational impact of micro-grants

Executing Entity / Project Coordinator

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
Component 1: Innovative, transformative, and locally-led climate adaptation technologies are identified, assessed and tested in developing countries	Outcome 8	Outcome indicator: Degree to which capacity of project proponent is strengthened through the incubation process. Target : 20 proponents scoring "High".	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Component 2: Innovative, transformative, and locally-led climate adaptation technologies are scaled up.	Outcome 8	Outcome indicator: Number of beneficiaries from the 10 scaled-up adaptation technologies and innovations among which % of women and youth. Target: at least 3 projects are verified as "very effective" and 7 as "effective. 1,500 direct beneficiaries with at least 30% women. 50% of indirect beneficiaries will be women and 20% youth.	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Component 3: Innovative, transformative, and locally led adaptation technologies are leveraged through the establishment of enabling environments (NSI), finance and knowledge	Outcome 8	Outcome indicator: Number of improved policies and regulations that promote new adaptation technology uptake. Amount of additional fund leveraged to support adaptation innovation Target: 10 improved policies or regulations that enforce resilience. USD 10,000,000 through 3 CN.	Ontrack	Satisfactory

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

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

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

Achievements realised During this reporting period, 18 projects have been selected, 5 have been contracted (one project covering 2 components), and 13 are under bidding process (2 of those also covering 2 components). UNEP CTCN is recruiting an external consultant to design and operationalize three separate but aligned Monitoring & Evaluation frameworks for the UNEP-CTCN AFCIA II sub-programme, the global AFCIA programme, and the broader CTCN portfolio, providing coherent indicators, systems, and capacity-building tools as well as gender responsive approaches to enhance impact measurement and alignment across AFCIA implementing entities. UNEP CTCN is also recruiting an AFCIA Strategic Advisor to provide high-level strategic and technical guidance to enhance the AFCIA programme's impact on climate adaptation technology innovation, investment, and scaling, through strengthened partnerships, improved programme design, and knowledge-driven coordination across implementing entities and regional hubs. Finally CTCN has been mandated at COP 31 to create matchmaing with its network member with the

objective to pilot projects with pro-bono technological support which could come as a complement to AFCIA. Challenges identified Political risks may be a factor that could generate delays in the implementation. As a mitigation measure no response plans or bidding processes are initiated during years of presidential elections in a host country. Financial risks have also been identified as the countries are willing to implement pilots while the budget allocated to each projects by components remain low and CTCN capacity to co-fund is limited as the bidding process to select the future host of the CTCN will start soon.

Other

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

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

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

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

Overall Rating

Overall rating

Satisfactory

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

1. Indicate trends, both positive and negative, in achievement of outcomes as per the project indicators. Trend related to Outcome 1 : High demand, not enough budget: This second edition of AFCIA program will continue to confirm what has already been identified under AFCIA. This challenge has been slightly remodeled under AFCIA II as the initial budget available is lower than during the first edition but most successful projects could receive additional funding to pilot a technology and or strengthen the NSI respective to this specific technology (the 10 most successful projects could thus get up to 330,000 USD instead of 250,000 USD under AFCIA I) but remains low as countries request the CTCN to pilot technologies on the ground. Trend related to Outcome 2: Piloting technologies generate tangible impacts and support both innovation and enabling environment. As referenced in the MTR, UNEP/CTCN noticed that "Piloting small scale climate change adaptation technologies are a way to reach real, palpable impact on community resilience". 10 projects are planned to pilot technologies and 10 will essentially focus on the Enabling Environment. Trend related to Outcome 3: A strong NSI will support the leveraging of additional funding or at least this is the expectations and that's why 10 projects will be supported to strengthen their NSI. 2. Detail critical risks that have affected progress. Risk 1 : Small scale projects are often implemented in silos making it difficult to create systemic change. The AFCIA II coordination proposal will try to create a common vision to the multi IEs AFCIA programmes. Risk 2: Political instability leads to lack of ownership and delays in implementation. The CTCN will aim at supporting SIDS/LDC and developing countries with a stable context (no presidential elections planned for the year during which TAs are prioritized) to limit these risks. 3. No MTR has been done yet on AFCIA II. 4. Throughout AFCIA II, all selected projects remained low risk, with no projects rated as High/Unsatisfactory or Moderate/Unsatisfactory. Robust risk screening and monitoring arrangements will continue throughout the implementation of AFCIA II.

Project Indicators

List of indicators

Type of Indicator (indicators towards Objectives, Outcomes, etc...)	Indicator	Baseline	Progress Since Inception	Target for Project End
Objectives	Number of innovative, transformative, and locally led adaptation technologies tested, scaled up and anchored into a NSI	0	18	60
Outcomes	Outcome 1: Degree to which capacity of project proponent is strengthened through the incubation process	0	18	20
Outcomes	Outcome 2 : Number of beneficiaries from the 10 scaled up adaptation technologies and innovations among which % of women and youth	0	0	At least 3 projects are defined as “very effective” and 7 as “effective”
Outcomes	Outcome 2 : Number of beneficiaries from the 10 scaled up adaptation technologies and innovations among which % of women and youth	0	750 (with 37,5% women)	1500 direct beneficiaries with at least 30% of women
Outcomes	Outcome 2 : Number of beneficiaries from the 10 scaled up adaptation technologies and innovations among which % of women and youth	0	50% women, 20% youth	50% of indirect beneficiaries will be women and 20% youth
Outcomes	Outcome 3 : Number of Improved policies and regulations that promote new adaptation technology uptake	0	0	10

Outcomes	Outcome 3 : Amount of additional fund leveraged to support adaptation innovation	0	0	10000000
Outputs	Output 1.1 Degree to which the process of developing requests for micro-grants has been based on a supportive approach to identifying innovation needs and barriers in the country	0	18	40 proponents scoring 'highly supportive' approach
Outputs	Output 1.1 Number of gender responsive comm, outreach strategy and CB developed	0	1	1
Outputs	Output 1.2 Number of project concept notes selected for technology testing and reponses Plans developed by CTCN	0	15	40
Outputs	Output 1.2 : Number of Gender pre-assessment formulated	0	20	80
Outputs	1.3 Number of adaptation innovations and technologies tested in developing countries	0	0	40
Outputs	1.3 Number of detailed gender assessments and GAP generated at project level	0	3	40
Outputs	2.1 Number of project concept notes selected for technology testing and reponses Plans developed by CTCN	0	0	10
Outputs	3.1 Number of NSI established or improved in developing countries	0	1	10
Outputs	3.1 Number of detailed gender assessments	0	0	10

	generated and GAP at project level			
Outputs	3.2 Number of concept notes submitted to the Adaptation Fund	0	0	3
Outputs	3.2 Number of FP gender assessments formulated	0	0	3
Outputs	3.3 Number of Digital Public Goods created	0	0	1
Outputs	3.3 Degree to which awareness raising strategy has incentivize stakeholders to consider uptake of the adaptation technologies being showcased	0	0	75
Outputs	3.3 Number of projects stories published	0	0	5
Outputs	3.3 Number of lessons learned and technology factsheets	0	0	5
Outputs	3.3 Number of M&E report developed and cleared by the CTCN	0	3	60
Outputs	2.1 Number of technologies scaled up in developing countries	0	2	10

Comments

Objective, support countries to test, scale up and leverage innovative, transformative, and locally led climate adaptation technologies across the technology cycle and anchor these into National Systems of Innovation: 18 projects have been selected under AFCIA II, • 5 projects have already been contracted for a total value of 770,050 USD. o Burundi Resilient Karusi: Smart Irrigation and Rainwater Harvesting (Component 1) 1project. o Mongolia EbA and digitalised risk mitigation insurance solutions also (C1&3), with the identification of reliable EbA solutions and the deployment of insurance products considered as a NSI, 2 projects. o Liberia Blue-Green Infrastructure for Urban Resilience, (C1) 1 project. o Saint Kitts GIS-based monitoring system for non-revenue water reduction, (C1) 1 project. • 13 projects are under bidding process for a total value of 1,099,000 USD Outcome 1 : The capacity of the project proponent is strengthened in the case of the 18 prioritized projects through the stakeholders consultations that are organized between the CTCN, the NDE; AF DA and project proponents. At least 3 meetings have been held for each project and up to 5 when necessary. Outcome 2 : Out of the 2 projects implemented under component 2, an conservative estimation is that Madagascar will reach directly 250 beneficiaries with at least 45% of women, and that Côte d'Ivoire will reach out 500 direct beneficiaries from which 30% women. Average between the 2 projects, 50% of women and 20% youth will indirectly be targeted. A revised target will be proposed once

the M&E officer would be in place and will have reviewed the M&E framework of AFCIA II. The first indicator (at least 3 projects are rated as very effective or effective) will be rated at closure of the TA implemented under Component 2 . Outcome 3 : No improved policies have been reached yet, but Mongolia aim at deploying digitalised risk mitigation insurance solutions (at least 2), Tanzania will launch an incubator for low carbon emissions start ups (1 incubator created), Fiji aims at defining a national policies on climate resilient agriculture (at least 2), and Lesotho will develop a roadmap, National Emergency Telecommunication Plan (NETP), a Cell Broadcast Feasibility Study and Groundwork for Implementation as well as CN to request additional funding to the identified financial institutions thus 4 NSI documents. Thus a total of 9 documents out of 4 projects. No concept notes has been identified or formulated so far. Output 1.1 : 18 projects have been designed in very close cooperating between the NDE, the AF DA, the project proponents. One outreach plan has been developed and will be revised and approved during next reporting period as an AFCIA COMMS Lead is being recruited to cover both AFCIA II and Coordination Services. Output 1.2 : 15 response plans have been signed (3 of them covering 2 components). These are : Mongolia, Lesotho, Madagascar, Burundi, Mongolia, Fiji, Cuba, Chile, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Gambia, Côte Ivoire, Liberia, Togo, Tanzania, Senegal, Sierra Leone. Each request received include a short pre gender analysis. We have received 20 requests in total so far (with 18 selected) Output 1.3: Out of the 5 contracted projects, none have reached the stage of testing the technology yet although this is the objective for at least 40 projects. Each project has to deliver a GAAP. Under this reporting period only Burundi, Liberia and SKN have already submitted a detailed GAAP that has been approved by CTCN gender specialist as well as the NDE and the members of the Steering Committee of each projects. Mongolia (covering 2 components) has been contracted by early dec and didn't reach this stage yet. Output 2.1: Out of Component 2, 2 projects have been selected: Côte Ivoire AI and APP to monitor crop disease, as well as Madagascar with an improvement of water management for the agriculture sector in water-scarce South region but both are still under bidding process. Output 3.1 : Out of the 4 projects already prioritized under this component, one has very recently been contracted (Mongolia with its insurance process). The 3 others remain main under bidding and are Tanzania with the establishment of Tanzania Climate Innovation Centre (TCIC), Lesotho with its adhesion to EWS4All initiative, Fiji with a National policies on climate resilient agriculture. The only project contracted under this component (Mongolia) has not yet submitted its gender assessment. Output 3.2: No CN have been identified or submitted so far. No FP gender assessments formulated yet. Output 3.3 : CTCN signed an adhesion with the Digital Public Good Alliance: <https://new.digitalpublicgoods.net/calls-for-collaborative-action/dpgs-for-climate-action>. The press release in under review before being disseminated. This alliance is the institution that will certify whether a good, a tool, a practice can be named as DPG. They also have a repository with the certified members. This partnership should help the CTCN in proviting high-standard DPG which will consequently benefit AFCIA as well. No projects has reached this stage during the reporting period. 3 kick off meetings and 2 in-person inception workshops have been organized so far. No projects stories published so far Out of the 5 contracted projects, 3 have an M&E that has been cleared by CTCN Project Manager, NDE, Project Proponent and Steering Committee. These will be reviewed by the M&E expert that is currently under recruitment to improve AFCIA II and coordination services frameworks.

Lessons Learned

Implementation and Adaptive Management		
Describe any changes undertaken to improve results on the ground or any changes made to project outputs (i.e. changes to project design)	Challenges & Opportunities	5 projects were initiated during this reporting, and all of them quite recently. Thus no change to the project outputs - design has been made so far.
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts?	Challenges & Opportunities	The AFCIA projects prioritized are all rated as low risk projects when it comes to safeguards. A Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) was developed

		<p>and approved by UNEP safeguards team for each project before the start of the implementation. The dissemination and communication of the grievance mechanism to the main stakeholders is done during the kick off meeting. UNEP CTCN will work on improving the Monitoring system of AFCIA II with the recruitment of a senior expert in Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning expected to be initiated in January 2026.</p>
<p>How have gender considerations been taken into consideration during the reporting period? What have been the lessons learned as a consequence of inclusion of such considerations on project performance or impacts? List lessons learned specific to gender, detailing measures and project/programme-specific indicators highlighting the role of women as key actors in climate change adaptation.</p>	<p>Challenges & Opportunities</p>	<p>During the reporting period, gender considerations were integrated primarily at the programmatic and preparatory level to ensure that AFCIA II is positioned to deliver gender-responsive adaptation outcomes across all supported projects. CTCN actively promoted AFCIA II to women-led NGOs, women experts, and academic institutions during the AFCIA pre-launch phase (October 2024–April 2025). A series of virtual launch events were organized in English, Spanish, and French, targeting National Designated Entities (NDEs), Adaptation Fund focal points, and women stakeholders through the CTCN Gender Constituency, academia, and universities, with support from the UNEP Global Adaptation Network (GAN) and the United Nations University (UNU). These outreach efforts aimed to increase awareness, lower participation barriers, and encourage the submission of gender-responsive technical assistance requests. A key structural measure adopted is the requirement that all AFCIA II-supported projects include a Gender Action Plan (GAP), which has been mandatory since 2024. This ensures that gender analysis, gender-</p>

		<p>responsive activities, and gender-disaggregated indicators are systematically embedded in project design, implementation, and monitoring across all AFCIA II windows. So far three projects have developed their gender assessments. Lessons learned to date indicate that early and proactive engagement with women-led organizations and academic institutions increases awareness of innovation opportunities and helps broaden participation in adaptation initiatives. Making gender requirements mandatory at the program level (e.g. GAPS) has proven critical to moving beyond ad hoc consideration of gender toward more consistent and accountable gender-responsive programming. These measures are expected to strengthen project performance and long-term impacts by ensuring that women are recognized and supported as key agents of change in climate adaptation, particularly in the identification, testing, and scaling of innovative solutions.</p>
<p>Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays?</p>	<p>Opportunities</p>	<p>5 projects were contracted during this reporting, and all contracts were signed very recently. So far no delay with the implementation has been registered. The bidding process has been very fast with an average of 4.75 months. This positive change could be the results of the arrangement put in place following procurement delays witnessed during AFCIA I. The focal points recently created between CTCN & UNON meet in-person every 2 weeks to review the ongoing processes, identify potential risks and their respective mitigation measures. Risks of political instability at country level have been identified and as a mitigation measure CTCN</p>

		<p>is only approving requests for countries with no presidential elections planned shortly (in the case of Central African Republic for example, that submitted a request to the CTCN in September 2025, it was agreed that the decision will be pushed to after the election planned on December 28th).</p>
<p>What implementation issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected progress?</p>	<p>Challenges</p>	<p>1. Challenge: Stand alone country-hosted EWS struggle to ensure their sustainability both because of the associated costs (both of software actualization and cloud hosting) Mitigation measure: Under AFCIA II, the CTCN will intend to collaborate with broader initiatives such as EWS4all Initiative (in the case of Lesotho), Copernicus, as well as UN agencies and regional partners to ensure both a better quantity and quality of data as well as a stronger sustainability of the initiatives. 2. Challenge: sustainable adaptation require more funding than what CTCN - AFCIA II can provide. Mitigation measure. the CTCN under AFCIA II is favorable in supporting countries that already benefitted from AFCIA I support whenever the demand process of the CTCN is respected, and that the impact of additional investment is clear. This is why both Burundi, Mongolia and Saint Kitts (one of the 1st countries supported under AFCIA I) are also supported under AFCIA II. CTCN is also exploring other ways to compensate this gap in funding. This includes a detailed stakeholder mapping of the financial institutions that could have a potential interest in the specific projects implemented in each host country as well as a matchmaking with CTCN network (that became</p>

		<p>mandatory as per COP 31) that could enable CTCN to access some technologies from his network pro bono. 3. Challenge: Post TA scale up requires an early connection with potential donors. Mitigation measure: Financial institutions active in the host countries are mapped as part of the broader and mandatory stakeholder analysis that is mandatory for each CTCN projects. The objective of this mapping of financial locally active institutions would be to identify possible synergies with initiatives ongoing or under formulation early in the process as well as understanding any potential interest - requirements of these potential investors and donors from the early stage of project development</p>
--	--	--

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

No

Climate Resilience Measures	
<p>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?</p>	
<p>What is the potential for the climate resilience measures undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?</p>	
Readiness Interventions (Applicable only to NIEs that received one or more readiness grants)	
<p>What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in accessing and implementing climate finance readiness support that would be relevant to the preparation, design and implementation of future concrete adaptation projects/programmes?</p>	
<p>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</p>	

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?

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	0
Baseline information	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	0	0	0
Baseline information	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0	0
Target performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	1500	30	0
Target performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	0	50	20
Target performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	1500	40	10
Performance at mid-term	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at mid-term	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at mid-term	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0	0
Performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0	0

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

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

	Number of targeted stakeholders - Total	Number of targeted stakeholders - % of female targeted	Hazards information generated and disseminated	Overall effectiveness
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

Output 1.1 Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated

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

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

Output 1.2 Targeted population groups covered by adequate risk reduction systems

Core Indicator 1.2: No. of Early Warning Systems

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

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

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

	Number of staff targeted - Total	Number of staff targeted - % of female targeted	Sector	Capacity level
Baseline information	0	0		
Target performance at completion	0	0		
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

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

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

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

	Type	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion			Multi-sector	4: High capacity
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

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

	Number of beneficiaries	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

Indicator 3.1: Increase in application of appropriate adaptation responses

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

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

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

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

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

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

	No. of technical committees/associations	% of women represented in committes/associations	Level of awareness
Baseline information	0		
Target performance at completion	25	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	0		
Target performance at completion	10	Technical guidelines	

Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

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

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

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

	Sector	Targeted asset	Changes in asset (quantitative or qualitative)
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Indicator 4.1.1: Vulnerable development sector services and infrastructure assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability

Indicator 4.1.1: No. and type of development sector services to respond to new conditions resulting from climate variability and change

	Number of services	Type	Sector
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

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

	Natural resource	Sector	Type
--	-------------------------	---------------	-------------

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

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

Core Indicator 5.1: Natural Assets protected or rehabilitated

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

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

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

	No. of targeted households	% of female headed households	Improvement level
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

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

Output 6 Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate

change impacts, including variability

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

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

Core Indicator 6.1.2: Increased income, or avoided decrease in income

	Number of households (total number in the project area)	Income source	Income level (USD)
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

Outcome 7: Improved policies and regulations that promote and enforce resilience measures**Indicator 7: Climate change priorities are integrated into national development strategy**

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

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

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

	No. of Policies introduced or adjusted	Sector	Scale	Type
Baseline information	0			
Target performance at completion	10	Multi-sector		
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

	No. of Development strategies	Regulation	Effectiveness
Baseline information	0		
Target performance at completion			4: Effective
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

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

	Sector of innovative practice	Geographic Scale	Type
Baseline information			
Target performance at completion			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	Other	No innovative practices	1: Ineffective
Target performance at completion	60	Multi-sector	Completed innovation practices	4: Effective
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

	No. of key findings generated	Type	Effectiveness
Baseline information	0		
Target performance at completion	5	Innovative	
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

completion			