



ADAPTATION FUND

Project Performance Report

Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	4/30/2022 - 4/30/2023
Project Title	Reducing vulnerabilities of populations in the Central Asia region from glacier lake outburst floods in changing climate
Project Summary	The project aims to address risks posed by GLOFs through strengthening the scientific and analytical capacities of institutions and government officials responsible for disaster risk reduction (DRR) and emergencies, through community-gender sensitive based approaches using participatory methods and public awareness campaigns to bring the attention of decision makers as well as the general public for the subject of risks associated with GLOFs. The project will encompass activities on potential outbursts for current glacier lakes and those that will become critical in near future in the light of changing climate.
Database Number	AF00000092
Implementing Entity (IE)	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Type of IE	Multilateral Implementing Entity
Country(ies)	Regional (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan)
Relevant Geographic Points (i.e. cities, villages, bodies of water)	Esik and Talgar (Kazakhstan), Ala-Archa and Ton-Tosor valleys (Kyrgyzstan), Shugnon district (southwestern part of the Pamir Range, Tajikistan), Pskem and Tepar (Uzbekistan)
Name of Implementing Entity Focal Point	Ms Natalya Kim

Project Milestones	
AFB Approval Date	10/15/2020
IE-AFB Agreement Signature Date	1/14/2021
Start of Project/Programme	4/29/2021
Actual Mid-term Review Date (if applicable)	10/29/2023
Original Completion Date	10/28/2026
Revised Completion Date after approval of extension request (if applicable)	

Were there any approval condition for this Project?

No

List each approval condition, if any, and report on the status of meeting them

Category of condition	
Condition or Requirement	
Current Status	
Planned actions, including a detailed time schedule	

List (only) inception report/ extension request(s)/ MTR that have been prepared for the project and provide date(s) of submission for each

Inception Report with Annexes, submitted on 2 June 2021

List the Website address (URL) of project

<https://glofca.org/>

Project Contacts

National/Regional Project Manager/Coordinator	Name	Email	Date
Coordinator	Ms Natalya Kim	n.kim@unesco.org	8/31/2021
Government(s) DA	Mr Olzhas Agabekov (Kazakhstan)	o.agabekov@ecogeo.gov.kz	7/23/2019
Government(s) DA	Mr Beksultan Ibraimov (Kyrgyz Republic)	international@mnr.gov.kg; ibraimov.beksultan@gmail.com; salima.baitokova@gmail.com	4/19/2023
Government(s) DA	Mr G.K. Gulmahmadzoda (Tajikistan)	muhit@hifzitabiat.tj; secretariatnda.tj@gmail.com	7/29/2019
Government(s) DA	Mr Bakhridin Nishonov (Uzbekistan)	uzhymet@meteo.uz	7/18/2019
Implementing Entity	Mr Jayakumar Ramasamy	r.jayakumar@unesco.org	4/29/2021
Executing Agency	Mr Amir Piric	a.piric@unesco.org	3/31/2023

Financial Data

Disbursement of AF grant funds

Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date (\$)	\$2,957,902.00
Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date (\$)	\$2,738,798.00
Project disbursement rate (%)	45.51
Project execution rate (%)	45.51
Add any comments on AF Grant Funds	In accordance with the disbursement schedule indicated in the Agreement, UNESCO has received cumulative 2,957,902 USD as the first and second tranches (830,033 USD and 2,127,869 USD respectively; IE fee included). The disbursed funds have been executed up to 46.7% over the reporting period.
Investment Income (\$)	\$0.00

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

Expenditure Data	
Output	Amount (\$)
Output 1.1: Appropriate mapping and monitoring strategies developed and endorsed	\$35,000.00
Output 1.2: Up-to-date atlas on glacier lakes for each country based on remote sensing data developed and maintained	\$264,878.00
Output 1.3: Organizational capacity to implement and oversee mapping and monitoring strengthened, with an emphasis on regional cooperation on transboundary hazards	\$147,249.35
Output 2.1: Vulnerability assessment and exposure maps developed for endangered communities, including gender and sector-specific analyses	\$30,000.00
Output 2.2: Local risk reduction plans drafted for selected communities vulnerable to GLOFs	\$140,000.00
Output 2.3: DRR and CCA concepts mainstreamed into sub-national development planning in the relevant country context	\$132,218.77
Output 3.1: Local to regional framework of institutional DRR context established and evaluated	\$12,480.00
Output 3.2: Design and implementation plans for four site-specific EWS completed	\$110,000.00
Output 4.1: EWS tested in selected vulnerable communities	\$21,372.34
Output 4.2: Complimentary adptation measures implemented	\$15,000.00
Output 5.1: Web-based knowledge-platform established on GLOF risks and adaptation strategies	\$72,941.64
Output 5.2: Education and training programmes undertaken to equip stakeholders with knowledge and capacity to prepare for, respond to and recover from GLOF disasters	\$182,291.14
Output 5.3: Knowledge and lessons learned from the targeted demonstration projects disseminated within Central Asia and across other high mountain regions	\$81,910.50
IE fee (\$)	\$102,325.36
Execution cost (\$)	\$33,725.14

Planned Expenditure Schedule		
Output	Projected Cost (\$)	Estimated Completion Date
Output 1.1: Appropriate mapping and monitoring strategies developed and endorsed	\$35,000.00	12/1/2023
Output 1.2: Up-to-date atlas on glacier lakes for each country based on remote sensing data developed and maintained	\$35,122.00	12/1/2023
Output 1.3: Organizational capacity to implement and oversee mapping and monitoring strengthened, with an emphasis on regional cooperation on transboundary hazards	\$122,750.65	11/30/2024
Output 2.1: Vulnerability assessment and exposure maps developed for endangered communities, including gender and sector-specific analyses	\$100,000.00	12/1/2024
Output 2.2: Local risk reduction plans drafted for selected communities vulnerable to GLOFs	\$150,000.00	12/1/2024
Output 2.3: DRR and CCA concepts mainstreamed into sub-national development planning in the relevant country context	\$189,381.23	12/1/2024
Output 3.1: Local to regional framework of institutional DRR context established and evaluated	\$24,960.00	3/31/2024
Output 3.2: Design and implementation plans for four site-specific EWS completed	\$877,600.00	12/1/2024
Output 4.1: EWS tested in selected vulnerable communities	\$1,108,627.66	11/30/2024

Output 4.2: Complementary adaptation measures implemented	\$385,000.00	12/1/2024
Output 5.1: Web-based knowledge-platform established on GLOF risks and adaptation	\$37,058.36	3/31/2024
Output 5.2: Education and training programmes undertaken to equip stakeholders with knowledge and capacity to prepare for, respond to and recover from GLOF disasters	\$124,888.86	3/31/2024
Output 5.3: Knowledge and lessons learned from the targeted demonstration projects disseminated within Central Asia and across other high mountain regions	\$67,389.50	3/31/2024
IE fee (\$)		\$262,321.64
Execution cost (\$)		\$21,239.86

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

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

Risk Assessment

Identified Risks

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

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
Financial and Economic: • The overall economic situation is deteriorating, and migrant workers are returning to Central Asia and governments in the region do not consider DRR a high priority any more • Governments reduce their funding for DRR	Low	The project team ensured that the necessity for DRR is continuously emphasized through awareness-raising events, meetings with specialists and decision makers from participating countries. The project representatives advocated for the inclusion of DRR aspects in the countries' UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks and respective Joint Work Plans. Besides, the Central Asian governments' representatives have repeatedly reaffirmed their strong interest in and commitment to DRR at a number of regional and international events, including the Regional Forum of the Heads of Emergency Authorities of Central Asian countries (October 2022) and the UN 2023 Water

		<p>Conference. The recent initiatives of Kyrgyzstan on Sustainable Mountain Development (2022) and the Five Years of Action for the Development of Mountain Regions (2023-2027), as well as of Tajikistan on the International Year of Glaciers Preservation (2025) reaffirmed these Governments' commitments to DRR agenda, with a particular focus on water-related and climate-induced hazards.</p>
<p>Technical: • The proposed technical solutions might prove to be too ambitious • The web-based management/content management system might face acceptance problems • There is a lack of internet access in rural areas</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The key national implementing partners are being gradually involved in the project planning through a number of consultation meetings and regular communication exchange to ensure the technical solutions to be proposed under the project meet the countries expectations and requirements. A series of technical webinars is organized to present the project's technical solutions (EWS concept, analytical toolbox for glacier lake mapping) to the national implementing partners and address their possible concerns. The webinars will be followed by thorough bilateral discussions at country level to make sure that the national institutions are fully engaged in and consulted during the development of the project's technical solutions. The project is also planning a number of information sessions and focus group discussions during the 2023 field season with the local authorities and community leaders in the project target areas to make sure those key stakeholders are meaningfully involved in the project activities and accept the proposed technical solutions. The issue of poor internet connection remains acute for the pilot communities in Tajikistan. The project will consider introduction of low-tech solutions in this case.</p>
<p>Social and Political: • The political and security situation in pilot districts may affect project implementation or weaken the interest of stakeholders to address adaptation planning issues • Lack of incentives for local communities to cooperate in activities that do not yield immediate results, but aim at longer-term resilience, may reduce stakeholder engagement and strong participation • Implementing partners for local level initiatives and pilot sites for project implementation may shift during project implementation, due to unforeseen (e.g. political, lack of interest) reasons • Hazard and risk mapping can lead to marginalised and vulnerable communities being potentially victimised, when their land-holdings or habitations</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Over the reporting period, the overall political and security situation in all pilot districts remained stabilized. The project maintains close relationships with the national implementing partners in all participating countries who have access to the pilot sites and have sufficient level of credibility from local communities. The project is planning to organize a number of meetings with local communities at project pilot sites in all participating countries to ensure their early engagement and awareness of the project for the benefits to their lives and livelihoods. The project will also produce promotional materials targeting the</p>

<p>are identified as being located within high risk zones</p>		<p>local communities and tailored to local contexts to sensitize those on the GLOF issue and raise awareness of the benefits the project can provide to them. Despite some particular turnover of central government staff in participating countries, the key implementing partners for local level activities and pilot sites remained the same over the reporting period. Nevertheless, the project team has been maintaining regular communication with local experts from all concerned implementing institutions to avoid dependency on a single agency.</p>
<p>Institutional/Management/Governance: • Delays in recruitment of qualified project staff may affect the timeframe of project activities • Government and non-governmental agencies do not contribute adequately to the project at different levels • Changing staff is slowing down project implementation</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Particular delays in recruitment of permanent project staff affected the timeframe of the project activities of the Year 1 and 2: the Project Officer and Project Assistant were hired 4 months after the launch of the project, and the country coordinators were working on a part-time consultancy basis, expecting the launch of another UNESCO regional project on cryosphere, which is supposed to co-fund these project positions. Currently, the recruitment process of the permanent project staff (country coordinators and a project assistant) is underway, and the project implementation is expected to speed up in the next 3-4 months with the full project team onboard. Frequent personnel turnover in the key government agencies results in lack of understanding of the project's approach, objectives and key components, which also slows down the project implementation. To mitigate the above, the project maintains good relations with the key national partners, emphasizing good perspective to all key stakeholders in order to keep them in the project. Through the engagement of the key governmental entities in the Project Steering Committee, as well as through bilateral meetings with top decision-makers, the project maintains its visibility and strengthens sense of ownership by respective governments. Representatives of key governmental agencies are engaged to contribute to the project activities. Several partnership agreements are undergo to formalize the partnership with the key governmental and non-governmental agencies to ensure a stronger commitment from their side and adequate contribution to the project implementation.</p>
<p>Environmental: • Adverse climatic conditions may damage adaptation measures being implemented •</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Adaptation measures such as installation of EWS and other complementary measures are</p>

<p>Technical construction of the EWS requires access and some potential disturbance to the natural landscape, at least during the installation phase • Identified high risk flood zones may be considered of low importance for environmental protection, and therefore neglected</p>		<p>not part of the work plan of the Years 1 and 2, thus this risk did not affect the project implementation over the reporting period. However, the methodologies and approaches used in Central Asia were compiled and reviewed, and complemented with international experience, to propose the latest best practices and technical solutions used and proven in harsh environmental conditions.</p>
---	--	---

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
COVID-19 pandemic	Low	The epidemiological situation in the Central Asia region has sufficiently improved over the reporting period and the travel restrictions were lifted. This allowed the project team to organize field works in the pilot areas and a number of on-site training activities. To reduce the potential risk, the project team continues using online mode proactively for consultation meetings with national partners and webinars, when necessary and relevant.
Relatively low engagement of women in the project activities	Low	The proportion of women researchers employed by national partner institutions and available for the project's field activities is generally low, and the level of technical capacities requires improvement. The gender development index rank is especially low in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan. The project team added the requirement to include women in all project activities, where possible, to the Terms of Reference of the local implementing partners. The requirement of women participation was stated specifically for focus group meetings aimed at exposure and vulnerability assessments in Kyrgyzstan as well as for the field activities in Tajikistan. The project team is working on strategies to increase the percentage of female direct and indirect beneficiaries of the project and foster the participation of women in the project implementation. Specific recommendations were elaborated: a) establishment of ranges for indicators in the project's Gender Action Plan; b) data on direct and indirect beneficiaries of the project must be gender-disaggregated, where possible; c) organization of small events to raise awareness of project-related issues for women's organizations. For that matter, in Tajikistan, the "Women and glaciers" group was identified as a potential partner to foster the participation of women in the project.

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?

ESP Compliance

Section 1: Identified ESP Risk Management

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

1.Compliance with the law	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Adaptation measures implemented under the project may require permits and as such present a risk of non-compliance with local legislation if not properly monitored.
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.	The USPs that are identified in project Outputs 2.1 and 2.2 will be screened at the community level and will bear in mind all necessary procedures such as EIAs, permits, and codes where applicable. Activities with a medium or high risk will not be considered for inclusion in the project. Screening and monitoring will continue as the EWS and complementary adaptation measures are implemented under Outputs 4.1 and 4.2.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	At least 4 pilot communities will have undertaken complementary adaptation options (such as work on channels and/or slope stabilization) in conformity with applicable regulations.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	The project has compiled an overview of the national legislative and regulatory framework for potential measures. Baseline condition varies by country and by measure.
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	Not applicable -- design and implementation of work related to infrastructure or earth works did not take place during the reporting period. The project has conducted community consultations to ensure free and informed consent to participation in the projects, and no objections to participation were raised by communities.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	n/a
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
2.Access and equity	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	n/a

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

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.	n/a
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	n/a
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	n/a
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	n/a
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
5. Gender equality and women's empowerment	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Women's status and representation may limit their meaningful participation in project activities
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	Men and women will participate fully and equitably. Women will be consulted in on-site, in- depth community assessments were undertaken at the project preparation stage. An initial Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan have been developed to ensure that women are meaningfully engaged in project activities and realize an equitable share of project benefits (see Annex 2). Specific project indicators will ensure that results-based management will cover meaningful participation of both women and men. In addition, a gender expert was consulted to propose a set of activities to improve women's participation in the project implementation, including awareness raising workshops for women organizations, women-only focus group discussions.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	Individual indicators are provided in the project's Gender Action Plan
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	Provided under the project Gender Assessment
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	A strategy with a roadmap for the improvement of women participation in the project activities is being developed by the project team.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	n/a
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
6. Core labour rights	

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	n/a
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.	n/a
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	n/a
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	n/a
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	n/a
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	n/a
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
7.Indigenous people	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	n/a
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.	n/a
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	n/a
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	n/a
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	n/a
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	n/a
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
8.Involuntary resettlement	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table	Yes

II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	n/a
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.	n/a
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	n/a
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	n/a
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	n/a
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	n/a
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
9. Protection of natural habitats	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	n/a
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.	n/a
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	n/a
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	n/a
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	n/a
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	n/a
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
10. Conservation of biological diversity	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes

During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	n/a
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.	n/a
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	n/a
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	n/a
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	n/a
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	n/a
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
11.Climate change	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	n/a
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.	n/a
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	n/a
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	n/a
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	n/a
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	n/a
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
12.Pollution prevention and resource efficiency	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact	No

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)	n/a
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.	n/a
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	n/a
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	n/a
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	n/a
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	n/a
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
13.Public health	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	No
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	n/a
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.	n/a
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	n/a
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	n/a
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	n/a
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	n/a
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	n/a
14.Physical and cultural heritage	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified.	No

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

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?	The Implementing Entity has overseen an initial training presentation and discussion on ESP safeguard measures.
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 EE is overseeing the day-to-day implementation of the ESMP. It has posted information on the project grievance mechanism on its website, has disseminated a brochure on the grievance mechanism that has been shared with project partners, and has discussed project-related risks in the context of project team meetings. An overview of upcoming ESP activities was provided at the Project Steering Committee meeting, including the hiring of a gender/safeguards consultant prior to the start the EWS design and installation activities, and the activities that will be conducted in cooperation with local communities.
Have the implementation arrangements at the EEs been effective during the reporting period?	Yes

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

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

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

			carried out?	identification for USP	impacts		
--	--	--	--------------	------------------------	---------	--	--

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

No USPs have been identified in this reporting period, and planned USPs are scheduled for subsequent reporting periods. The specific safeguards work that will be needed for community-level EWS and other risk-reduction activities will take place in subsequent reporting periods.

GP Compliance

Section 1: Quality at entry

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

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

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

Gender-responsive element	Level	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Rated result for the reporting period
Gender-disaggregated beneficiaries	Objective	Number of beneficiaries (AF 0 Core Indicator)		At least 1,400 direct beneficiaries (of that at least 700 women and 400 youth) and at least 89,000 indirect beneficiaries (of that 45,000 women and youth)	Satisfactory
Support to women	Output	Number of authorities	20 (of that, 10 women)	By the end of the project, 40	Satisfactory

authorities in developing monitoring and mapping skills		engaged in mapping and monitoring activities		authorities (and of that number, 20 women) consider themselves to be involved in GL mapping and monitoring	
Vulnerability assessment and exposure maps developed for endangered communities will including gender analyses	Output	Number of communities with exposure maps	One community has undergone hazard mapping, but this does not include gender and sector-specific analysis	By the end of the project, 8 communities (2 in each country) will have completed vulnerability assessments and exposure maps	Satisfactory
Support for women's participation in EWS training and utilization	Output	Number of staff trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events (by gender)	Approximately 24 staff in participating countries address DRR issues generally (including 12 women), but they lack specific expertise on GLOF risk reduction and management	24 staff have received specialized training or participated actively in the EWS framework (including 12 women)	Satisfactory
Support for women's awareness of adverse impacts of climate change and appropriate responses	Output	Percentage of target population aware of predicted adverse impacts of climate change, and of appropriate responses, and of that, percentage of women and vulnerable groups.	Community consultations indicated that while nearly all vulnerable community residents were concerned about climate change, far fewer could identify adverse impacts, and even fewer appropriate responses.	At least 80% of people in the target communities are aware of measures to adapt to climate change (and, of that, at least 50% women and youth / vulnerable groups)	Satisfactory
Ensuring women's participation in education and training programmes undertaken to equip stakeholders with	Output	Number of staff trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events, by gender	GLOF response training is not specifically provided to government staff	By the end of the project: 24 staff, and of that number 12 women, trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of GLOFs	Satisfactory

knowledge and capacity to prepare for, respond to and recover from GLOF disasters.					
--	--	--	--	--	--

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
Relatively low women's representation in government partner institutions.	Satisfactory	Satisfactory for this reporting period (project is on track to achieve the end-of-project targets for women's participation), but a gender specialist will be hired to develop a strategy to identify women specialists and ensure that they are able to utilize capacity development activities in the project. Furthermore, the project will raise awareness of women in science by participating in UN days such as the International Day of Women and Girls in Science.

Section 3: Implementation arrangements

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP	The IE organized a training session on gender policy for the project team.
Have the implementation arrangements at the IE been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP?	The EE is monitoring gender participation in project meetings and trainings during the reporting period. Additionally, a dedicated training session on gender policy compliance was organized for the project team members to brainstorm on the set of activities for the improvement of women participation in the project implementation.
Have the implementation arrangements at the EE(s) been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
Have any capacity gaps affecting GP compliance been identified during the reporting period and if so, what remediation was implemented?	No

Section 4: Grievances

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

List all grievances received through the grievance	For each grievance, provide	Provide the
--	-----------------------------	-------------

mechanism during the reporting period regarding gender-related matters of project/programme activities [6]	information on the grievance redress process used	status/outcome
---	--	-----------------------

Comments

A gender specialist will be hired in the future in order to support women's participation at all levels of the project and to assess ways in which project risks and benefits may affect women and men differently.

Rating

Implementing Entity				
Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
Outcome 1. Authorities in participating countries have improved knowledge of potential GLOF hazards and a coordinated national and regional approach to mapping and monitoring potential GLOF sites.	Outcome 2	Two regional exchange workshops conducted, with participation of the key partner institutions from participating countries engaged in GLOF mapping and monitoring. Desk-based studies on the state of knowledge on GLOFs in Central Asia are conducted, and a Best Practice Guidance Document is drafted. A Toolbox for lake mapping is developed and a training is organized for the authorities in charge.	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Outcome 2. Decision-makers and vulnerable households are aware of GLOF threats and have the necessary information to plan measures to adapt to those threats.	Outcome 7	Field visits to pilot communities undertaken, information on risk knowledge at community level collected. Local partners are trained in sophisticated GLOF modelling approaches in a series of web-based and in-person workshops. GLOF hazard and risk modelling (including vulnerability and exposure) completed for all pilot sites.	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Outcome 3. A coordinated EWS network is designed and embedded in the institutional setting for disaster risk management at all levels.	Outcome 1	Site-specific studies for pilot communities are launched and design of EWS initiated. First-order assessment of all pilot sites conducted based on available remotely sensed imagery and existing studies, to preliminary identify main threats to the pilot communities. Sophisticated GLOF outburst and debris flow modelling studies underway for all pilot sites as basis for EWS design. A webinar series to discuss best practices and exchange experiences on EWS design is conducted.	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Outcome 4. Pilot communities reduce risk from GLOF hazards and relevant agencies have a means of maintaining	Outcome 1	Mapping of local partner institutions/stakeholders is undertaken to identify which institutions have capacities to take over the technical engineering,	Ontrack	Satisfactory

adaptation measures and upscaling to other vulnerable communities.		including the acquisition of suitable equipment for the construction of the EWS stations. Companies with significant international experience are engaged to provide technical backstopping.		
Outcome 5. Researchers, government authorities, and communities can access and exchange information they need on GLOF hazards and risk reduction measures to adapt to them.	Outcome 2	Creation and launch of a web-platform on GLOFs. Development of information materials on GLOFs. Regional and international exchange with other experts on climate adaptation and GLOF DRM.	Ontrack	Satisfactory

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

Name	Email
Mr Jayakumar Ramasamy	r.jayakumar@unesco.org

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

The project is the first UNESCO project financed by the Adaptation Fund. It was successfully launched at a regional level in April 2021 and received positive feedback and appreciation from all key partner institutions in the participating countries, particularly due to the fact that it is the first regional project addressing glacier lake hazard in Central Asia. The project is on track to achieve the targets of performance indicators under the project results framework. During the reporting period, the project implementation procedures have been fairly time-intensive, notably to formalize and establish cooperation mechanisms with numerous partner institutions in the participating countries (agree on the terms of reference, provisions of cooperation agreements, contracts, work plan, etc.). Lack of permanent project staff has in a way affected the implementation rate. However, the missing team members are expected to be recruited shortly to boost the project implementation. The cooperation modalities have been clarified with the partners, and further project implementation is expected to be smooth and efficient.

Executing Entity / Project Coordinator

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
Outcome 1. Authorities in participating countries have improved knowledge of potential GLOF hazards and a coordinated national and regional approach to mapping and monitoring potential GLOF sites.	Outcome 2	Two regional exchange workshops conducted, with participation of the key partner institutions from participating countries engaged in GLOF mapping and monitoring. Desk-based studies on the state of knowledge on GLOFs in Central Asia are conducted, and a Best Practice Guidance Document is drafted. A Toolbox for lake mapping is developed and a training is organized for the authorities in charge.	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Outcome 2. Decision-makers and vulnerable households are aware of GLOF threats and	Outcome 7	Field visits to pilot communities undertaken, information on risk knowledge at community level collected.	Ontrack	Satisfactory

have the necessary information to plan measures to adapt to those threats.		GLOF hazard and risk modelling (including vulnerability and exposure) completed for all pilot sites.		
Outcome 3. A coordinated EWS network is designed and embedded in the institutional setting for disaster risk management at all levels.	Outcome 1	Site-specific studies for pilot communities are launched and design of EWS initiated.	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Outcome 4. Pilot communities reduce risk from GLOF hazards and relevant agencies have a means of maintaining adaptation measures and upscaling to other vulnerable communities.	Outcome 1	Mapping of local partner institutions/stakeholders is undertaken to identify which institutions have capacities to take over the technical engineering, including the acquisition of suitable equipment for the construction of the EWS stations. Companies with significant international experience are engaged to provide technical backstopping.	Ontrack	Satisfactory
Outcome 5. Researchers, government authorities, and communities can access and exchange information they need on GLOF hazards and risk reduction measures to adapt to them.	Outcome 2	Creation and launch of a web-platform on GLOFs. Development of information materials on GLOFs. Regional and international exchange with other experts on climate adaptation and GLOF DRM.	Ontrack	Satisfactory

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

Name	Email	Institution
Mr Amir Piric	a.piric@unesco.org	UNESCO Almaty Regional Office

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

The project is on track to achieve the targets in the project results framework. Cooperation with the University of Zurich, an Implementing Partner, was instrumental, and the in-country partners express their overall support to and interest in the project. The project implementation procedures during the reporting period have been fairly time-intensive due to lack of permanent project staff, rapid changes in government authorities in the region and lack of proper handover procedures, which in a way caused delays and resulted in additional negotiation efforts required from the project management unit to clarify the project's strategy and cooperation modalities to numerous implementing partners at country level. While the project is compliant with the Adaptation Fund's Environmental & Social Policy, and the Gender Policy for the reporting period, the project team will hire a gender/safeguards specialist to support the community-level activities in future reporting periods and ensure overall support for women's meaningful participation in project activities.

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.

After the successful completion of the inception phase and the 1st year activities, the project implementation experienced some delays in its second year due to the staffing issue and significant turnover in governmental stakeholders, lacking proper handover procedures. Another challenge was revision process for the pilot sites initiated at the request of Kyrgyzstan, which resulted in delays in funds disbursement and field activities at the project target area, pending for official endorsement by the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat. Besides, the complexity of the recruitment process and contract establishment procedures (for high value contracts), coupled with the turnover of a number of project staff members, resulted in additional delays in the project implementation. To address these challenges, the following measures were undertaken: - temporary support staff has been mobilized to facilitate the project implementation, pending for the recruitment of permanent staff; - national consultants were mobilized to facilitate the project implementation at the country level; - several rounds of working meetings were organized with the governmental counterparts of the project to provide technical advice and clarify the project implementation modalities; - recruitment process for the missing project support staff has been launched. Despite the challenges, a number of key milestones have been achieved over the reporting period, including: - finalization of a toolbox on glacier lake mapping and monitoring; - completion of a training series on GLOF modelling and glacier lake atlas creation for the concerned governmental institutions; - 150,000 km² of the glaciated watershed area across four participating countries was mapped using the GLOFCA mapping tool; - hazard modelling with RAMMS software has been initiated for the pilot communities in four participating countries; - first-order assessment of all pilot sites was conducted based on available remotely sensed imagery and existing studies. Considering the above progress, challenges and solutions implemented to address bottlenecks and delays, I rate the project performance as Satisfactory.

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 beneficiaries (AF Core Indicator).	0	47 indirect beneficiaries (of that 9 women and 7 youth).	By the end of the project: At least 1,400 direct beneficiaries (of that at least 700 women

				and 400 youth) and at least 89,000 indirect beneficiaries (of that 45,000 women and youth).
Objectives	Early Warning Systems (AF Core Indicator). Category: Floods.	1) Risk knowledge: 1. 2) Monitoring and warning service: 0-1. 3) Dissemination and communication: 0-1. 4) Response capability: 0.	Not part of the work plan of the Year 1 and 2.	By the end of the project: 1) Risk knowledge: 3. 2) Monitoring and warning service: 3. 3) Dissemination and communication: 3. 4) Response capability: 3
Outputs	Number of authorities engaged in mapping and monitoring activities.	20 authorities (and of that number, 10 women) consider themselves to be involved in GL mapping and monitoring. No country level strategies for GL mapping and monitoring.	31 authorities (27 onsite + 4 online follow-up) received training with a new automated tool that is being used for GL mapping and monitoring at national and regional scales.	40 authorities (and of that number, 20 women) consider themselves to be involved in GL mapping and monitoring. By the end of the project, each participating country has a GL mapping and monitoring strategy.
Outputs	Percentage of watershed mapped for all participating countries.	A very limited percentage of the watershed is mapped using older data; in situ measurements have been taken only in a few cases.	150,000 km ² of the glaciated watershed area across all countries had lake mapping completed during the development of the GLOFCA toolbox for lake mapping and monitoring.	By the end of the project, 347,000 km ² is mapped using recent (2015-2016) data.
Outputs	Number of targeted institutions with increased capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability risks (AF Output Indicator 2.1.2). Number of capacity strengthening workshops.		Two regional exchange workshops were organized. The focus in Year 1 was on glacier lake mapping and monitoring, while in Year 2 the focus was on downstream GLOF hazard mapping. Furthermore, 2 web-based workshops and 1 in-person workshop was conducted with local authorities to train in the use of RAMMS	By the end of the project, 16 institutions have increased capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability risks. By the end of the project, at least 4 regional workshops and 8 workshops with local authorities have been conducted to strengthen monitoring capacity.

			<p>software for GLOF modelling and hazard mapping. Finally, an in-person training workshop for lake mapping and monitoring was undertaken. In total, over the first 2 years, the 2 regional exchange workshops and 4 training workshops have involved the participation of 22 institutions from participating countries: -</p> <p>Kazakhstan (6): 1. Ministry of Emergency Situations; 2. State Mudflow Protection Agency "Kazselezaschita"; 3. Institute of Geography and Water Security; 4. Central-Asian Regional Glaciological Center; 5. Center for Emergency Situations and Disaster Risk Reduction; 6. Al-Farabi Kazakh National University.</p> <p>- Kyrgyzstan (4): 1. Ministry of Emergency Situations; 2. Ministry of Natural Resources, Ecology and Technical Supervision; 3. Central Asian Institute of Applied Geosciences; 4. Institute of Water Problems and Hydropower Engineering; -</p> <p>Tajikistan (5): 1. Committee for</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			Environmental Protection, Agency for Hydrometeorology; 2. Committee for Emergency Situations and Civil Defense; 3. Institute of Water Problems, Hydropower and Ecology; 4. Aga Khan Agency for Habitat; 5. Center of Glaciers Research, Academy of Sciences; - Uzbekistan (7): 1. Center of Hydrometeorological Service (Uzhydromet); 2. Ministry of Emergency Situations; 3. State Committee on Geology and Mineral Resources; 4. State Monitoring Service for Geohazards; 5. Center of Glacial Geology, Institute of Geology and Geophysics; 6. National University of Uzbekistan; 7. Institute of Astronomy named after Mirzo Ulugbek, Academy of Sciences.	
Outputs	Number of communities with exposure maps.	One community has undergone hazard mapping, but this does not include gender and sector specific analysis.	During Year 2, hazard modelling with RAMMS software was initiated in pilot communities in all 4 countries which will be basis for vulnerability and exposure mapping to be completed in Year 3.	By the end of the project, 8 communities (2 in each country) will have completed vulnerability assessments and exposure maps.
Outputs	Number and type of risk reduction	No local risk reduction plans exist	Not part of the work plan of the Year 1	At least 8 communities will

	actions or strategies introduced at local level (AF Output Indicator 3.1.1).	in the pilot communities.	and 2.	participate in the development of a risk reduction strategy. At least 4 of the strategies will include EWS and complementary adaptation measures.
Outputs	Number of targeted development strategies with incorporated climate change priorities enforced (AF Output Indicator 7.2).	DRR concepts are not mainstreamed into subnational development plans.	Not part of the work plan of the Year 1 and 2.	By the end of the project, at least 8 local or district development plans include GLOF planning and response.
Outputs	Number of staff trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of climate related events (by gender) (AF Output Indicator 2.1.1). DRM framework for GLOFs is integrated into country level multihazard DRM frameworks.	Approximately 24 staff in participating countries address DRR issues generally (including 12 women), but they lack specific expertise on GLOF risk reduction and management.	The project contributed towards 2 joint events with the Asian Development Bank in Tajikistan focusing on Disaster Risk Management. The first event (November 2022) had 30 participants, including 23 men and 7 women, with 10 participants from Ministries and government agencies, 9 participants from INGOs, 3 from international organizations, and 9 participants from other background. The second event (January 2023) had 22 participants from government ministries (gender not recorded).	24 staff have received specialized training or participated actively in the EWS framework (including 12 women).
Outputs	Site specific studies for pilot communities.	Vulnerable communities exposed to GLOFs lack EWS.	Scoping visits to Tepar and Pskem pilot communities in Uzbekistan undertaken in order to explore risk perceptions and needs of local stakeholders through focus group meetings. Scoping	By the midpoint of the project: Sites specific studies have been completed for each pilot community.

			<p>visits to Ala Archa, Ton and Tossor valleys (target area in Kyrgyzstan) undertaken in order to explore risk perceptions and needs of local stakeholders, and to inspect installation sites of existing monitoring equipment. Bathymetry measurements undertaken in Ala Archa valley. First-order assessment of all pilot sites conducted based on available remotely sensed imagery, and existing studies, to preliminary identify main threats to the pilot communities. Sophisticated GLOF outburst and debris flow modelling studies (based on RAMMS training) are underway for all pilot communities, jointly conducted with local authorities, and expected to be completed following field studies in July - August 2023.</p>	
Outputs	Presence of EWS system.	None of the vulnerable communities surveyed has an EWS that monitors and responds directly to GLOF threats.	Not part of the work plan of the Year 1 and 2.	By the end of the project: At least 4 communities have an EWS in operation.
Outputs	Presence of complementary adaptation measures.	None of the vulnerable communities surveyed during the community consultations had undertaken any	Not part of the work plan of the Year 1 and 2.	At least 4 pilot communities will have undertaken complementary adaptation options (such as work on channels and/or

		adaptation measures.		slope stabilization) in conformity with applicable regulations. At least 7 pilot communities will have undertaken low-cost / no cost adaptation options (such as hazard zone demarcation, evacuation route planning, etc.).
Outputs	Percentage of targeted population aware of predicted adverse impacts of climate change, and of appropriate responses (AF Output Indicator 3.1.1). Of that number, percentage of women, vulnerable groups. Number of training drills.	Community consultations indicated that while nearly all vulnerable community residents were concerned about climate change, far fewer could identify adverse impacts, and even fewer appropriate responses.	Not part of the work plan of the Year 1 and 2.	By the end of the project, at least 80% of people in the target communities are aware of measures to adapt to climate change (and, of that, at least 50% women and youth/vulnerable groups). By the end of the project, all pilot communities have participated in at least 2 EWS drills.
Outputs	Number of financing sources identified. Presence of a maintenance and financing strategy.	Governments have expressed interest, but funding has not been identified. No maintenance and financing strategy exists.	Not part of the work plan of the Year 1 and 2.	By the end of the project: At least one source of financing has been identified for each participating country. By the end of the project: Each participating country has a maintenance and financing strategy for the EWS systems.
Outputs	Usage of web platform. Number of stakeholders who are aware of the platform and who access it more than once.	Several climate change web platforms exist with information on Central Asia, but they do not contain information on GLOFs.	A dedicated web platform on glacier lake outburst floods in Central Asia (glofca.org) was created and launched. The web platform provides reliable and credible information and knowledge about glacier lake outburst floods, disaster risk reduction, and early warning systems in	The web platform has at least 100 unique visitors annually from within the participating countries.

			<p>Central Asia to all stakeholders in the interested public.</p> <p>The primary architecture of the web platform was created; the project team continues working on structuring the thematic subsections of the website to fill it in with quality content. Overall number of unique visitors of the web platform exceeds 100 people annually. However, the number of visitors from within the participating countries (Central Asia) has decreased during Year 2 from 51 to 7 due to the website being under reconstruction for significant period of time and access problems in Kazakhstan. The number of unique visitors over the last reporting period from outside Central Asia include the United States (28), Germany (18), Switzerland (3), China (22), Singapore (13), Canada (10), United Kingdom (3), Malaysia (3), United Arab Emirates (2). The website is being updated and the access issues are being solved by the project team to ensure bigger number of visitors for subsequent reporting periods.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Outputs	Number of staff trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate related events, by gender (AF Output Indicator 2.1.1).	GLOF response training is not specifically provided to government staff.	Not part of the work plan of the Year 1 and 2.	By the end of the project: 24 staff, and of that number 12 women, trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of GLOFs.
Outputs	Extent to which project lessons are scaled up to other communities in Central Asia. Number of knowledge products for institutions supporting mountain communities and for people at risk.	Local communities lack accessible, targeted materials on GLOF response.	In total, there were 12 knowledge products developed: 1) Brochure "Reducing the vulnerability of the Central Asia populations from glacial lake outburst floods in a changing climate", 11 pages (EN, RU); 2) Infographics "Reducing glacial lake hazards in Central Asia", 4 pages (EN, RU); 3) Animation video "Melting glaciers of Central Asia and climate change responses" (EN, RU); 4) Video "Findings of the 2022 Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change (IPCC) with focus on Central Asia" (EN); 5) Video "GLOFCA pilot site in Ala-Archa, Kyrgyzstan" (EN, RU); 6) Overview of the pilot site area in Uzbekistan, video; 7) Video "GLOFCA Teams on Expedition to Project Pilot Sites in Uzbekistan" (EN, RU); 8) Video "GLOFCA project in action, 2021", overview of the Year 1 activities (EN); 9) Synthesis reports on	By the end of the project: Lessons learned from the project will be incorporated in at least 16 communities at risk of GLOFs. By the end of the project: At least 6 knowledge products have been produced and distributed to disseminate good practice and lessons learned from the project.

			GLOF hazard and risk: State of Knowledge (country reports for Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan) (EN); 10) Stakeholder data base; 11) E-library on GLOFs; 12) Video E-library on GLOFs.	
--	--	--	---	--

Comments

Lessons Learned

Implementation and Adaptive Management		
Describe any changes undertaken to improve results on the ground or any changes made to project outputs (i.e. changes to project design)	Challenges & Opportunities	No changes were made to the project outputs or design. However, one of the participating countries (Kyrgyzstan) proposed to replace the initially selected pilot sites with those, where the GLOFs risk is higher. Community consultations were conducted for the newly proposed sites and a renewed letter of endorsement signed by respective Designated Authority. The justification documents with an official request to consider change of pilot sites in Kyrgyzstan were submitted to the Adaptation Fund. In Uzbekistan, hazard modelling results suggest that GLOF may not be the most significant risk to the pilot community, and therefore discussions are underway with local authorities to broaden the design of the EWS under the project to provide protection also against other climate related hazards (avalanches and landslides).
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been	Opportunities	Since the community-level activities were not part of the

<p>effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts?</p>		<p>Year 1 and 2 work plan, the effectiveness of environmental and social safeguard measures could not be properly estimated. The project team will hire a safeguards specialist to ensure adequate planning and compliance of all community level and field activities with the AF ESP principles.</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</p>	<p>Gender considerations are kept in mind while planning the project activities. All lists of participants are formulated taking into account gender considerations. When an activity/event envisages nominees, the respective institutions are encouraged to nominate women participants. When formulating ToR with project partners concerning field activities, it is specifically noted that 50% representation of women is expected. Hiring a gender expert would improve the project implementation from gender considerations perspective, and the project plans to do this.</p>
<p>Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays?</p>	<p>Challenges</p>	<p>Particular delays in recruitment of full-time project staff affected the timeframe of the project activities of the Year 2. Steps are well underway to fill these positions, taking on learnings from these roles over the first two years of the project. Complicated procedures of establishing contracts (bidding, Contracts Committee review for high-value contracts), involving several approving and certifying officers, in a way affect the project's efficiency, raising concerns from the national partners' side. More advance planning, taking into accounts the schedules of all people involved, would help to reduce delays with administrative arrangements. The political situation in</p>

		<p>Tajikistan makes it more difficult now for the Swiss implementing partner to obtain permits for fieldwork in the GBAO region (project target area in Tajikistan). For the 2023 field season, the process of obtaining permits has been initiated as early as possible. If permits are not obtained for any reason, the local partners will undertake the field mission alone. The Executing Entity will ensure to mobilize its official channels to facilitate the issuance of GBAO permits for the project team members.</p>
<p>What implementation issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected progress?</p>	<p>Challenges</p>	<p>It is crucial to enhance project ownership among the national stakeholders through joint planning, regular communication and exchange, both at the governmental and community level. Communication between the project implementing partners in Switzerland and the local institutions has been challenging at times, due to the Swiss scientists primarily working remotely. The absence of full-time Country Coordinators has also contributed to particular delays. Increased efforts are now being made by the project team to improve in-county presence, and direct bilateral exchanges and working meetings have been enhanced, including organization of project exchange visits of national experts to Switzerland. Despite the convenience and cost effectiveness of online meetings, face-to-face meetings continue to be more efficient in addressing partners' concerns and building trust. The project team will enhance its on-the-ground presence for the smooth implementation of the project activities. The project should engage local communities at the earliest stage and sensitize</p>

		<p>them on the GLOFs subject, raising their awareness of the project and the benefits it can provide to them. Dissemination of promotional and information materials among wide range of stakeholders and local communities can facilitate the process. During the 2023 summer field season, a large focus will be given to engagement with local communities in the pilot sites. The request of Kyrgyzstan to change the project target area (pilot sites) has created uncertainty and has led to additional resources being used to facilitate this process. The rationale for shifting pilot sites was well supported by all project countries, and it will overall result in the project having a greater impact in Kyrgyzstan. However, the lesson learned was that any major changes requiring AFB approval may cause delays and should be avoided.</p>
--	--	---

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

No

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

support, etc) from employing readiness grants been used to inform institutional capacity needs, gender issues, and environmental and social aspects in developing and implementing concrete projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	
Concrete Adaptation Interventions	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing concrete adaptation interventions that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes implementing concrete adaptation interventions?	
What is the potential for the concrete adaptation interventions undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	
Knowledge Management	
How has existing information/data/knowledge been used to inform project development and implementation? What kinds of information/data/knowledge were used?	
Has the existing information/data/knowledge been made available to relevant stakeholder? If so, what channels of dissemination have been used?	
Please list any knowledge products generated and include hyperlinks whenever possible (e.g. project videos, project stories, studies and technical reports, case studies, training manuals, handbooks, strategies and plans developed, etc.)	
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	
Describe any difficulties there have been in accessing or retrieving existing information (data or knowledge) that is relevant to the project. Please provide suggestions for improving access to the relevant data.	
Has the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	
Innovation	
Describe any innovative practices or technologies that figured prominently in this project.	
Complementarity/ Coherence with other climate finance sources	
Has the project been scaled-up from any other climate finance? Or has the project build upon any other climate finance initiative?	
If you answered yes, kindly specify the name of the Fund/Organization.	

Results Tracker

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

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

Is this the mid-term or terminal project performance report? Not Applicable

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

Core Indicator: No. of beneficiaries

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

completion	indirect beneficiaries)			
------------	-------------------------	--	--	--

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

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

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

Output 1.1 Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated

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

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

Output 1.2 Targeted population groups covered by adequate risk reduction systems

Core Indicator 1.2: No. of Early Warning Systems

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Number of beneficiaries	Scale	Sector	Capacity Level
Baseline information				

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

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

Indicator 3.1: Increase in application of appropriate adaptation responses

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Core Indicator 5.1: Natural Assets protected or rehabilitated

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

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

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

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

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

	No. of targeted households	% of female headed households	% increase in income level vis-à-vis baseline	Alternate Source
Baseline information				

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	No. of Policies introduced or adjusted	Sector	Scale	Type

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

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

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

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

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

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

Output 8: Viable innovations are rolled out, scaled up, 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				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

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