



ADAPTATION FUND

Project Performance Report

Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	6/28/2021 - 6/27/2022
Project Title	Enhancing urban resilience to climate change impacts and natural disasters: Honiara
Project Summary	<p>The project focuses on strengthening the resilience of Honiara to external shocks and stresses, building on the strong knowledge platform that has already been established by a climate vulnerability assessment for the city (UN-Habitat, 2014) and the subsequent Honiara Urban Resilience and Climate Action Plan (HURCAP). Concrete actions that target reductions in exposure and sensitivity to climate-related impacts are proposed at the community, ward, and city scale through a multi-actor, multi-level approach to resilience building by the different phases of participatory development of the adaptation plan. In line with and in support of the HURCAP, the overarching goal of this project is to enhance the resilience of Honiara and its inhabitants to current and future climate impacts and natural disasters, with a particular focus on pro-poor adaptation actions that involve and benefit the most vulnerable communities in the city. Components: 1. Community-level actions and 2. Community level capacity strengthening to support the implementation of prioritized resilience actions in vulnerability hotspot communities and strengthen the capacity of local communities to respond to climate change and natural hazards through awareness raising and capacity development training. 3. Ward-level actions and 4. Ward level capacity strengthening to to support the implementation of resilience actions that target women, youth, urban agriculture and food security, and disaster risk reduction and strengthen the capacity of ward officials / councils to lead climate change adaptation and DRR planning activity, in support of increased urban resilience. 5. City-wide governance and capacity strengthening to strengthen institutional arrangements at the city-level to respond to climate change and natural disasters through mainstreaming and improved partnership 6. Knowledge Management and Advocacy</p>
Database Number	AF00000105
Implementing Entity (IE)	UN-Habitat

Type of IE	Multilateral Implementing Entity
Country(ies)	Solomon Islands
Relevant Geographic Points (i.e. cities, villages, bodies of water)	The city of Honiara and its 12 Wards, with particular focus on 5 informal settlements: Fishing Village, Ontong Java, White River, Gilbert Camp, Aekafo
Name of Implementing Entity Focal Point	Bernhard Barth, UN-Habitat

Project Milestones	
AFB Approval Date	10/13/2017
IE-AFB Agreement Signature Date	1/18/2018
Start of Project/Programme	6/28/2018
Actual Mid-term Review Date (if applicable)	10/1/2020
Original Completion Date	6/27/2022
Revised Completion Date after approval of extension request (if applicable)	6/27/2024

Were there any approval condition for this Project?

Yes

List each approval condition, if any, and report on the status of meeting them	
Category of condition	Environmental and Social Safeguards
Condition or Requirement	Decision B.30/26: Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided: (a) To approve the project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review; (b) To approve the funding of \$4,395,877 for the implementation of the project, as requested by UN-Habitat; (c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UN-Habitat as the Multilateral Implementing Entity for the project; and (d) To request UN-Habitat to ensure that the following issues have been addressed no later than the date of submission of the first project performance report (PPR): (i) The environmental and social management plan (ESMP) of the project should be updated based on the comprehensive climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments in the target cities and informal settlements to remove any unidentified sub-project and reflect all environmental and social risks inherent with the identified adaptation activities; and (e) The updated ESMP should be submitted to the Board no later than the date of submission of the first PPR.
Current Status	Condition not met
Planned actions, including a detailed time schedule	As of May 2025, a new AOC is underway, with the Honiara City Council in partnership with the World Bank as part of the CAUSE Project. The ESMP will be done by the CAUSE team prior to the implementation of each selected interventions.

	Tentative timeline is September-October 2025. Please note that we will be requesting an 18 month extension and this extended phase will include additional ESMPs as relevant. We can also provide the ESMP Guidelines of the World Bank for clearance by the AF Board.
--	--

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 July 2018) Mid-term Evaluation Report (submitted February 2021) 12 month no cost extension request, submitted along with the previous PPR 3 12 months extension request, submitted along with this PPR 4

List the Website address (URL) of project

Twitter account: <https://twitter.com/Rhoniara> Facebook page: https://www.facebook.com/Climate-Resilient-Honiara-590844857955469/?modal=admin_todo_tour

Project Contacts			
National/Regional Project Manager/Coordinator	Name	Email	Date
Coordinator	Inga Korte	inga.korte@un.org	7/11/2022
Government(s) DA	Chanel Iroi	c.iroi@met.gov.sb	7/11/2022
Implementing Entity	Bernhard Barth, UN-Habitat	bernhard.barth@un.org	7/11/2022
Executing Agency	Stanley Waleania, PS Ministry of Lands, Housing and Survey	SWaleania@mlhs.gov.sb	7/11/2022
Executing Agency	Darryn McEvoy, Professor at Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT)	darryn.mcevoy@rmit.edu.au	7/11/2022

Financial Data

Disbursement of AF grant funds	
Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date (\$)	\$2,202,550.00
Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date (\$)	\$1,006,556.00
Project disbursement rate (%)	50.1
Project execution rate (%)	24.84
Add any comments on AF Grant Funds	"A first kick-off Agreement of Cooperation with the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Survey (MLHS) was signed on 30 November 2018 (see procurement) over USD 24,010. A follow up AoC with same entity is currently being prepared. An AoC has also been signed with the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT) on 10 January 2019 over USD 372,176. Overall the project expenditure is below the projected amounts, mostly due to delays due to COVID-19 and related travel restrictions. The implementing capacity of the national EE has also been hampered, mostly by the above-mentioned COVID-19 related challenges. Synergies with

	another ongoing UN-Habitat project (Integration of Nature Based Solutions in Honiara, Solomon Islands) have been utilized to maximize impact and reach of this AF project even with ongoing dealys due to COVID-19. "
Investment Income (\$)	\$0.00
Cumulative Investment Income since inception (\$)	\$0.00

Expenditure Data

Output	Amount (\$)
1.1 In addition to existing community action plans developed as part of the HURCAP process, complete community climate action plans for White River and Tuvaruhu informal settlements	\$0.00
1.2. In-depth community profiling for the hotspot communities	\$0.00
1.3. Scoping and feasibility studies of prioritized local actions for each hotspot community	\$29,756.00
1.4. Implementation of screened / agreed resilience actions in each hotspot community	\$13,017.00
2.1. Training on conducting community profile self-assessment and monitoring	\$0.00
2.2 Awareness and capacity development support, including workshops relating to key issues (CCA/Community Early Warning/DRR/Health)	\$0.00
3.1. To develop a women-focused climate risk communications programme	\$18,861.00
3.2. To integrate climate change into educational programs for youth and children	\$0.00
3.3 Ecosystem-based adaptation options, in particular for food security, sustainable livelihoods, flood mgt. etc. implemented	\$1,796.00
3.4. Climate resilient community spaces developed, including productive open spaces and community evacuation centres	\$9,778.00
4.1. Provide 'Planning for Climate Change' training for nominated 'resilience officers' in each of Honiara's wards, and integrate training with DRR knowledge (what to do and where to go)	\$29,003.00
4.2. Pilot best practice participatory approach to city government, NGO, and community collaboration in climate planning and enhance the understanding of adaptation pathways	\$0.00
4.3. Assess locally appropriate land administration options for peri-urban settlements, and households, around Ngossi and Panatina wards	\$34,185.00
5.1. Capacity development needs assessment to be conducted in Honiara with focal Ministries and HCC	\$0.00
5.2. Develop and run capacity development workshops for planners and other urban and related professionals in support of urban resilience: planning, land administration and GIS risk mapping	\$14,075.00
5.3. Employ a climate adaptation and resilience officer, and constitute a multi-stakeholder steering group and provide support for regular meetings	\$0.00
5.4. Develop and support more effective partnership networks, including for cross-border issues, and provide support for increased participation	\$3,800.00
5.5. Policy and stakeholder mapping, and a whole-of-govt. review to identify areas for mainstreaming of climate change considerations across urban policy (including land use plans and building codes)	\$8,515.00
6.1 Climate change training and knowledge exchange	\$5,885.00
6.2. Advocacy materials	\$9,401.00
6.3. Knowledge sharing platform	\$0.00
6.4. Project learning mechanism	\$0.00
IE fee (or "Programme Cycle Management" fee)	\$1,004.00
EE cost (or "Programme Execution cost")	\$125.60

IE fee (\$)	\$1,004.00
Execution cost (\$)	\$125.60

Planned Expenditure Schedule

Output	Projected Cost (\$)	Estimated Completion Date
1.1 In addition to existing community action plans developed as part of the HURCAP process, complete community climate action plans for White River and Tuvaruhu informal settlements	\$11,556.00	6/27/2023
1.2. In-depth community profiling for the hotspot communities	\$9,420.00	6/27/2023
1.3. Scoping and feasibility studies of prioritized local actions for each hotspot community	\$0.00	6/27/2023
1.4. Implementation of screened / agreed resilience actions in each hotspot community	\$700,000.00	6/27/2023
2.1. Training on conducting community profile self-assessment and monitoring	\$31,035.00	6/27/2023
2.2 Awareness and capacity development support, including workshops relating to key issues (CCA/Community Early Warning/DRR/Health)	\$92,362.00	6/27/2023
3.1. To develop a women-focused climate risk communications programme	\$45,360.00	6/27/2023
3.2. To integrate climate change into educational programs for youth and children	\$79,127.00	6/27/2023
3.3 Ecosystem-based adaptation options, in particular for food security, sustainable livelihoods, flood mgt. etc. implemented	\$300,000.00	6/27/2023
3.4. Climate resilient community spaces developed, including productive open spaces and community evacuation centres	\$300,000.00	6/27/2023
4.1. Provide 'Planning for Climate Change' training for nominated 'resilience officers' in each of Honiara's wards, and integrate training with DRR knowledge (what to do and where to go)	\$56,096.00	6/27/2023
4.2. Pilot best practice participatory approach to city government, NGO, and community collaboration in climate planning and enhance the understanding of adaptation pathways	\$62,744.00	6/27/2023
4.3. Assess locally appropriate land administration options for peri-urban settlements, and households, around Ngossi and Panatina wards	\$68,095.00	6/27/2023
5.1. Capacity development needs assessment to be conducted in Honiara with focal Ministries and HCC	\$22,610.00	6/27/2023
5.2. Develop and run capacity development workshops for planners and other urban and related professionals in support of urban resilience: planning, land administration and GIS risk mapping	\$13,976.00	6/27/2023
5.3. Employ a climate adaptation and resilience officer, and constitute a multi-stakeholder steering group and provide support for regular meetings	\$50,000.00	6/27/2023
5.4. Develop and support more effective partnership networks, including for cross-border issues, and provide support for increased participation	\$20,371.00	6/27/2023
5.5. Policy and stakeholder mapping, and a whole-of-govt. review to identify areas for mainstreaming of climate change considerations across urban policy (including land use plans and building codes)	\$8,799.00	6/27/2023
6.1 Climate change training and knowledge exchange	\$14,115.00	6/27/2023
6.2. Advocacy materials	\$20,000.00	6/27/2023
6.3. Knowledge sharing platform	\$20,000.00	6/27/2023
6.4. Project learning mechanism	\$10,000.00	6/27/2023

IE fee (or "Programme Cycle Management" fee)	\$30,192.96	6/27/2023
EE cost (or "Programme Execution cost")	\$820.27	6/27/2023
IE fee (\$)		\$30,192.96
Execution cost (\$)		\$820.27

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
1. Environmental/social: Current climate and seasonal variability and/or hazard events result in infrastructure construction delays or undermine confidence in adaptation measures by local communities	Not Applicable	- N/A for construction works - Criteria for the selection of infrastructure projects at the community level will provide incentives for communities to cooperate towards long-term resilience because they are based on the outcomes of the climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments which look especially at long-term trends and impacts.
2. Institutional: Loss of government support (at all levels) for the project (activities and outputs) may result in lack of prioritization of AF project activities.	Moderate	'-Project implementaiton slowed down from the beginning of 2019 due to campaigning and care taker government arrangements. During the 2 months mostly affected by elections (May and June 2019), field activities had to be put on hold and project team has focused on preparation of next implementation phases; engagement of institutional stakeholders is facilitated by the presence of project team within Ministry and City Council premises -The roject team conducted a Rapid Assesment of COVID-19 on informal settlements to highlight how existing vulnerabilities are exacerbated by COVID-19, further supporting the imporatance of the CRH project.
2. Institutional: Loss of government support (at all levels) for the project (activities and outputs) may result in lack of prioritization	Low	'-Project implementaiton slowed down from the beginning of 2019 due to campaigning and care taker government arrangements. During the 2 months mostly affected by elections (May and June 2019), field activities had to be put on hold and project team has focused on preparation of next implementation

of AF project activities.		phases; engagement of institutional stakeholders is facilitated by the presence of project team within Ministry and City Council premises -The roject team conducted a Rapid Assesment of COVID-19 on informal settlements to highlight how existing vulnerabilities are exacerbated by COVID-19, further supporting the imporatnce of the CRH project.
3. Institutional: Capacity constraints of local institutions may limit the effective implementation of interventions	Low	- The project has a strong capacity building and training component, designed to promote effectiveness and sustainability at the community and the district, province and national government levels. - The project is deliberately designed to work on the national level (institutionally) at the city, ward and community level, as the lack of institutional capacity has been identified as a key challenge for effective resilience building. Without institutional capacity development at the higher level, local resilience planning is not possible.
4. Institutional/social Lack of commitment/buy-in from local communities may result in delay at intervention sites.	Low	A bottom-up approach to detailed planning (including further vulnerability assessments and action planning and prioritizations) is followed and will continue during all the phases of implementation (including through community infrastructure implementation directly by the communities) and community-level monitoring.
5. Institutional/social: Disagreement amongst stakeholders with regards to adaptation measures (infrastructure) and site selection.	Low	Community consultations are done in a way that none is left behind and views all all participants are heard. In the 3 communities where consultations have been organized, the priority needs were recognized by all participants
6. Institutional: Communities may not adopt activities during or after the AF project, including infrastructure maintenance	Low	- Solution design considers the sustainability aspects in terms of future management and gives priority to low-tech and low-maintenance solutions. - The interventions will be institutionalized within the ministries, Honiara City Council and communities to ensure sustainable delivery of (post-) project implementation, including formal agreements for infrastructure maintenance through communities, HCC and MID as well as service/infrastructure user fees where applicable (e.g. provision of water). - Capacity building and training of communities will be undertaken to improve their awareness and understanding of the benefits of the activities, including infrastructure maintenance. - Communities are involved in project implementation/decision making throughout the project.
7. Financial: Complexity of financial management and procurement. Certain administrative processes could delay the project execution or could lack integrity	Moderate	UN-Habitat's control framework, under the financial rules and regulations of the UN secretariat, ensures documentation of clearly defined roles and responsibilities for management, internal auditors, the governing body, other personnel and demonstrates prove of payment / disbursement. Furthermore, financial training has been provided to project staff. A project administrator is being recruited and will be trained to comply with the reporting requirements.
8. Institutional: Delays in project implementation, and particularly in the development of infrastructure interventions	Not Applicable	N/A
9. Institutional: A lack of coordination between and	Low	Apart during the months affected by elections and when country was on lockdown due to COVID-19, weekly meetings are

within national government Ministries and Departments.		organized within the staff placed in the Ministry and the one in the City Council, ensuring a constant exchange of information and smooth follow up
--	--	---

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
Social unrest and insecurity	Low	Project activities are continuously screened for potential security risks; when the social situation is tense the field activities are suspended and preparation of other tasks is prioritized. A lot of flexibility is required by all project team in switching priorities and continuously adapting the planning.
Delayed start up of field activities	Moderate	Adaptation of planning is done constantly, merging activities when possible in order to optimize the available resources and time. Holistic re-planning should allow to absorb the initial delay during the next phases of implementation. In particular the reallocation of tasks to RMIT whilst capacities of the local and national government partners are being built will (and has) helped to catch up on some activities. Delays in contracting with RMIT were overcome; a very good cooperation between the operational teams in UN-Habitat and RMIT has emerged.
Outbreak of the global COVID-19 pandemic and related restrictions	Moderate	'- the lockdown and movement restrictions were imposed right before the household surveys were planned to take place. All HH surveys are currently on hold until further notice. The project team is discussing ways to gather necessary baseline data without conducting HH surveys (extraction from census data, analysis of existing maps, FGD, etc) - The necessary project staff will need to be recruited from the pool of experts that is currently available in Honiara, or bilateral exceptions will need to be negotiated between the United Nations and the Government of Honiara to allow project staff entry into the country. - Some project components heavily depend on engagement with the communities in the field. Should Solomon Islands experience another breakout of community transmissions (and related restrictions), the project will need to revise work plans as trainings and site assessments/ physical works cannot be conducted remotely. - Some activities can be conducted remotely by RMIT, and meetings (including OMC meetings) are scheduled to take place virtually. However, given the low capacities of counterparts and challenging internet connectivity in Honiara this will remain challenging - Synergies with another ongoing UN-Habitat project (Integration of Nature Based Solutions in Honiara, Solomon Islands) have been utilized to reduce the impact of ongoing delays due to COVID-19.
Bureaucratic procedures	Low	UN-Habitat has supported the MLHS procurement processes and through a NZ volunteer has strengthened capacities of national and local government. RMIT has taken over several responsibilities from MLHS in order not to compromise the overall project implementation too much. Furthermore, small scale Agreements of Cooperations between UN-Habitat and MLHS ensured that continued project implementation support by MLHS was guaranteed.

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?

In general, the project has been designed based on a deep understanding of local context and potential risks.

Solutions and mitigation strategies are embedded in the design; a constant monitoring of the implementation progress, security trends and flexibility in adapting the planning help ensuring the progression of activities.

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?	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)	Neither during the project development phase nor during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. However, initially the principle was triggered to ensure that the screening at the USP level is fully ensured.
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 to be assessed for all USP
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

2. Access and equity

Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Neither during the project development phase nor during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. However, initially the principle was

	triggered to ensure that the screening at the USP level as well as other activities is fully ensured. Whilst impacts were not identified risks could not be excluded. The screening prior to the first Project Management Committee resulted in the identification of the following potential risks. Risk: Equal and meaningful participation in all planning and capacity development activities is critical to ensure optimal project outcomes and with regard to avoidance of other ESGY related risks. Opportunity: The project has the opportunity to empower marginalized groups with benefits beyond those intended by the project.
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.	Project Manager and task manager to work in cooperation with communities, CSO and knowable stakeholders to ensure representative participation which includes women, youth, people with disabilities, elderly, representatives of all communities.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Percentage of women participants (target 50% of total participants) 2. Percentage of Youths participants (target: 25% of total participants are below the age of 26) 3. Percentage of people with disabilities (target: 75% of people with disabilities in target location participate if possible) 4. Percentage of participants above the age of 52 (target 15% of total participants) 5. All ethnic, religious and otherwise self-identified groups participate (target: at least one member)
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0 0 0 0 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Joint Risk Assessment of all outcome areas 1 to 6 for potential risks as per ESS and presentation to and endorsement of ESMP by Project Management Committee. 2. Training of all key project stakeholders (information sessions at PMCs, workshop at Inception Workshop) 3. Training of all communities 4. Posters for communities 5. Integration of ESS in compliance mechanisms of all Agreements of Cooperation and activities as per indicators. 6. Reporting on ESS to each PMC.
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)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard	Neither during the project development phase nor

<p>measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)</p>	<p>during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. However, initially the principle was triggered to ensure that the screening at the USP level as well as other activities is fully ensured. Whilst impacts were not identified risks could not be excluded. The screening prior to the first Project Management Committee resulted in the identification of the following potential risks. The outcome of the planning activities could adversely affect vulnerable and marginalized groups If well designed, the activity could contribute to the participation of and specific environmental and social development gains for vulnerable and marginalized groups beyond the expectations of the project.</p>
<p>List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.</p>	<p>Design of planning processes and assurance of adequate engagement of stakeholders (see above). Every outcome (plans, consultations, training design) will be reviewed against this principle (all principles) by the task manager, the project manager and in certain cases UN-Habitat's regional office. Project Manager and task manager to ensure that capacity development, land and governance issues are designed to take all ESGY principles into consideration.</p>
<p>List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.</p>	<p>1. Each plan, design, workshop/ consultation outcome screened against potential negative implications for people in vulnerable situations. 2. Percentage of theatre, radio, educational and capacity development related activities that comprehensively mitigates negative implications for people in vulnerable situations. 3. Percentage of theatre, radio, educational and capacity development related activities that promote the empowerment of people in vulnerable situations and seize other ESGY-related opportunities. 4. Percentage of women participants (target 50% of total participants) 5. Percentage of Youths participants (target: 25% of total participants are below the age of 26) 6. Percentage of curricula that include comprehensive reference to ESGY principles 7. Percentage of assessments that fully integrate ESGY principles. 8. Percentage of local governance systems that actively promote ESGY opportunities.</p>
<p>State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator</p>	<p>0</p>
<p>Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period</p>	<p>1. Joint Risk Assessment of all outcome areas 1 to 6 for potential risks as per ESS and presentation to and endorsement of ESMP by Project Management Committee. 2. Training of all key project stakeholders (information sessions at PMCs, workshop at Inception Workshop) 3. Training of all communities 4. Posters for communities 5. Integration of ESS in compliance mechanisms of all</p>

	Agreements of Cooperation and activities as per indicators. 6. Reporting on ESS to each PMC.
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)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Neither during the project development phase nor during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. However, initially the principle was triggered to ensure that the screening at the USP level as well as other activities is fully ensured. Whilst impacts were not identified risks could not be excluded. The screening prior to the first Project Management Committee resulted in the identification of the following potential risks. Whilst at the planning stage land rights will not be directly affected, this risk was triggered to ensure that all planning fully considers potential implications. If not done carefully the planning process may affect land tenure arrangements and/or community-based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources
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.	Land rights will be assessed as part of the vulnerability assessment. Potential risks will be openly discussed with communities and experts.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Vulnerability Assessment methodology incorporates land rights 2. Number of assessment reports that include land-rights (target: all)
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Joint Risk Assessment of all outcome areas 1 to 6 for potential risks as per ESS and presentation to and endorsement of ESMP by Project Management Committee. 2. Training of all key project stakeholders (information sessions at PMCs, workshop at Inception Workshop) 3. Training of all communities 4. Posters for communities 5. Integration of ESS in compliance mechanisms of all Agreements of Cooperation and activities as per indicators. 6. Reporting on ESS to each PMC.
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)	Neither during the project development phase nor during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. However, initially the principle was triggered to ensure that the screening at the USP level as well as other activities is fully ensured. Whilst impacts were not identified risks could not be excluded. The screening prior to the first Project Management Committee resulted in the identification of the following potential risks. Whilst the project design should ensure that women are fully participating and are empowered this principle was triggered to ensure that women and youth are fully participating in design of project activities and thus would also participate in implementation and benefit from and have access to opportunities and benefits
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	Meaningful participation of women will be ensured (see above). Gender experts will support the process. Community planners will be trained to ensure gender and youth aware processes. Gender disaggregated data will be collected.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Number of community planners trained in gender and youth aware planning. 2. Number of assessments that include comprehensive disaggregated (gender, youth) data sets. 3. Number of KMAC team members trained in ESGY strategy 4. Percentage of KMAC materials screened against the relevant ESGY principles. 5. Percentage of KMAC materials that actively promote gender equality and empowerment of women and youth 6. Number of Women in HCC that benefit from the project 7. Number of Women, Youth, people with disabilities in HCC leadership roles
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0 0 0 0 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Joint Risk Assessment of all outcome areas 1 to 6 for potential risks as per ESS and presentation to and endorsement of ESMP by Project Management Committee. 2. Training of all key project stakeholders (information sessions at PMCs, workshop at Inception Workshop) 3. Training of all communities 4. Posters for communities 5. Integration of ESS in compliance mechanisms of all Agreements of Cooperation and activities as per

	indicators. 6. Reporting on ESS to each PMC.
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)	Neither during the project development phase nor during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. However, initially the principle was triggered to ensure that the screening at the USP level is fully ensured.
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 to be assessed for all USP
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)	Neither during the project development phase nor during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. However, initially the principle was triggered to ensure that the screening at the USP level is fully ensured. Whilst there are no indigenous peoples as such in the area, the term has been applied to include traditional landowners which are of critically important in the peri-urban areas and along the seashore.

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.	Meaning full participation of landowners and their representatives (where applicable)
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Number or assessments and plans that fully recognize traditional landowners, their rights and concerns
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Joint Risk Assessment of all outcome areas 1 to 6 for potential risks as per ESS and presentation to and endorsement of ESMP by Project Management Committee. 2. Training of all key project stakeholders (information sessions at PMCs, workshop at Inception Workshop) 3. Training of all communities 4. Posters for communities 5. Integration of ESS in compliance mechanisms of all Agreements of Cooperation and activities as per indicators. 6. Reporting on ESS to each PMC.
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 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)	Neither during the project development phase nor during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. However, initially the principle was triggered to ensure that the screening at the USP level is fully ensured. However, this is seen as a precautionary action only as involuntary resettlement can be excluded but voluntary (in site or near site) resettlements as part of / or consequence of the project is potentially possible. The screening (prior to the first Project Management Committee) however concluded that involuntary resettlement is not triggered for ongoing outputs. Screening of USPs remains critical.
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 to be assessed for all USP
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	1. Joint Risk Assessment of all outcome areas 1 to 6 for potential risks as per ESS and presentation to and endorsement of ESMP by Project Management Committee. 2. Training of all key project stakeholders (information sessions at PMCs, workshop at Inception Workshop) 3. Training of all communities 4. Posters for communities 5. Integration of ESS in compliance mechanisms of all Agreements of Cooperation and activities as per indicators. 6. Reporting on ESS to each PMC.
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)	Neither during the project development phase nor during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. However, initially the principle was triggered to ensure that the screening at the USP level is fully ensured. This principle is fully supported by the planned activities to restore ecosystems.
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 to be assessed for all USP
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	No

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)	Neither during the project development phase nor during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. However, initially the principle was triggered to ensure that the screening at the USP level is fully ensured.
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 to be assessed for all USP
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)	Neither during the project development phase nor during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. However, initially the principle was triggered to ensure that the screening at the USP level is fully ensured.
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 to be assessed for all USP
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 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)	Neither during the project development phase nor during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. However, initially the principle was triggered to ensure that the screening at the USP level is fully ensured.
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 to be assessed for all USP
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)	Neither during the project development phase nor during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. This principle was triggered due to the outbreak of the global pandemic. While all members of society are affected, the pandemic has exacerbated existing vulnerabilities, hence the project's target beneficiaries are disproportionately affected by health and socio-economic impacts.
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 outbreak of COVID-19 significantly altered the assessment of Principle 13, Public Health. Guidelines on physical distancing and safe hygiene are followed by all project staff, and awareness raising on those were delivered to all communities. Project staff has access to PPE (hand

	sanitizer and masks and gloves). Government guidelines on meetings and movement restrictions are strictly followed.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. number of communities that receive awareness raising on COVID-19 and safe hygiene 2. Number of Assessments conducted to gain insight on the impact of COVID-19 on informal settlements
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	all communities have received substantial awareness raising on COVID-19 symptoms and preventive measures A Rapid Assessment on the impact of COVID-19 on informal settlements has been carried out
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. 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)	Neither during the project development phase nor during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. However, initially the principle was triggered to ensure that the screening at the USP level is fully ensured.
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 to be assessed for all USP
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.	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)	Neither during the project development phase nor during the implementation (when all activities were screened again prior to commencement) impacts were identified. However, initially the principle was triggered to ensure that the screening at the USP level is fully ensured.
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 to be assessed for all USP
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?	We have developed the interim ESPM management plan. As no risks have currently been observed, no further actions have been taken. Currently no impacts have been observed. However, in order to implement the ESMP of the project capacity development, monitoring and promotion of redress mechanisms have been widely shared.
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?	MLHS, MECDM, RMIT: have received and subsequently provided training to partners and beneficiaries and ensure that the redress mechanisms are fully understood.
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
---	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	--	--	---	---	---

Section 6: Grievances

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

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

Comments

GP Compliance

Section 1: Quality at entry

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

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

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

Gender-responsive element	Level	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Rated result for the reporting period
Output 1.1: In addition to existing community action plans developed as part of the HURCAP process, complete community climate action plans for White River (Wind Valley) and Tuvaruhu (Jabros) informal settlements	Output	Roles and responsibilities of women are identified in each plan	5	5	Good
Output 2.1: Training on conducting community profile self-assessment and monitoring (also for compliance with ESMP)	Output	No of trainings that are positively evaluated and % of women trained	0	50%	
Expected Accomplishment 2 Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes and capacity to implement at local level	Outcome	A majority of community members (including women and youth) are empowered to directly contribute to local resilience building	0	60%	
Output 3.1: To develop a women-focused climate risk communications programme	Output	No of women-focused communication programmes	0	1	
Output 3.3:	Output	No of ecosystem-	0	2 At least 50%	

Ecosystem-based adaptation options, in particular for food security, sustainable livelihoods, flood mgt. etc. implemented.		based adaptation initiatives (participation of women)		women	
Output 4.1: Provide 'Planning for Climate Change' training for nominated 'resilience officers' in each of Honiara's wards, and integrate training with DRR knowledge (what to do and where to go).	Output	No of training events and % of women trained	0	2 At least 50% women	

Section 2: Quality during implementation and at exit

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

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

Section 3: Implementation arrangements

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP	An integrated Environment and Social Safeguards, Gender and Youth Strategy (ESGY) has been developed and Executing Entities have been trained. The project manager oversees project implementation and ensures that the policy is upheld and outputs comply with the requirements. Furthermore, the project's participatory approach includes guidelines on how to adopt a gender based approach in the design and implementation of field activities (including conduction of workshops, etc.) and checklists are developed for the field staff to ensure representation of marginalized groups in all meetings and workshops.
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 Executing Entities have to comply with the ESGY strategy, ensure to collect gender disaggregated data, ensure women's representation and that the gender dimension of climate change is integrated in

	their work packages.
Have the implementation arrangements at the EE(s) been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
Have any capacity gaps affecting GP compliance been identified during the reporting period and if so, what remediation was implemented?	Yes

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 used
---	---	---------------------------------

Comments

Rating

Implementing Entity					
Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Comments	Rating
1.1.1 Identification of key issues and prioritisation of actions for two additional hotspot case studies (Nggosi and Panatina wards)	Outcome 1, Outcome 3	Complete by month 12	Completed		Satisfactory
1.2.1 In-depth profiling of all hotspot communities	Outcome 1, Outcome 3	Complete by month 12	Completed		Satisfactory
1.3.1 Carry out scoping and feasibility study (community level)	Outcome 1, Outcome 4	Ongoing (completion planned for month 24)	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
1.4.1 Implementation of screened activities	Outcome 1, Outcome 4	Ongoing (completion planned for month 24)	Delayed		Marginally Unsatisfactory
2.1.1: Training on surveys, data recording, and data management	Outcome 2	First stage complete by month 12; 2 additional stages planned over next 2 years	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
2.2.1: Awareness and capacity	Outcome 3,	First stage complete	Ontrack		Marginally

building activity relating to key community issues	Outcome 6	by month 12; 2 additional stages planned over next 2 years			Satisfactory
3.1.2: Work with women's groups in Honiara to determine the most effective means of communication about climate risk strategies	Outcome 3	Complete by month 12	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
3.3.2 Translate/apply the Climate Change Child-Centred Adaptation approach to schools and youth programmes in Honiara	Outcome 2, Outcome 3	Preparation stage complete by month 12; implementation planned over next 2 years	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
3.3.1 Conducting training and piloting of closed-loop organic waste and urban food production activities, and reducing climate vulnerability through ecosystem services	Outcome 5	Ongoing (completion planned for month 36)	Ontrack		Satisfactory
3.4.1 Engage with HCC to identify and promote climate resilient public space, planting trees to combat heat stress, evacuation centres	Outcome 1	Ongoing (completion planned for month 36)	Ontrack		Satisfactory
4.1.1 Training of resilience officers in both CC adaptation and DRR, and provide a platform for whole of city regular meetings and capacity building	Outcome 2	Preparation stage complete by month 12; implementation planned over next 2 years	Ontrack		Marginally Unsatisfactory
4.2.1 Pilot best practice approach to city government, NGO and community collaboration in climate action planning	Outcome 2, Outcome 7	Preparation stage complete by month 12; implementation planned over next 2 years	Ontrack		
4.3.1 Assess appropriate land administration options	Outcome 2	Ongoing (completion planned for month 36)	Ontrack		Highly Satisfactory
5.1.1 Capacity development needs assessment in Honiara (planning, GIS risk mapping, land administration, engineering, data management, climate change adaptation, media and communications)	Outcome 2		Ontrack		Satisfactory
5.2.1 Initiate new MoU's between Government departments, Solomon Islands National University (SINU), and RMIT University/UN-Habitat	Outcome 2	Complete by month 12	Ontrack		
5.5.2 Conduct a whole-of-government policy review to identify areas for mainstreaming	Outcome 2		Ontrack		

of climate change considerations across urban policy					
6.1.1 Develop climate change adaptation training and knowledge exchange programmes between HCC staff and ward councillors	Outcome 2	Complete by month 12	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
6.2.1 Advocacy materials	Outcome 8	Continuous	Ontrack		Satisfactory
6.3.1 Develop and maintain a knowledge sharing mechanism at the city-wide scale, in close collaboration with HCC and the two key ministries	Outcome 8	Continuous	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
6.4.1 Conduct and record a participatory joint learning event based on annual review of activities and make available project findings and recommendations	Outcome 8	Continuous	Ontrack		Satisfactory

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

Name	Email
Stanley Waleanisia, PS Ministry of Lands, Housing and Survey	SWaleanisia@mlhs.gov.sb

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 has made satisfactory overall progress despite significant disruptions due to COVID-19. Key foundational activities, including hotspot profiling, stakeholder mapping, capacity assessments, and MoU signings, were completed on time, while many ongoing components have advanced through stakeholder engagement, training development, and remote collaboration. However, delays remain in the implementation of community-based actions, training rollouts, and recruitment of key personnel, largely due to travel restrictions and institutional disruptions. With resumed in-country support from partners like RMIT and NZ volunteers, the project is well-positioned to accelerate delivery. It is recommended to fast-track recruitment, revise timelines, and scale up hybrid training and implementation methods to maintain momentum and ensure impact.

Executing Entity / Project Coordinator

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating
1.1.1 Identification of key issues and prioritisation of actions for two additional hotspot case studies (Nggosi and Panatina wards)	Outcome 1, Outcome 3	Complete by month 12	Completed	Satisfactory
1.2.1 In-depth profiling of all hotspot communities	Outcome 1, Outcome 3	Complete by month 12	Completed	Satisfactory
1.3.1 Carry out scoping and feasibility study (community level)	Outcome 1, Outcome 4	Ongoing (completion planned for month 24)+H47:I64	Ontrack	Marginally Satisfactory

1.4.1 Implementation of screened activities	Outcome 1, Outcome 4	Ongoing (completion planned for month 48)	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
2.1.1: Training on surveys, data recording, and data management	Outcome 2	First stage complete by month 12; 2 additional stages planned over next 2 years	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
2.2.1: Awareness and capacity building activity relating to key community issues	Outcome 3, Outcome 6	First stage complete by month 12; 2 additional stages planned over next 2 years	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
3.1.2: Work with women's groups in Honiara to determine the most effective means of communication about climate risk strategies	Outcome 3	Complete by month 12	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
3.3.2 Translate/apply the Climate Change Child-Centred Adaptation approach to schools and youth programmes in Honiara	Outcome 2, Outcome 3	Preparation stage complete by month 12; implementation planned over next 2 years	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
3.3.1 Conducting training and piloting of closed-loop organic waste and urban food production activities, and reducing climate vulnerability through ecosystem services	Outcome 5	Ongoing (completion planned for month 36)	Ontrack		Satisfactory
3.4.1 Engage with HCC to identify and promote climate resilient public space, planting trees to combat heat stress, evacuation centres	Outcome 1	Ongoing (completion planned for month 36)	Ontrack		Satisfactory
4.1.1 Training of resilience officers in both CC adaptation and DRR, and provide a platform for whole of city regular meetings and capacity building	Outcome 2	Preparation stage complete by month 12; implementation planned over next 2 years	Ontrack		Marginally Unsatisfactory
4.2.1 Pilot best practice approach of city government, NGO and community collaboration in climate action planning	Outcome 2, Outcome 7	Preparation stage complete by month 12; implementation planned over next 2 years	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
4.3.1 Assess appropriate land administration options	Outcome 2	Ongoing (completion planned for month 36)	Completed		Highly Satisfactory
5.1.1 Capacity development needs assessment in Honiara (planning, GIS risk mapping, land administration, engineering, data management, climate change adaptation, media and communications)	Outcome 2	Complete by month 12	Completed		Satisfactory
5.2.1 Initiate new MoU's between Government departments, Solomon	Outcome 2	Complete by month 12	Completed		Highly Satisfactory

Islands National University (SINU), and RMIT University/UN-Habitat					
5.2.2 Development of tailored capacity building workshops for professional staff to build knowledge and required skill sets (HCC and focal Ministries) at RMIT University	Outcome 7	Complete by month 12	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
5.3.1 Employ a Climate Adaptation and Resilience Officer for HCC, and constitute a multi-stakeholder steering group for implementation of the project.	Outcome 7	Hiring process complete by month 9	Ontrack		Highly Satisfactory
5.4.1 Develop a formal mechanism for managing cross-boundary urban resilience issues between Guadalcanal Province and HCC	Outcome 7	Preparation stage complete by month 12; implementation planned over next 2 years	Ontrack		Highly Satisfactory
5.5.1 Map and assess linkages between relevant stakeholders and initiatives for improved governance and institutional response to CC impacts and natural disasters	Outcome 2	Complete by month 12	Ontrack		Satisfactory
5.5.2 Conduct a whole-of-government policy review to identify areas for mainstreaming of climate change considerations across urban policy	Outcome 2	Ongoing (completion planned for month 24)	Ontrack		Satisfactory
6.1.1 Develop climate change adaptation training and knowledge exchange programmes between HCC staff and ward councillors	Outcome 2	Complete by month 12	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
6.2.1 Advocacy materials	Outcome 3	Continuous	Ontrack		Satisfactory
6.3.1 Develop and maintain a knowledge sharing mechanism at the city-wide scale, in close collaboration with HCC and the two key ministries	Outcome 8	Continuous	Ontrack		Marginally Satisfactory
6.4.1 Conduct and record a participatory joint learning event based on annual review of activities and make available project findings and recommendations	Outcome 8	Continuous	Ontrack		Satisfactory

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

Name	Email	Institution
Inga Korte	inga.korte@org	

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

"Rating takes into account the severe impact that the outbreak of the global COVID-19 pandemic had on the project implementation and oversight. Most severely, travel restrictions on RMIT severely slow down

project implementation as field visits are impossible. Furthermore, Project management oversight is severely impacted due to the travel restrictions. In addition, the restrictions related to gatherings of community members further hinder the implementation of project activities. Despite the severe restrictions outlined above, the project has made some progress at community level with the finalization of all community profiles and draft actions plans. Community buy in is ensured through transparent project implementation, training activities and inclusive, bottom up implementation approach. Multi-expertise teams have been mobilized to highlight potential synergic actions whenever possible. For instance, strategies for solid waste management are developed taking into account environmental and health consideration, the reduction of flood levels (reduction of drain blockages), governance implication at local and town level, but also climate change mitigation, livelihood and food security (transformation of green waste into energy and compost used by youth groups for urban agriculture projects), and potential local partnership on implementing some of the engineering actions have been identified. Rated as less positive are the delays associated with the lack of a project bank account and hence extremely limited implementation capacity of the MLHS. This has for example made it impossible to date to hire Resilience Officers to support the project at the ward level. Even though a NZ volunteer has taken over some of the responsibilities, there are still several limitations on project implementation. "

Other					
Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating	
1.1.1 Identification of key issues and prioritisation of actions for two additional hotspot case studies (Nggosi and Panatina wards)	Outcome 1, Outcome 3	Complete by month 12	Completed		Satisfactory
1.2.1 In-depth profiling of all hotspot communities	Outcome 1, Outcome 3	Complete by month 12	Completed		Satisfactory
1.3.1 Carry out scoping and feasibility study (community level)	Outcome 1, Outcome 4	Ongoing (completion planned for month 24)			Marginally Satisfactory
1.4.1 Implementation of screened activities	Outcome 1, Outcome 4	Ongoing (completion planned for month 48)			Marginally Satisfactory
2.1.1: Training on surveys, data recording, and data management	Outcome 2	First stage complete by month 12; 2 additional stages planned over next 2 years			Marginally Satisfactory
2.2.1: Awareness and capacity building activity relating to key community issues	Outcome 3, Outcome 6	First stage complete by month 12; 2 additional stages planned over next 2 years			Marginally Satisfactory
3.1.2: Work with women's groups in Honiara to determine the most effective means of communication about climate risk strategies	Outcome 3	Complete by month 12			Marginally Satisfactory
3.3.2 Translate/apply the Climate Change Child-Centred Adaptation approach to schools and youth programmes in Honiara	Outcome 2, Outcome 3	Preparation stage complete by month 12; implementation planned over next 2 years			Marginally Satisfactory

3.3.1 Conducting training and piloting of closed-loop organic waste and urban food production activities, and reducing climate vulnerability through ecosystem services	Outcome 5	Ongoing (completion planned for month 36)			Satisfactory
3.4.1 Engage with HCC to identify and promote climate resilient public space, planting trees to combat heat stress, evacuation centres	Outcome 1	Ongoing (completion planned for month 36)			Satisfactory
4.1.1 Training of resilience officers in both CC adaptation and DRR, and provide a platform for whole of city regular meetings and capacity building	Outcome 2	Preparation stage complete by month 12; implementation planned over next 2 years			Marginally Unsatisfactory
4.2.1 Pilot best practice approach of city government, NGO and community collaboration in climate action planning	Outcome 2, Outcome 7	Preparation stage complete by month 12; implementation planned over next 2 years			Marginally Satisfactory
4.3.1 Assess appropriate land administration options	Outcome 2	Ongoing (completion planned for month 36)			Highly Satisfactory
5.1.1 Capacity development needs assessment in Honiara (planning, GIS risk mapping, land administration, engineering, data management, climate change adaptation, media and communications)	Outcome 2	Complete by month 12			Satisfactory
5.2.1 Initiate new MoU's between Government departments, Solomon Islands National University (SINU), and RMIT University/UN-Habitat	Outcome 2	Complete by month 12			Highly Satisfactory
5.2.2 Development of tailored capacity building workshops for professional staff to build knowledge and required skill sets (HCC and focal Ministries) at RMIT University	Outcome 7	Complete by month 12			Marginally Satisfactory
5.3.1 Employ a Climate Adaptation and Resilience Officer for HCC, and constitute a multi-stakeholder steering group for implementation of the project.	Outcome 7	Hiring process complete by month 9			Highly Satisfactory
5.4.1 Develop a formal mechanism for managing cross-boundary urban resilience issues between Guadalcanal Province and HCC	Outcome 7	Preparation stage complete by month 12; implementation planned over next 2 years			Highly Satisfactory
5.5.1 Map and assess linkages between relevant stakeholders and initiatives for improved governance and institutional response to CC impacts and natural disasters	Outcome 2	Complete by month 12			Satisfactory

5.5.2 Conduct a whole-of-government policy review to identify areas for mainstreaming of climate change considerations across urban policy	Outcome 2	Ongoing (completion planned for month 24)			Satisfactory
6.1.1 Develop climate change adaptation training and knowledge exchange programmes between HCC staff and ward councillors	Outcome 2	Complete by month 12			Marginally Satisfactory
6.2.1 Advocacy materials	Outcome 3	Continuous			Satisfactory
6.3.1 Develop and maintain a knowledge sharing mechanism at the city-wide scale, in close collaboration with HCC and the two key ministries	Outcome 8	Continuous			Marginally Satisfactory
6.4.1 Conduct and record a participatory joint learning event based on annual review of activities and make available project findings and recommendations	Outcome 8	Continuous			Satisfactory

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

Name	Email
Bernhard Barth	Bernhard.Barth@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.

"Rating takes into account the severe impact that the outbreak of the global COVID-19 pandemic had on the project implementation and oversight. Most severely, travel restrictions on RMIT severely slow down project implementation as field visits are impossible. Furthermore, Project management oversight is severely impacted due to the travel restrictions. In addition, the restrictions related to gatherings of community members further hinder the implementation of project activities. Despite the severe restrictions outlined above, the project has made some progress at community level with the finalization of all community profiles and draft actions plans. Community buy in is ensured through transparent project implementation, training activities and inclusive, bottom up implementation approach. Multi-expertise teams have been mobilized to highlight potential synergistic actions whenever possible. For instance, strategies for solid waste management are developed taking into account environmental and health consideration, the reduction of flood levels (reduction of drain blockages), governance implication at local and town level, but also climate change mitigation, livelihood and food security (transformation of green waste into energy and compost used by youth groups for urban agriculture projects), and potential local partnership on implementing some of the engineering actions have been identified. Rated as less positive are the delays associated with the lack of a project bank account and hence extremely limited implementation capacity of the MLHS. This has for example made it impossible to date to hire Resilience Officers to support the project at the ward level. Even though a NZ volunteer has taken over some of the responsibilities, there are still several limitations on project implementation. "

Overall Rating

Overall rating

Marginally Satisfactory

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

Marginally Satisfactory

Project Indicators

List of indicators

Type of Indicator (indicators towards Objectives, Outcomes, etc...)	Indicator	Baseline	Progress Since Inception	Target for Project End
Outcomes	1.Number of hotspot communities whose physical infrastructure has been improved to enhance climate resilience with particular emphasis on the poorest, women, youth, elderly and other vulnerable households.	0	0	5
Outputs	1.1 Community action plans as foundation for concrete adaptation action available.	3	5	5
Outputs	1.1 Roles and responsibilities of women are identified in the plans	0	0	5
Outputs	1.2 Detailed base-line data (including for monitoring of environmental and social risks) available for selected hotspot communities (ensuring gender and age disaggregation of data and detailed assessment of household level vulnerability)	0	0	5
Outputs	1.3 Action plans and detailed proposals for prioritized	0	5	5

	community level concrete climate action are available			
Outputs	1.4 Concrete climate actions implemented	0	0	10
Outcomes	2. A majority of community members (including women and youth) are empowered to directly contribute to local resilience building	0	0	60
Outputs	2.1 No of trainings that are positively evaluated and % of women trained	0	12	5
Outputs	2.2 No of workshops	0	5	5
Outcomes	3. Ward-level and community (with particular emphasis on women and youth) capacity strengthened in support of ecosystems-based adaptation and public space	0	1	2
Outputs	3.1 No of women-focused communication programmes	0	1	1
Outputs	3.2 No of children and youth educational programmes	0	1	2
Outputs	3.3 No of ecosystem-based adaptation initiatives (participation of women)	0	0	2
Outputs	3.4 No of community / public spaces developed	0	0	2
Outcomes	4 No of ward development plans that fully mainstream climate change	0	2	2
Outputs	4.1 No of training events and % of women trained	0	1	2
Outputs	4.2 No of ward level	0	0	2

	structure established			
Outputs	4.3 No of ward level land administration options developed	0	2	2
Outcomes	5. Capacities of Honiara City Council (and the national government institutions supporting HCC) strengthened as expressed in the HCC corporate plan	0	0	1
Outputs	5.1 No of capacity needs assessments	0	1	1
Outputs	5.2 No. of capacity development workshops	1	2	3
Outputs	5.3.1 Resilience officer employed	0	0	1
Outputs	5.3.2 No of stakeholder meetings	0	5	8
Outputs	5.4 Set up resilience working group with HCC and Guadalcanal Province	0	0	1
Outputs	5.5 No of policy reviews	0	0	1
Outcomes	6. All stakeholders are well aware of programme as documented through pre and post project survey	0	50	50
Outputs	6.1 Knowledge exchange mechanism is established	0	1	1
Outputs	6.2 No of newsletters and web updates	0	3	4
Outputs	6.3 No of website updates	0	7	16
Outputs	6.4 No of lessons learnt documentation	0	0	1

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	The main highlight is the extra-mile effort put in synergic actions within different increasing the level of processes and planning complexity but with expected extra accent put on capacity building at all level, and willingness shared among partner opportunity for providing good quality training and creating new capacities. in AC UN-Habitat project (Integration of Nature Based Solutions in Honiara, Solomon impact and reach of this AF project even with ongoing dealys due to COVID-19)
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts?	Challenges & Opportunities	Yes, given that no unwanted negative impacts were incurred. The below measures included a revised Environmental and Social Management Report, https://www.dropbox.com/s/i4frbg46df16lnf/04%20Annex%204%20ESGY%20S Programme Management Committee Report included varous annexes for approval (https://www.dropbox.com/s/hz5ld5ri368zd6j/02%20Annex%202%20PMC%20F) In addition in July 2019 a further update was issued (https://www.dropbox.com/s/rn2u6zzqyn8lgsc/ESGY%20Scoping%20and%20In%20Fiji%20Jul%202019.pdf?dl=0). We apologize for not submitting this in line both documents are significantly advanced from the document which was part of version with track change.
How have gender considerations been taken into consideration during the reporting period? What have been the lessons learned as a consequence of inclusion of such considerations on project performance or impacts? List lessons learned specific to gender, detailing measures and project/programme-specific indicators highlighting the role of women as key actors in climate change adaptation.	Challenges & Opportunities	Gender considerations are embedded in all project aspects, not only from a number women in consultations, trainings and workshops; gender balance considered in H psychological point of view. Women are culturally silent in presence of men, and public especially if contradicting opinion of men or on sensitive subjects. Focus g the opportunity to women to express themselves as much as possible (women gro gap, women are invited to speak in an appropriate manner). Survey questionnaire sensitivity is reflected in it; survey teams are gender balanced; survey will be carr respondents are expected to be female (men out at work)
Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays?	Challenges & Opportunities	There is a severe delay in project implementation, mostly due to 2 different factor complex bureocratic and administrative processes for establishing a project bank implementation capacities. The main cause of delay remains the outbreak of the C restrictions of the main implementing oartner RMIT. A larger team needs to be re with project implementation once MLHS has established the bank account and ca Nevertheless, implementing partners have made a constant and significant effort t activities remotely and come up with creative solutions for field work implementa
What implementation	Challenges & Opportunities	The diversity and complementarity of expertise offered by the "task force" mobili good interaction with the project team in Honiara has a great potential for deliveri

<p>issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected progress?</p>	<p>further the expected results. This is also due to the team members and their personal willingness to multiply interlinkages and sharing of data and lessons learnt. The project has been well as frequent missions by the main implementing partner. Without a physical presence, the project is severely impacted. This lesson learnt has and will continue to result in the recruitment of more staff to provide on site support. Bureaucratic government procedures take extremely long (e.g. visa processing). This has to be taken into consideration when designing the implementation modalities. For example, outsourcing of the implementation of some infrastructure projects to local contractors. Bank CAUSE project, are potential solutions.</p>
--	---

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

Yes

<p>Climate Resilience Measures</p>	
<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>The diversity and complementarity of expertise offered by the "task force" mobilized by the RMIT, and the smooth and good interaction with the project team in Honiara has a great potential to efficiently implement the project and to achieve the expected results. The team members' willingness to multiply interlinkages, and to share data and lessons learnt is highly contributing to this positive outcome. The project requires on-site project oversight as well as frequent missions by the main implementing partner. Physical presence is an important factor for timely implementation; without it, project implementation is severely impacted. This lesson learnt has and will continue to result in the recruitment of more project staff in Honiara to provide on-site support in order to ensure the effectiveness of results. Long/ complicated bureaucratic procedures have been identified as one of the main challenges affecting the achievement of results. This must be taken into consideration when designing the implementation modalities for the coming 2 years. For example, outsourcing of the implementation of some infrastructure projects, or partnering with other organisations/initiatives are potential solutions. Planning for sufficient staff is of critical importance: resources and capacities of implementing partners are limited and require extensive guidance and procedures for recruitment take extremely long. Additionally, constant community engagement and frequent consultations with several stakeholders represent a critical component of the project. Hence, frequent in-person monitoring is required. Thorough community mobilization and capacity building remains critical. The majority of the settlements do not have a formal governance structure and require extensive support in order to set up community committees. These structures would be crucial in guiding the project implementation in a more transparent and inclusive way. 20 Community/National Impact • Community Governance: Community organization has and will to</p>

	<p>continue to drastically improve, leading to increased social coherence; • Linkages: Connecting target communities with HCC as well as national government has been important for the target communities; • Climate Resilient Assets: Building community assets that are urgently needed; • Advocacy: The project highlights the importance of climate resilience incremental informal settlements upgrading to a wide range of stakeholders through continued advocacy, potentially leading to an increase in programming targeted specifically at informal settlements; • Increased awareness: through continued engagement and capacity development, communities have benefitted from awareness raising activities on a range of topics. The integration of both bottom-up and top-down approaches into climate resilient community development plans has been greatly contributing to informing communities on future development.</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>	
<p>Readiness Interventions (Applicable only to NIEs that received one or more readiness grants)</p>	
<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>n/a</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 climate change?</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Concrete Adaptation Interventions</p>	
<p>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?</p>	<p>Costing of sufficient staff is of critical importance: the resources and capacities of implementing partners are extremely limited. Projects like this that require constant community engagement and negotiations with several stakeholders require quite a few human resources. Thorough community mobilization and capacity building remains critical - most settlements do not have a formal governance structure and require extensive support in order to set up community committees that can guide project implementation in a transparent and inclusive way. Climate adaptation in Fiji is very situational and requires individual solutions for each settlement/household. However, the CRH project tries to identify solutions that are applicable at a larger scale and</p>

	could be easily contextualized for future programmes
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?	no adaptation interventions have been undertaken yet. However, already in the assessment and design phase the project has a strong focus on implementing interventions that can be scaled up later on. See response in cell D18 for additional details.
Knowledge Management	
How has existing information/data/knowledge been used to inform project development and implementation? What kinds of information/data/knowledge were used?	For project formulation and implementation, the comprehensive experience of UN-Habitat in the region and Solomon Islands as well as the Honiara Urban Resilience and Climate Action Plan (HURCAP) and the experience of the EEs and the NDA provided the foundation. Extensive consultations and literature reviews supplemented this. The project works with a wide range of government and civil society partners for accurate data and information.
Has the existing information/data/knowledge been made available to relevant stakeholder? If so, what channels of dissemination have been used?	Newletters, presentations at local and regional conferences and workshops
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.)	RMIT Ocean Cities Studio (https://www.tracevisual.com.au/ocean-cities-studio-2020/)
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	10 learning objectives were established, and the project is on track to meet them. - 3 learning objectives have been met (2.2.1. autonomous replication in other communities possible, 2.1.2 improved understanding community vulnerabilities, and 2.1.3 improved climate change sensitive community planning). - 3 learning objectives are well underway to be met and activities are still ongoing (2.1.4 improved climate change awareness of communities, 2.1.5 improved awareness of community livelihood opportunities, 4.1.1 sharing of lessons learnt and best practices) - 4 learning objectives are only partially met as activities are delayed/ have only partially started (1.1.1 improved understanding of local vulnerabilities at city level, 1.1.2 improved awareness of geography of hazard risks, 1.1.3 improved climate change sensitive planning at city level, 3.1.1 improved knowledge of resilient community and housing development)
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.	The project deals with large data sets (related to the hazard mapping. Vulnerability Assessment Reports, as well as the community household survey). Sharing large datasets with the local agents has been challenging, especially when internet access is slow and limited. The project makes use of a variety of different platforms to share data (depending on feasibility of each municipality), and include dropbox, WeTransfer, googledrive, as well as

	external hard discs for storage and backups.
Has the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	Yes absolutely. For example, the understanding of communities' vulnerabilities provided the basis for development of inclusive and sustainable climate action plans and hence directly contributed to the project outcomes.
Innovation	
Describe any innovative practices or technologies that figured prominently in this project.	'-Remote scientific support for local teams supporting workshops and engagement -Integration of science and traditional ecological knowledge. -Student design studios
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?	No
If you answered yes, kindly specify the name of the Fund/Organization.	

Results Tracker

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

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

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

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

Core Indicator: No. of beneficiaries				
		Total	% of female beneficiaries	% of Youth beneficiaries
Baseline information	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project			
Baseline information	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project			
Baseline information	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0	0
Target performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	6000	50	30
Target performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	81000	47.23	56.24

Target performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	87000	48.614999999999995	43.120000000000005
Performance at mid-term	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	4499	50	28
Performance at mid-term	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	85001	42.8	55.4
Performance at mid-term	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	89500	46.4	41.7
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	6000	50	Inland flooding	4: Effective
Performance at mid-term	4499	50	Inland flooding	4: Effective
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	3	Multi-sector	Local	2: Undertaking or updating of assessments in progress
Target performance	5	Multi-sector	Local	3: Risk and

at completion				vulnerability assessments completed or updated
Performance at mid-term	5	Multi-sector	Local	3: Risk and vulnerability assessments completed or updated
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	20	10	Multi-sector	2: Low capacity
Target performance at completion	20	25	Multi-sector	4: High capacity
Performance at mid-term	11	30	Multi-sector	3: Medium capacity
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		

Target performance at completion	20	25	Public
Performance at mid-term	52	69	Public
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	NGO	Local	Multi-sector	1: No capacity
Target performance at completion	NGO	Local	Multi-sector	3: Medium capacity
Performance at mid-term	NGO		Multi-sector	3: Medium capacity
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	0	Multi-sector
Target performance at completion	100	Multi-sector
Performance at mid-term	10	Multi-sector
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	6000	50	1: Aware of neither
Target performance at completion	6000	50	4: Mostly aware
Performance at mid-term	701	55	3: Partially aware
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			
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	Multi-sector	Local	2: Partially responsive (Lacks most elements)
Target performance at	Multi-sector	Local	4: Mostly responsive

completion			(Most defined elements)
Performance at mid-term	Multi-sector	Local	
Performance at completion			

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

	Sector	Targeted asset	Changes in asset (quantitative or qualitative)
Baseline information	Multi-sector	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	1: Not improved
Baseline information	Multi-sector	1: Health and Social Infrastructure (developed/improved)	1: Not improved
Baseline information	Disaster risk reduction	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	1: Not improved
Baseline information	Urban development	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	1: Not improved
Target performance at completion	Multi-sector	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	4: Mostly Improved
Target performance at completion	Multi-sector	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	4: Mostly Improved
Target performance at completion	Multi-sector	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	4: Mostly Improved
Target performance at completion	Multi-sector	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strengthened)	3: Moderately improved
Performance at mid-term	Multi-sector		1: Not improved
Performance at mid-term	Multi-sector		1: Not improved
Performance at mid-term	Multi-sector		1: Not improved
Performance at mid-term	Multi-sector		1: Not improved
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	1		Food security
Baseline information	0		Disaster risk reduction
Baseline information	0		Multi-sector
Target performance at completion	6		Food security
Target performance at completion	12		Disaster risk reduction
Target performance at completion	5		Multi-sector
Performance at mid-term	0		Food security
Performance at mid-term	0		Coastal management

Performance at mid-term	0		Multi-sector
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	1: Ineffective	Multi-sector	Land
Target performance at completion	4: Effective	Multi-sector	
Performance at mid-term			
Performance at completion			

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

Core Indicator 5.1: Natural Assets protected or rehabilitated

	Natural asset or Ecosystem (type)	Total number of natural assets or ecosystems protected/rehabilitated	Unit	Effectiveness of protection/rehabilitation
Baseline information	Catchment area/Watershed/Aquifer	1	ha rehabilitated	1: Ineffective
Baseline information	Coasts			
Target performance at completion	Catchment area/Watershed/Aquifer	2	ha protected	4: Effective
Target performance at completion	Coasts	2	km rehabilitated	3: Moderately effective
Performance at mid-term	Catchment area/Watershed/Aquifer			
Performance at mid-term	Coasts			
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	2: Most not integrated

Target performance at completion	4: Most
Performance at mid-term	3: Some
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	1	Urban development	Local	Urban policy
Performance at mid-term	0	Urban development	Local	
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	Sector	Status	Effectiveness
--	------------------------------------	--------	--------	---------------

	technologies			
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			