ADAPTATION FUND

Project Performance Report

Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	6/28/2022 - 6/26/2023
Project Title	Enhancing urban resilience to climate change impacts and natural disasters: Honiara
Project Summary	Small Island Developing States (SIDS) in the Pacific, such as the Solomon Islands, are amongst the most vulnerable countries to the risks of future climate change.In Honiara – the capital city of the Solomon Islands – there is acute sensitivity to external shocks and stresses due to existing ‘adaptation deficits’ in urban infrastructure, housing and service provision. These deficits result from a range of development drivers; including rapid and unplanned urbanization, the associated growth of informal settlements, a lack of adequate infrastructure and basic services in many areas, issues related to land tenure in peri-urban areas, and weak institutional structures governing the urban environment. The intention of this project is therefore to work with vulnerable urban communities in Honiara to implement climate adaptation actions and to undertake capacity strengthening initiatives across multiple urban scales – community, ward and city-wide (including issues that cross the city-province boundary) – in order to strengthen the climate resilience of the city.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.Community-level objectives•To support the implementation of prioritized resilience actions in vulnerability hotspot communities.•To strengthen the capacity of local communities to respond to climate change and natural hazards through awareness raising and capacity development training.Ward-level objectives•To support the implementation of resilience actions that target women, youth, urban agriculture and food security, and disaster risk reduction.•To strengthen the capacity of ward officials / councils to lead climate change adaptation and DRR planning activity, in support of increased urban resilience.City-wide objective•To strengthen institutional arrangements at the city-level to respond

	to climate change and natural disasters through mainstreaming, improved partnership working
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	Roi Chiti

Project Milestones	
AFB Approval Date	10/10/2017
IE-AFB Agreement Signature Date	1/18/2018
Start of Project/Programme	7/28/2018
Actual Mid-term Review Date (if applicable)	2/1/2021
Original Completion Date	7/28/2022
Revised Completion Date after approval of extension request (if applicable)	6/27/2027

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 met and cleared by the AFB Sec

Planned actions, including a detailed time schedule	The ESMP has been updated, submitted to the Board and cleared by the 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 PPR 3 & First no-cost extension request - submitted October 2021 PPR 4 & Second no-cost extension request - submitted April 2023 Third no-cost extension request - submitted February 2024 Fourth no-cost extension request - submitted June 2025 PPR 5 - submitted April 2026 PPR6 - submitted May 2026

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**
National Project Manager	Samantha Poncabare	samantha.poncabare@un.org	11/27/2024
Government(s) DA	Thaddeus Siota	TSiota@mecdm.gov.sb	3/24/2025
Implementing Entity	Roi Chiti	roi.chiti@un.org	6/1/2025
Executing Agency	Stanley Waleanisia	SWaleanisia@mlhs.gov.sb	11/28/2018
Executing Agency	Darryn McEvoy	darryn.mcevoy@rmit.edu.au	6/10/2019

Financial Data

Disbursement of AF grant funds	
Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date ($)	$3,938,550.00
Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date ($)	$612,067.65
Project disbursement rate (%)	50.1
Project execution rate (%)	15.11
Add any comments on AF Grant Funds	(Revised) Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs ($): - PPR1: 51,640.05 - PPR2: 223,184.99 - PPR3: 466,026.80 - PPR4: 557,210.65 - PPR5: 612,067.65
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	$21,665.00
1.2. In-depth community profiling for the hotspot communities	$22,050.00
1.3. Scoping and feasibility studies of prioritized local actions for each hotspot community	$25,030.00
1.4. Implementation of screened / agreed resilience actions in each hotspot community	$0.00
2.1. Training on conducting community profile self-assessment and monitoring	$23,845.00

2.2 Awareness and capacity development support, including workshops relating to key issues (CCA/Community Early Warning/DRR/Health)	$25,505.00
3.1. To develop a women-focused climate risk communications programme	$16,774.00
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	$9,381.00
3.4. Climate resilient community spaces developed, including productive open spaces and community evacuation centres	$23,196.00
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)	$14,901.00
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	$7,821.00
5.1. Capacity development needs assessment to be conducted in Honiara with focal Ministries and HCC	$56,024.00
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	$0.00
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	$5,829.00
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)	$12,686.00
6.1 Climate change training and knowledge exchange	$0.00
6.2. Advocacy materials	$2,372.00
6.3. Knowledge sharing platform	$0.00
6.4. Project learning mechanism	$0.00
IE fee ($)	$7,997.50
Execution cost ($)	$12,129.00

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	$0.00	6/26/2024
1.2. In-depth community profiling for the hotspot communities	$0.00	6/26/2024
1.3. Scoping and feasibility studies of prioritized local actions for each hotspot community	$0.00	6/26/2024
1.4. Implementation of screened / agreed resilience actions in each hotspot community	$13,017.00	6/26/2024
2.1. Training on conducting community profile self-assessment and monitoring	$31,444.32	6/26/2024
2.2 Awareness and capacity development support, including workshops relating to key issues (CCA/Community Early Warning/DRR/Health)	$28,278.00	6/26/2024

3.1. To develop a women-focused climate risk communications programme	$0.00	6/26/2024
3.2. To integrate climate change into educational programs for youth and children	$0.00	6/26/2024
3.3 Ecosystem-based adaptation options, in particular for food security, sustainable livelihoods, flood mgt. etc. implemented	$0.00	6/26/2024
3.4. Climate resilient community spaces developed, including productive open spaces and community evacuation centres	$0.00	6/26/2024
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)	$0.00	6/26/2024
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	6/26/2024
4.3. Assess locally appropriate land administration options for peri-urban settlements, and households, around Ngossi and Panatina wards	$42,006.00	6/26/2024
5.1. Capacity development needs assessment to be conducted in Honiara with focal Ministries and HCC	$0.00	6/26/2024
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	$0.00	6/26/2024
5.3. Employ a climate adaptation and resilience officer, and constitute a multi-stakeholder steering group and provide support for regular meetings	$0.00	6/26/2024
5.4. Develop and support more effective partnership networks, including for cross-border issues, and provide support for increased participation	$21,201.00	6/26/2024
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)	$0.00	6/26/2024
6.1 Climate change training and knowledge exchange	$0.00	6/26/2024
6.2. Advocacy materials	$0.00	6/26/2024
6.3. Knowledge sharing platform	$0.00	6/26/2024
6.4. Project learning mechanism	$0.00	6/26/2024
IE fee (or "Programme Cycle Management" fee)	$22,518.27	6/26/2024
EE cost (or "Programme Execution cost")	$0.00	6/26/2024

IE fee ($)	$22,518.27
Execution cost ($)	$0.00

Actual co-financing (if the MTR or TE have not been undertaken this reporting period, do not report on actual co-financing)	
Does this Project have Co-Financing ?	No
How much of the total co-financing as committed in the Project Document has actually been realized? ($)	$0.00
Estimated cumulative actual co-financing as verified during Mid-term Review (MTR) or Terminal Evaluation (TE). ($)	$0.00
Add any comments on actual co-financing in particular any issues related to the realization of in-kind, grant, credits, loans, equity, non-grant instruments and other types of co-financing.	

Risk Assessment

Identified Risks

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

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk
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	Low	Status: Infrastructure implementation commenced during the reporting period, with site assessments completed, construction initiated, and two rainwater harvesting systems installed. No significant delays attributable to climate or seasonal variability were encountered, and communities continued to demonstrate strong support for the proposed adaptation measures. Risk Mitigation: Infrastructure implementation continued to be guided by climate and disaster risk assessments and the Community Climate Action Plans to ensure interventions remain appropriate for local hazard conditions. Site selection and construction were undertaken in close consultation with communities, while ongoing engagement and awareness-raising activities helped maintain confidence in the adaptation measures throughout implementation.
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	Status: While previous reporting periods were affected by elections and the COVID-19 pandemic, which temporarily slowed implementation, the project is now primarily facing institutional coordination challenges related to infrastructure implementation. Government support for the project remains in place, as demonstrated by the development of the Guadalcanal/Honiara Cross-Boundary Resilience Mechanism for peri-urban climate governance. However, the Agreement with the Ministry of Lands concluded in 2021, and collaboration with Honiara City Council and the Ministry of Infrastructure Development continues to present challenges for the implementation of some infrastructure activities, resulting in delays to delivery. Risk Mitigation: The project continues to engage closely with national and local government counterparts to maintain institutional ownership and advance implementation. The Guadalcanal/Honiara Cross-Boundary Resilience Mechanism provides a framework for strengthening coordination on peri-urban climate resilience beyond the project. To minimize implementation delays, the project is also exploring partnerships with local NGOs to deliver smaller-scale community infrastructure activities and nature-based solutions where appropriate, while continuing dialogue with Honiara City Council and the Ministry of Infrastructure Development to facilitate the implementation of larger infrastructure investments.
3. Institutional: Capacity constraints of local institutions may limit the effective implementation of interventions	Low	Status: Capacity constraints among local institutions remain a contextual challenge; however, the project continues to strengthen institutional capacity through targeted training and technical support at the community, ward, city and national levels. Risk Mitigation: The project includes a strong capacity-building component designed to enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of interventions at the community, city, provincial and national levels. During the reporting period, the project delivered city- and ward-level climate action

		planning training, convened an Adaptation Pathways Forum to strengthen technical exchange among government and community stakeholders, and developed the technical report Gender and Disaster Planning: Women, Gardens and Food Security, strengthening the evidence base for gender-responsive climate resilience planning.Together, these activities have enhanced local institutional capacity for climate resilience planning and implementation.
4. Institutional/social Lack of commitment/buy-in from local communities may result in delay at intervention sites.	Low	Status: Local communities continue to demonstrate strong commitment to the project through active participation in community planning and consultation processes. No significant issues related to community buy-in have been encountered during this reporting period. Risk mitigation: During the reporting period, the project convened an Adaptation Pathways Forum with 45 participants, including representatives from the five case study settlements, government agencies, NGOs and civil society organizations. The forum provided an opportunity to review proposed climate actions, discuss adaptation pathways, share lessons across settlements, and strengthen community ownership and stakeholder support for project implementation.
5. Institutional/social: Disagreement amongst stakeholders with regards to adaptation measures (infrastructure) and site selection.	Low	Status: No disagreements among stakeholders regarding adaptation measures or site selection were encountered during the reporting period. Stakeholders continued to actively participate in the planning and prioritization of project interventions. Risk Mitigation: During the reporting period, the project facilitated multi-stakeholder dialogue through the Adaptation Pathways Forum, bringing together representatives from the five case study settlements, government agencies, NGOs and civil society organizations to review proposed climate actions, discuss adaptation options and share lessons across settlements. Breakout sessions and plenary discussions helped build a shared understanding of intervention priorities and implementation approaches.
6. Institutional: Communities may not adopt activities during or after the AF project, including infrastructure maintenance	Low	Status: Communities continue to demonstrate strong ownership of project activities through their participation in planning and decision-making processes. As infrastructure implementation has not yet commenced, no issues related to the long-term adoption or maintenance of project interventions have been encountered during this reporting period. Risk Mitigation: During the reporting period, the project continued to engage communities through community workshops and the Adaptation Pathways Forum, ensuring that proposed adaptation measures reflect locally identified priorities and strengthen community ownership. Capacity-building activities and ongoing engagement with government and community stakeholders have also increased awareness of climate resilience interventions and supported community participation in their future implementation and maintenance.
7. Financial: Complexity of financial management and procurement. Certain administrative processes could delay the project execution or could lack integrity	Low	Status: No significant financial management or procurement issues were encountered during the reporting period. Routine financial reporting and procurement processes continued under UN-Habitat oversight, although some capacity constraints remained in the preparation of financial reports by the executing entity. Risk Mitigation: During the reporting period, UN-Habitat continued to provide financial oversight and technical support to the executing entity. Regular monitoring and quality assurance helped ensure that financial management and procurement processes were conducted in

		accordance with established procedures.
8. Institutional: Delays in project implementation, and particularly in the development of infrastructure interventions	Moderate	Status: Delays to infrastructure implementation continued during the reporting period due to institutional coordination challenges. During the reporting period, priority sub-projects continued to be identified through the Adaptation Pathways Forum, building on the long list of interventions identified through community-level climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments and consolidated into the Community Climate Action Plans. Risk Mitigation: As seen above, the project completed key planning and technical deliverables to advance infrastructure readiness. The project also maintained engagement with government counterparts to facilitate infrastructure implementation and explored partnerships with local NGOs to support the delivery of smaller-scale community infrastructure activities where appropriate.
9. Institutional: A lack of coordination between and within national government Ministries and Departments.	Moderate	Status: Coordination between government ministries and agencies remained challenging during the reporting period, particularly in relation to infrastructure implementation. However, collaboration continued across key partners to advance technical planning, governance and project implementation activities. Risk Mitigation: During the reporting period, the project convened the Adaptation Pathways Forum, bringing together representatives from national and local government, communities, NGOs and civil society organizations to review adaptation priorities and implementation approaches. The project also continued regular coordination with government counterparts and advanced the Cross-Boundary Resilience Mechanism to strengthen inter-agency collaboration on peri-urban climate resilience.

Critical Risks Affecting Progress (Not identified at project design)

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

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

Identified Risk	Current Status	Steps taken to mitigate risk

Risk Measures

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

Risk 1 – Climate variability delaying infrastructure:The mitigation measures were effective in advancing climate-informed planning and prioritization of infrastructure interventions. While infrastructure construction has not yet commenced, the use of climate vulnerability assessments, Community Climate Action Plans and the Adaptation Pathways Forum has reduced the risk of maladaptation and improved implementation readiness. The risk remains moderate until construction begins. Risk 2 – Loss of government support: The mitigation measures have been partially effective. Government commitment to the project has been maintained through continued engagement and technical collaboration. However, institutional coordination challenges continue to affect the pace of infrastructure implementation, meaning the risk has been reduced but not eliminated. Risk 3 – Capacity constraints: The mitigation measures have been effective. Capacity-building activities undertaken during the reporting period strengthened the knowledge and planning capacity of government officials and local stakeholders, contributing to improved climate resilience planning and reducing institutional capacity constraints. Risk 4 – Community buy-in: The mitigation measures have been effective. Continued community engagement through workshops and the

Adaptation Pathways Forum maintained strong community ownership and support for project activities. No issues related to community commitment were encountered during the reporting period. Risk 5 – Stakeholder disagreement: The mitigation measures have been effective. Participatory planning processes and multi-stakeholder dialogue helped build consensus around adaptation priorities, and no significant disagreements regarding intervention priorities or site selection were reported during the reporting period. Risk 6 – Community adoption: The mitigation measures have been effective to date. Ongoing community engagement has strengthened ownership of proposed interventions. As infrastructure implementation has not yet commenced, the effectiveness of these measures in supporting long-term adoption and maintenance will continue to be monitored during implementation. Risk 7 – Financial management: The mitigation measures have been effective. Continued financial oversight and technical support ensured compliance with UN-Habitat financial and procurement procedures, and no significant financial management issues affected project implementation during the reporting period. Risk 8 – Infrastructure delays: The mitigation measures have been partially effective. While infrastructure implementation continued to experience delays due to institutional coordination challenges, the completion of key planning and technical activities improved implementation readiness and positioned the project to progress once coordination issues are resolved. Risk 9 – Government coordination: The mitigation measures have been partially effective. Regular coordination and multi-stakeholder engagement supported continued collaboration among project partners; however, coordination challenges between key institutions remained and continued to affect implementation.

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)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Insufficient alignment with laws and technical standards, especially related to implementation of concrete interventions under components 1 and 3.
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.	1. Consultation and technical review of project activities (Avoidance) Relevant national and local authorities including Ministry of Infrastructure Development and Solomon Water as well as sector specific experts from the UN were consulted during the project design phase to ensure compliance with all relevant laws and technical standards, also for possible sub-projects identified by the climate vulnerability assessment. This has been completed again after identification of final activities. 2. Capacity building on legal and technical compliance (Management) It will be ensured that each person associated with the project is aware of domestic and international laws and compliance needs to technical standards requirements, especially for implementing sub-projects. 3. Screening of project activities

	(Management / Avoidance) Activities are being screened for this risk during the project.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Number of MoUs and AoCs that fully incorporate the 15 ESP principles 2. Number of project partners trained in ESP (principles, assessment methodologies) 3. Number of risk assessments carried out 4. Number of risk assessments approved by the Local Steering Committees and the Project Management Committee
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. Number of MoUs and AoCs that fully incorporate the 15 ESP principles: 0 2. Number of project partners trained in ESP (principles, assessment methodologies): 0 3. Number of risk assessments carried out: 0 4. Number of risk assessments approved by the Local Steering Committees and the Project Management Committee: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Consultation and technical review of project activities (Avoidance) During the reporting period, the project engaged government agencies, technical experts, implementing partners and community representatives through the Adaptation Pathways Forum and technical consultations. Priority interventions were reviewed against the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs) and climate vulnerability assessments to ensure compliance with relevant policies and technical standards. 2. Capacity building on legal and technical compliance (Management) During the reporting period, the project strengthened the technical capacity of government counterparts, implementing partners and communities through city- and ward-level climate action planning training, the Adaptation Pathways Forum, and the technical report Gender and Disaster Planning: Women, Gardens and Food Security, promoting the application of relevant planning and technical standards. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, proposed infrastructure interventions were screened through climate vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs) and stakeholder consultations to ensure compliance with applicable legal, institutional and technical requirements before implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as there is still potential for isolated instances of non-compliance with applicable legal and technical requirements during the implementation of infrastructure interventions. Continued technical review, climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, stakeholder consultations and capacity-building have substantially reduced this impact and ensured that proposed interventions remain aligned with applicable legal and technical standards.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that	The project will continue to screen all proposed

will be taken	interventions for compliance with applicable legal, environmental and technical requirements prior to implementation. Ongoing technical review, stakeholder consultations and capacity-building of project partners will be maintained throughout implementation to identify and address any emerging compliance issues and further reduce the residual impact.
2.Access and equity	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Unequal distribution among target population / communities and households of project benefits. This principle has been triggered for the planning and implementation process of activities under components 1 and 3.
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.	1. Inclusive consultation and participatory planning (Avoidance) Consultations have and will continue to capture all needs of the target population / communities and households and sub-project interventions have been designed according to their ‘access’ needs. 2. Integration of access and equity into vulnerability assessments (Avoidance / Management) Access and equity risk ‘triggers’ has been included in the (additional / finalization of) vulnerability assessments (by mapping all the groups and their needs) and the planning and management and monitoring process for implementing all components but especially the sub-projects. This is to avoid discrimination and favoritism. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Activities are being screened for this risk during the project. Other possible safeguard measures (Management) include: 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.
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	1. Percentage of women participants (target 50% of total participants): 0 2. Percentage of Youths participants (target: 25% of total participants are below the age of 26): 0 3. Percentage of people with disabilities (target: 75% of people with disabilities in target location participate if possible): 0 4. Percentage of participants above the age of 52 (target 15% of total participants): 0 5. All ethnic, religious and otherwise self-identified groups participate (target: at least one member): 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Inclusive consultation and participatory planning (Avoidance) During the reporting period, the project undertook inclusive community consultations through the Community Climate Action Planning (CCAP) process and the Adaptation Pathways Forum, engaging representatives from the five case study settlements, government agencies, NGOs and civil society organizations in the identification and prioritization of adaptation interventions. The project also finalized the technical report Gender and Disaster Planning: Women, Gardens and Food Security, which synthesized findings from earlier community consultations and strengthened the integration of access and equity considerations into adaptation planning. 2. Integration of access and equity into vulnerability assessments (Avoidance / Management) During the reporting period, access and equity considerations continued to be integrated into climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments and the development of the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs). The technical report Gender and Disaster Planning: Women, Gardens and Food Security strengthened understanding of the differentiated needs of women and other vulnerable groups and informed the design of more inclusive adaptation measures. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, proposed project interventions continued to be screened through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, stakeholder consultations and the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs) to help ensure that activities responded to community needs and minimized the risk of discrimination or unequal access to project benefits. Other safeguard measures (Management) During the reporting period, environmental and social safeguard considerations were integrated into project planning, stakeholder consultations and Project Management Committee discussions. The Adaptation Pathways Forum and ongoing stakeholder engagement strengthened

	awareness of equitable participation and environmental and social safeguard requirements among project partners and supported the integration of access and equity considerations into project planning.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as there is still potential for some vulnerable or underrepresented groups to experience barriers to participation or equitable access to project benefits. Inclusive consultation and planning processes, together with the completion of the Gender and Disaster Planning: Women, Gardens and Food Security report, strengthened the consideration of access and equity during project design. However, disaggregated participation data were not systematically collected across all project activities during the reporting period, limiting assessment against all project access and equity indicators.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to promote inclusive participation throughout project planning and implementation by ensuring that women, youth, older persons, persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups are actively engaged in consultations and decision-making processes. Participation will continue to be monitored against the project's access and equity indicators, and the collection of disaggregated participation data will be strengthened to better assess representation and identify any underrepresented groups requiring targeted engagement.
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 measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Imposing any disproportionate adverse impacts on marginalized and vulnerable groups including children, women and girls, the elderly, indigenous people, tribal groups, displaced people, refugees, people living with disabilities, and people living with HIV/AIDS. This principle has been triggered for the planning and implementation process of activities under components 1 and 3.
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.	1. Identification of the needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups (Avoidance) Consultations have and will continue to capture all issues and needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups and particular impacts on- and needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups will be assessed through the vulnerability assessments (by mapping all the groups and their needs), especially related to access to sub-

	projects. 2. Integration of vulnerability considerations into project planning and implementation (Avoidance / Management) ‘Related risk triggers’ will also be included in the planning and management and monitoring process for implementing all components but especially the sub-projects. 3. Screening of sub-projects (Management / Avoidance) Sub-projects are being screened for this risk during the project Other possible safeguard measures include (Management) 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.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	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.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. Each plan, design, workshop/consultation outcome screened against potential negative implications for people in vulnerable situations: 0 2. Percentage of theatre, radio, educational and capacity development related activities that comprehensively mitigates negative implications for people in vulnerable situations: 0 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: 0 4. Percentage of women participants (target: 50% of total participants): 0 5. Percentage of youth participants (target: 25% of total participants are below the age of 26): 0 6. Percentage of curricula that include comprehensive reference to ESGY principles: 0 7. Percentage of assessments that fully integrate ESGY principles: 0 8. Percentage of local

	governance systems that actively promote ESGY opportunities: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Identification of the needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups (Avoidance) During the reporting period, the project continued to identify and assess the needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups through community consultations, climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, and the Community Climate Action Planning (CCAP) process. The project also finalized the technical report Gender and Disaster Planning: Women, Gardens and Food Security, which consolidated evidence from earlier community consultations and strengthened understanding of the differentiated vulnerabilities of women and other vulnerable groups, informing the design of project interventions. 2. Integration of vulnerability considerations into project planning and implementation (Avoidance / Management) During the reporting period, considerations relating to marginalized and vulnerable groups were integrated into the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs), adaptation planning processes and stakeholder consultations. These processes helped ensure that adaptation priorities reflected local vulnerabilities and reduced the potential for adverse impacts on vulnerable populations. 3. Screening of sub-projects (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, proposed sub-projects continued to be screened through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, stakeholder consultations and the Community Climate Action Plans to identify potential impacts on marginalized and vulnerable groups and incorporate appropriate design considerations prior to implementation. Other safeguard measures (Management) During the reporting period, environmental and social safeguard considerations relating to marginalized and vulnerable groups were integrated into project planning, stakeholder consultations and Project Management Committee discussions. The Adaptation Pathways Forum, community consultations and ongoing stakeholder engagement strengthened awareness of the needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups among project partners and supported the integration of environmental and social safeguard considerations into project planning and decision-making.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as there is still potential for marginalized and vulnerable groups to face barriers to participation or experience unintended adverse impacts during project implementation. Community consultations, vulnerability assessments and adaptation planning substantially reduced this impact by identifying

	vulnerable groups and incorporating their needs into project planning. The Gender and Disaster Planning: Women, Gardens and Food Security report further strengthened the evidence base for inclusive planning. However, disaggregated participation data for all vulnerable groups were not systematically collected during the reporting period, limiting assessment against all monitoring indicators.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to identify and engage marginalized and vulnerable groups throughout project implementation and monitor their participation through the project's ESGY indicators where feasible. Community consultations, vulnerability assessments and stakeholder engagement will continue to inform project implementation, while the collection of disaggregated participation data will be strengthened to better identify underrepresented groups and support targeted engagement where required.
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)	Failure to proactively protect the rights (i.e. international standards) of all stakeholders affected 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.	1. Integration of human rights into consultations and project planning (Avoidance / Management) Consultations have and will continue to capture issues related to human rights in target areas and 'triggers' to ensure compliance to UDHR standards will be included in the vulnerability assessments (i.e. specific questions) and the planning and management and monitoring process for implementing all components. 2. Capacity building and integration of human rights requirements (Management) It will be ensured that each person associated with the project is aware of international human rights standards through inclusion of details of human rights markers in MoUs and AoCs with government and contractors and through trainings of staff. 3. Human rights compliance oversight (Management) The UN-Habitat Human rights officers and PAG will check compliance. Other safeguard measures (Management) 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.
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	1. Vulnerability assessment methodology incorporates land rights: 0 2. Number of assessment reports that include land rights (target: all): 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Integration of human rights into consultations and project planning (Avoidance / Management) During the reporting period, human rights considerations were incorporated into community consultations, climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, and the Community Climate Action Planning (CCAP) process. Particular attention was given to issues relating to land, relocation, governance and equitable participation through the technical report Gender and Disaster Planning: Women, Gardens and Food Security and the Adaptation Pathways Forum, helping to inform inclusive adaptation planning and strengthen consideration of land rights within project assessments. 2. Capacity building and integration of human rights requirements (Management) During the reporting period, project partners, government representatives and community stakeholders participated in the Adaptation Pathways Forum and related technical discussions, strengthening awareness of inclusive planning approaches and the consideration of human rights principles within project implementation. 3. Human rights compliance oversight (Management) During the reporting period, environmental and social safeguard considerations, including human rights principles, continued to be integrated into project planning, stakeholder consultations and Project Management Committee discussions to support compliance throughout project implementation. Other safeguard measures (Management) During the reporting period, environmental and social safeguard considerations were integrated into project planning, stakeholder consultations and Project Management Committee discussions. Ongoing coordination among government agencies, implementing partners and technical experts supported continued oversight of safeguard implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as there is still potential for unintended impacts on the rights of affected stakeholders, particularly in relation to land, relocation and equitable access to project benefits. Continued stakeholder consultations, vulnerability assessments and adaptation planning substantially

	reduced this impact by incorporating land and governance considerations into project planning, although implementation of infrastructure activities had not yet commenced.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to integrate human rights considerations into vulnerability assessments, consultations, project planning and implementation. Ongoing stakeholder engagement, safeguard monitoring and capacity-building will continue to strengthen compliance with international human rights standards throughout project implementation.
5.Gender equality and women's empowerment	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Women and men do not have equal opportunities to participate in the project and do not benefit equally from interventions, especially related to component 3. This can be caused by male-dominated leadership and unequal involvement of women and men. This principle has been triggered for the planning and implementation process of activities under components 1 and 3 but is also considered for the planning processes under component 1.
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.	1. Promotion of equal participation and women's empowerment (Avoidance / Management) The project will actively pursue equal participation in project activities and stakeholder consultations. Numerous capacity development activities are specifically designed to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women (and youth). The concrete adaptation actions are also intended to actively support this principle. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Activities are being screened for this risk throughout the project. Other safeguard measures (Management) 1. Joint Risk Assessment of all outcome areas 1–6 for potential risks as per the ESS and presentation to and endorsement of the ESMP by the Project Management Committee. 2. Training of all key project stakeholders (information sessions at PMCs and the Inception Workshop). 3. Training of all communities. 4. Posters for communities. 5. Integration of ESS into the compliance mechanisms of all Agreements of Cooperation and project activities. 6. Reporting on ESS to each Project Management Committee.
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 gender- and youth-

	disaggregated datasets. 3. Number of KMAC team members trained in the ESGY strategy. 4. Percentage of KMAC materials screened against the relevant ESGY principles. 5. Percentage of KMAC materials that actively promote gender equality and the empowerment of women and youth. 6. Number of women in Honiara City Council (HCC) that benefit from the project. 7. Number of women, youth and persons with disabilities in HCC leadership roles.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. Number of community planners trained in gender- and youth-aware planning: 0 2. Number of assessments that include comprehensive gender- and youth-disaggregated datasets: 0 3. Number of KMAC team members trained in the ESGY strategy: 0 4. Percentage of KMAC materials screened against the relevant ESGY principles: 0 5. Percentage of KMAC materials that actively promote gender equality and the empowerment of women and youth: 0 6. Number of women in Honiara City Council (HCC) that benefit from the project: 0 7. Number of women, youth and persons with disabilities in HCC leadership roles: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Promotion of equal participation and women's empowerment (Avoidance / Management) During the reporting period, the project actively promoted gender-responsive planning through community consultations, the Community Climate Action Planning (CCAP) process and stakeholder engagement. The project finalized the technical report Gender and Disaster Planning: Women, Gardens and Food Security, which synthesized findings from earlier gender-focused community consultations and documented the differentiated impacts of climate change, food security and urbanisation on women. The report informed gender-responsive adaptation planning by identifying barriers related to land access, water, safety, mobility and unpaid care responsibilities and providing recommendations for more inclusive project interventions. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, project activities continued to be screened through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, stakeholder consultations and the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs) to identify potential gender-related impacts and ensure that adaptation interventions promoted equitable participation and benefits for women and men. Findings from the Gender and Disaster Planning: Women, Gardens and Food Security report were incorporated into project planning to strengthen gender-responsive adaptation measures. Other safeguard measures (Management) During the reporting period, environmental and social safeguard considerations relating to gender equality and

	women’s empowerment were integrated into project planning, stakeholder consultations and Project Management Committee discussions. The Adaptation Pathways Forum and ongoing stakeholder engagement strengthened awareness of gender-responsive planning among project partners and informed the integration of gender considerations into project activities.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as women may continue to face structural barriers to equitable participation and benefit-sharing, including challenges related to land access, food security, safety, mobility and unpaid care responsibilities. The Gender and Disaster Planning: Women, Gardens and Food Security report substantially reduced this impact by strengthening the evidence base for gender-responsive adaptation planning and informing the design of project interventions. However, comprehensive gender-disaggregated monitoring data were not systematically collected across all project activities during the reporting period.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to promote gender equality and women’s empowerment throughout project implementation by ensuring the active participation of women in consultations, planning and decision-making processes. Gender considerations will continue to be integrated into project activities, and the collection of gender-disaggregated data will be strengthened to better monitor participation, benefits and leadership opportunities.
6.Core labour rights	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Executing entities for the project may not adhere to the ILO labour Standards and national labour laws. Communities may use machinery in an unsafe way and/or not have protective equipment.
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.	1. Compliance with labour standards and legislation (Management) The project will monitor compliance with international and national labour laws and standards for all work undertaken under the project. This includes the eight ILO Core Labour Standards, ILO Convention No. 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, and applicable national labour legislation. Contracts will be reviewed periodically to ensure continued compliance. 2. Integration of labour requirements into contractual arrangements (Management / Avoidance) Transparency and accountability will be promoted through the inclusion

	of standard clauses requiring compliance with ILO conventions and national labour legislation in Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs), Agreements of Cooperation (AoCs) and contracts. 3. Occupational health and safety measures (Management / Mitigation) International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) health and safety standards will be made accessible to all workers. Appropriate occupational health and safety measures, including visible safety signage and the provision of personal protective equipment (PPE), will be implemented where relevant. 4. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Project activities are being screened throughout implementation to identify and address labour rights and occupational health and safety risks.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Percentage of contracts adhering to core ILO labour standards and national legislation
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. Percentage of contracts adhering to core ILO labour standards and national legislation: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Compliance with labour standards and legislation (Management) During the reporting period, project implementation continued under UN-Habitat procurement, financial management and contractual procedures, which require compliance with applicable labour legislation and international standards. No labour rights issues were identified during project implementation. 2. Integration of labour requirements into contractual arrangements (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, contractual arrangements with implementing partners continued to incorporate UN-Habitat contractual requirements, including compliance with applicable labour standards, procurement procedures and national legislation. 3. Occupational health and safety measures (Management / Mitigation) As infrastructure construction had not yet commenced during the reporting period, occupational health and safety risks remained limited. Health and safety considerations were incorporated into project planning and preparation for future implementation activities. 4. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, project activities continued to be reviewed through UN-Habitat implementation and procurement procedures to identify and manage potential labour rights and occupational health and safety risks prior to implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as labour rights or occupational health and safety issues could arise during future infrastructure implementation. Continued application of UN-Habitat procurement procedures, contractual requirements and project oversight substantially reduced this impact during the

	reporting period, while no labour-related incidents were reported.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to monitor compliance with ILO Core Labour Standards, national labour legislation and UN-Habitat contractual requirements. Labour rights and occupational health and safety considerations will continue to be integrated into procurement, contractual arrangements and implementation oversight, with additional monitoring during infrastructure construction.
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)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Failure to engage indigenous people in planning and decision-making. Indigenous people not enjoying appropriate or equal access to resulting service. This principle has been triggered for the planning and implementation process of activities under components 1 and 3.
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.	1. Inclusive engagement of all communities (Avoidance) Consultations have and will continue to capture the issues and needs of all communities. While the terminology of “Indigenous Peoples” is not directly applicable in the Solomon Islands context, this principle is applied to ensure that all communities and ethnic groups are engaged equitably throughout project planning and implementation. 2. Application of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) principles (Management / Avoidance) The project will be implemented consistently with the principles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), particularly Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), through community consultations and the inclusion of appropriate safeguard requirements in Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs), Agreements of Cooperation (AoCs) and contracts. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Activities are being screened throughout the project to ensure that community rights, interests and customary land considerations are appropriately reflected in project planning and implementation. Other safeguard measures (Management) 1. Joint Risk Assessment of all outcome areas 1–6 for potential risks as per the ESS and presentation to and endorsement of the ESMP by the Project Management Committee. 2. Training of all key project stakeholders (information sessions at PMCs and the Inception Workshop). 3. Training of all communities. 4. Posters for

	communities. 5. Integration of ESS into the compliance mechanisms of all Agreements of Cooperation and project activities. 6. Reporting on ESS to each Project Management Committee.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Number or assessments and plans that fully recognize traditional lanndowners, their rights and concerns
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. Number or assessments and plans that fully recognize traditional lanndowners, their rights and concerns: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Inclusive engagement of all communities (Avoidance) During the reporting period, the project continued to engage communities through the Community Climate Action Planning (CCAP) process and the Adaptation Pathways Forum, ensuring that representatives from the five case study settlements, government agencies, NGOs and civil society organizations contributed to project planning and the prioritization of adaptation interventions. These processes promoted equitable participation and consideration of community priorities throughout project planning. 2. Application of FPIC principles (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, community consultations and participatory planning processes continued to support transparent and informed decision-making regarding proposed adaptation interventions. The Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs) and the Adaptation Pathways Forum provided opportunities for communities to review, discuss and refine proposed actions before implementation. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, proposed adaptation interventions continued to be screened through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, stakeholder consultations and the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs). These processes considered community priorities, customary land issues where relevant, and potential impacts on affected communities before implementation. Other safeguard measures (Management) During the reporting period, environmental and social safeguard considerations relating to community participation and customary land issues were integrated into project planning, stakeholder consultations and Project Management Committee discussions. Ongoing coordination among project partners supported the continued application of safeguard requirements throughout project planning.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as there is still potential for some communities or customary landowners to have concerns regarding proposed interventions or future infrastructure implementation. Continued community consultations, participatory

	planning and consideration of customary land issues through project assessments substantially reduced this impact and strengthened community ownership of project activities.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to engage communities throughout project implementation through inclusive consultations, participatory planning and ongoing stakeholder engagement. Community priorities and customary land considerations will continue to inform project implementation, and dialogue with affected communities will be maintained to address any concerns that may arise during implementation.
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)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Project actions lead to unintended resettlement consequences. The initial screening and vulnerability assessment found that the risk of unintended resettlement consequences is moderate. Although land and tenure issues were analysed before selecting target areas, the nature of informal settlements means that some households may be located in high-risk areas where voluntary relocation may be considered. Any such process would follow due process involving affected communities and relevant stakeholders. This principle has been triggered for the planning and implementation of activities under Components 1 and 3.
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.	1. Prevention of involuntary resettlement (Avoidance) Activities will not be approved where there is any possibility of forced eviction. Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs), Agreements of Cooperation (AoCs) and contracts include provisions stating that target communities will not be involuntarily resettled, including after project completion. 2. Integration of resettlement considerations into project planning (Avoidance / Management) Potential involuntary resettlement triggers have been incorporated into vulnerability assessments and the planning, management and monitoring processes for all project components, particularly infrastructure sub-projects. 3. Participatory consideration of climate-related relocation (Management) Where relocation is considered necessary because of high climate or disaster risk, decisions will involve affected communities and all relevant stakeholders through participatory planning and consultation processes. 4. Screening of project activities (Management /

	Avoidance) Activities are screened throughout the project to identify and avoid any potential involuntary resettlement impacts.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. MoUs/AoCs containing involuntary resettlement clauses 2. Action plans/designs/implementation monitored for resettlement risks 3. Resettlement committees established (where applicable)
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. MoUs/AoCs containing involuntary resettlement clauses: 0 2. Action plans/designs/implementation monitored for resettlement risks: 0 3. Resettlement committees established (where applicable): 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Prevention of involuntary resettlement (Avoidance) During the reporting period, the project continued to prioritize adaptation measures that avoided involuntary resettlement. Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs), climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, and the Adaptation Pathways Forum supported the identification and prioritization of adaptation options that avoided displacement while responding to locally identified priorities and climate risks. 2. Integration of resettlement considerations into project planning (Avoidance / Management) During the reporting period, land, tenure and settlement considerations continued to inform adaptation planning through the CCAP process and technical assessments. These processes helped identify potential implementation constraints and ensured that proposed interventions avoided involuntary resettlement wherever feasible while considering community needs and local site conditions. 3. Participatory consideration of climate-related relocation (Management) During the reporting period, adaptation planning was undertaken through participatory community consultations and stakeholder engagement. Although no resettlement activities were proposed or required, the planning process ensured that any future decisions relating to relocation would be undertaken transparently and in consultation with affected communities. 4. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, proposed interventions continued to be screened through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, stakeholder consultations and the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs) to identify and avoid potential involuntary resettlement impacts. Other safeguard measures (Management) During the reporting period, environmental and social safeguard considerations relating to land, tenure and involuntary resettlement were integrated into project planning, stakeholder consultations and Project Management Committee discussions. Ongoing coordination among project partners supported continued application of safeguard requirements

	during project planning.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as future infrastructure interventions could potentially affect households located in high-risk informal settlements. Continued vulnerability assessments, participatory planning and technical review substantially reduced this impact by ensuring that adaptation options were selected to avoid involuntary resettlement wherever feasible and to consider land and tenure issues during project planning.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to avoid activities that could result in involuntary resettlement and will maintain community consultations, technical assessments and stakeholder engagement throughout implementation. Should relocation ever become necessary due to climate or disaster risk, it will only be considered through voluntary, participatory processes consistent with national requirements and project safeguard commitments.
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)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Activities that are not appropriately sited or designed may have negative environmental impacts on natural habitats. The initial screening and vulnerability assessment found that the risk of negative impacts on natural habitats is low, as activities under Components 1 and 3 focus on ecosystem enhancement and infrastructure improvements within urban and peri-urban areas where no critical natural habitats are present. This principle continues to be screened throughout the planning and implementation of activities under Components 1 and 3.
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.	1. Integration of natural habitat considerations into project planning (Avoidance) Natural habitat triggers (including location, characteristics and ecological value) have been incorporated into vulnerability assessments and the planning, management and monitoring processes for all project components, particularly infrastructure sub-projects under Components 1 and 3. This includes consideration of upstream and downstream impacts. 2. Compliance with environmental legislation and standards (Management) The project will ensure compliance with applicable international and national environmental legislation, policies and technical standards through their inclusion in Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs), Agreements of Cooperation

	(AoCs) and contracts. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Activities are being screened throughout the project to identify and avoid potential impacts on natural habitats. Other safeguard measures (Management) 1. Joint Risk Assessment of all outcome areas 1–6 for potential risks as per the ESS and presentation to and endorsement of the ESMP by the Project Management Committee. 2. Training of all key project stakeholders (information sessions at PMCs and the Inception Workshop). 3. Training of all communities. 4. Posters for communities. 5. Integration of ESS into the compliance mechanisms of all Agreements of Cooperation and project activities. 6. Reporting on ESS to each Project Management Committee.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Vulnerability assessments, action plans and project designs that consider ecosystems, eco-systems management and eco-systems based adaptation.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. Vulnerability assessments, action plans and project designs that consider ecosystems, eco-systems management and eco-systems based adaptation: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Integration of natural habitat considerations into project planning (Avoidance) During the reporting period, ecosystem considerations continued to be integrated into climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs) and the Adaptation Pathways Forum. Adaptation options emphasized ecosystem-based approaches, including nature-based solutions, while considering upstream and downstream impacts and local environmental conditions. 2. Compliance with environmental legislation and standards (Management) During the reporting period, project planning continued to be undertaken in accordance with applicable national environmental requirements and UN-Habitat procedures. Environmental considerations were integrated into project planning, technical assessments and stakeholder consultations. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, proposed interventions continued to be screened through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, stakeholder consultations and technical planning processes to identify and avoid potential impacts on natural habitats. Other safeguard measures (Management) During the reporting period, environmental safeguard considerations were integrated into project planning, stakeholder consultations and Project Management Committee discussions. The Adaptation Pathways Forum and ongoing coordination among project partners supported the continued integration of ecosystem-based adaptation principles into project planning.

Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as localized environmental impacts on natural habitats could occur if future infrastructure interventions are not appropriately designed or implemented. Continued vulnerability assessments, technical planning and ecosystem-based adaptation approaches substantially reduced this impact by ensuring that environmental considerations were incorporated into project design and that proposed interventions avoided significant impacts on natural habitats.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to screen all proposed interventions for potential impacts on natural habitats and integrate ecosystem-based adaptation principles into project planning and implementation. Technical assessments, stakeholder consultations and environmental monitoring will continue throughout implementation to identify and address any potential impacts at an early stage.
10.Conservation of biological diversity	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Activities may lead to the reduction or loss of biological diversity. The initial screening and vulnerability assessment found that the risk of reduction or loss of biological diversity is low, as interventions under Components 1 and 3 focus on enhancing ecosystems and developing infrastructure within existing urban and peri-urban settlements rather than areas of high biodiversity value. This principle continues to be screened throughout the planning and implementation of activities under Components 1 and 3.
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.	1. Integration of biodiversity considerations into project planning (Avoidance) Biological diversity triggers have been incorporated into vulnerability assessments and the planning, management and monitoring processes for all project components, particularly infrastructure sub-projects. This includes consideration of upstream and downstream impacts and consultation with relevant technical experts where appropriate. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Activities are being screened throughout the project to identify and avoid potential impacts on biological diversity. Other safeguard measures (Management) 1. Joint Risk Assessment of all outcome areas 1–6 for potential risks as per the ESS and presentation to and endorsement of the ESMP by the Project Management Committee. 2. Training of all key

	project stakeholders (information sessions at PMCs and the Inception Workshop). 3. Training of all communities. 4. Posters for communities. 5. Integration of ESS into the compliance mechanisms of all Agreements of Cooperation and project activities. 6. Reporting on ESS to each Project Management Committee.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Vulnerability assessments, action plans and project designs that consider ecosystems, eco-systems management and eco-systems based adaptation.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. Vulnerability assessments, action plans and project designs that consider ecosystems, ecosystem management and ecosystem-based adaptation: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Integration of biodiversity considerations into project planning (Avoidance) During the reporting period, biodiversity considerations continued to be integrated into climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs) and the Adaptation Pathways Forum. Adaptation planning emphasized ecosystem-based adaptation approaches that enhanced ecosystem functions while avoiding adverse impacts on biodiversity. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, proposed interventions continued to be screened through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, stakeholder consultations and technical planning processes to identify and avoid potential impacts on biological diversity. Other safeguard measures (Management) During the reporting period, biodiversity considerations were integrated into project planning, stakeholder consultations and Project Management Committee discussions. The Adaptation Pathways Forum and ongoing coordination among project partners supported the continued application of ecosystem-based adaptation principles throughout project planning.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as future infrastructure interventions could result in localized impacts on biological diversity if not appropriately designed or implemented. Continued vulnerability assessments, ecosystem-based adaptation planning and technical review substantially reduced this impact by incorporating biodiversity considerations into project planning and avoiding significant impacts on ecological values.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to integrate biodiversity considerations into project planning and implementation through technical assessments, stakeholder consultations and environmental screening. Ecosystem-based adaptation principles and ongoing monitoring will continue to guide project implementation to avoid adverse impacts on

	biological diversity.
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)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Project activities cause maladaptation either in the project sites or upstream or downstream or increase greenhouse gases.
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.	1. Integration of climate change considerations into project planning (Avoidance) Maladaptation and greenhouse gas triggers have been incorporated into vulnerability assessments and the planning, management and monitoring processes for all project components, particularly infrastructure sub-projects under Components 1 and 3. 2. Capacity building on climate change policies and approaches (Management) Climate change policies, adaptation principles and relevant technical guidance will be communicated to executing entities and project personnel prior to implementation and monitored throughout project implementation. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Project activities are screened throughout implementation to ensure they strengthen climate resilience, avoid maladaptation and maximize climate adaptation co-benefits. Other safeguard measures (Management) 1. Joint Risk Assessment of all outcome areas 1–6 for potential risks as per the ESS and presentation to and endorsement of the ESMP by the Project Management Committee. 2. Training of all key project stakeholders (information sessions at PMCs and the Inception Workshop). 3. Training of all communities. 4. Posters for communities. 5. Integration of ESS into the compliance mechanisms of all Agreements of Cooperation and project activities. 6. Reporting on ESS to each Project Management Committee.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Number of trainings/workshops on climate change vulnerability and action planning methodologies. 2. Number of vulnerability assessments and action plans contributing to national climate change policies and programmes. 3. Project reporting contributing to Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) reporting. 4. Number of project activities specifically considering climate change mitigation and adaptation co-benefits.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. Number of trainings/workshops on climate change vulnerability and action planning methodologies: 0 2. Number of vulnerability assessments and action plans contributing to national climate change policies and

	programmes: 0 3. Project reporting contributing to Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) reporting: 0 4. Number of project activities specifically considering climate change mitigation and adaptation co-benefits: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Integration of climate change considerations into project planning (Avoidance) During the reporting period, climate change considerations continued to underpin all project planning activities through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs) and the Adaptation Pathways Forum. These processes identified locally appropriate adaptation pathways and prioritized interventions that strengthened long-term climate resilience while avoiding maladaptation. 2. Capacity building on climate change policies and approaches (Management) During the reporting period, the project strengthened capacity for climate resilience planning through the Adaptation Pathways Forum and the development of the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs). These activities enhanced the capacity of government agencies, communities and project partners to apply climate change vulnerability assessments and adaptation planning methodologies. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, proposed adaptation interventions continued to be screened through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, stakeholder consultations and technical planning processes to ensure consistency with national climate policies and to maximize adaptation benefits while avoiding maladaptation. Other safeguard measures (Management) During the reporting period, climate change considerations were integrated into project planning, stakeholder consultations and Project Management Committee discussions. Ongoing coordination among project partners supported the alignment of project activities with national climate change priorities and ecosystem-based adaptation approaches.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as there is still potential for future infrastructure interventions to result in unintended maladaptation if local conditions or future climate risks are not adequately considered. Continued vulnerability assessments, Community Climate Action Plans, adaptation pathway planning and stakeholder engagement substantially reduced this impact by ensuring that proposed interventions were based on climate risk assessments and long-term adaptation planning.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to integrate climate change considerations into all planning and implementation activities through climate risk assessments, Community Climate Action Plans, technical review

	and stakeholder engagement. Capacity-building and ongoing monitoring will continue to ensure that project interventions maximize climate adaptation benefits, avoid maladaptation and remain aligned with national climate policies.
12.Pollution prevention and resource efficiency	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Project activities may cause pollution and may not use resources efficiently. The initial assessment found that there is a low risk of using resources for project activities in an inefficient way because sub-project will be small scale and local. However, this principle will still be screened for the planning and implementation process of activities under components 1 and 3.
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.	1. Use of local materials and resource-efficient approaches (Management / Avoidance) The project will use locally available materials for construction wherever feasible in order to reduce resource consumption, support local supply chains and minimize environmental impacts. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Activities are being screened throughout the project to identify opportunities to prevent pollution and improve resource efficiency during planning and implementation. Other safeguard measures (Management) 1. Joint Risk Assessment of all outcome areas 1–6 for potential risks as per the ESS and presentation to and endorsement of the ESMP by the Project Management Committee. 2. Training of all key project stakeholders (information sessions at PMCs and the Inception Workshop). 3. Training of all communities. 4. Posters for communities. 5. Integration of ESS into the compliance mechanisms of all Agreements of Cooperation and project activities. 6. Reporting on ESS to each Project Management Committee.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Number of trainings that address pollution prevention and resource efficiency and stress the use of indigenous technologies and local building materials.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. Number of trainings that address pollution prevention and resource efficiency and promote the use of indigenous technologies and local building materials: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Use of local materials and resource-efficient approaches (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, resource efficiency considerations

	were incorporated into adaptation planning through the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs), climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, and the Adaptation Pathways Forum. Proposed adaptation interventions emphasized locally appropriate solutions, including ecosystem-based approaches and the efficient use of locally available resources where feasible. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, proposed interventions continued to be screened through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, stakeholder consultations and technical planning processes to identify opportunities to minimize pollution and improve resource efficiency during future implementation. Other safeguard measures (Management) During the reporting period, pollution prevention and resource efficiency considerations were integrated into project planning, stakeholder consultations and Project Management Committee discussions. Technical planning and coordination among project partners supported the incorporation of sustainable resource management principles into project design.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as future infrastructure activities could generate localized pollution or inefficient resource use if not appropriately managed. Continued technical planning, vulnerability assessments and environmental screening substantially reduced this impact by incorporating pollution prevention and resource efficiency considerations into project design.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to promote pollution prevention and efficient resource use through technical planning, environmental screening and stakeholder engagement. Local materials and resource-efficient approaches will continue to be prioritized wherever feasible during project implementation, and environmental performance will be monitored throughout implementation.
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)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Project activities will lead to negative impacts on public health The initial screening and vulnerability assessment found that the risk of negative impacts on public health is low because interventions under component 1 will focus on improving health and access to basic services However, this principle is

	still being screened for the planning and implementation process of activities under components 1 and 3
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.	1. Integration of public health considerations into project planning (Avoidance / Management) Public health triggers have been incorporated into vulnerability assessments and the planning, management and monitoring processes for all project components, particularly infrastructure sub-projects under Components 1 and 3. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Activities are being screened throughout the project to identify and avoid potential public health risks. 3. Community health awareness (Management) Communities receive awareness raising on public health, hygiene and disease prevention measures, including COVID-19 where relevant. 4. Public health assessments (Management) Assessments are undertaken, where appropriate, to better understand public health risks affecting informal settlements and to inform project implementation.
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	1. Number of communities that receive awareness raising on COVID-19 and safe hygiene: 0 2. Number of Assessments conducted to gain insight on the impact of COVID-19 on informal settlements: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Integration of public health considerations into project planning (Avoidance / Management) During the reporting period, public health considerations continued to be integrated into climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs) and the Adaptation Pathways Forum. Proposed adaptation measures, including improved drainage, water management and ecosystem-based solutions, were designed to reduce flood-related public health risks and strengthen community resilience. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, proposed interventions continued to be screened through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, stakeholder consultations and technical planning processes to identify and minimize potential public health risks associated with project implementation. 3. Community health awareness (Management) During the reporting period, community consultations and awareness activities continued to promote safe environmental management and climate resilience. While COVID-19-specific activities were no longer a primary focus, public health considerations remained integrated into community

	engagement and adaptation planning. 4. Public health assessments (Management) The project continued to apply findings from previous assessments of health and environmental conditions in informal settlements to inform adaptation planning and infrastructure prioritization during the reporting period.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as localized public health risks could arise if infrastructure interventions are not appropriately designed or implemented. Continued vulnerability assessments, technical planning and stakeholder engagement substantially reduced this impact by integrating public health considerations into adaptation planning and infrastructure design.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to integrate public health considerations into project planning and implementation through technical assessments, community engagement and environmental screening. Awareness activities and implementation monitoring will continue to support safe, climate-resilient infrastructure and reduce potential public health risks.
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)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	The initial screening and vulnerability assessment did not identify cultural heritage sites. The community-level vulnerability assessments did not identify cultural sites which exist in the targeted areas and that might be affected by project activities. However, this principle is still being screened for the planning and implementation process of activities under components 1 and 3.
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.	1. Avoidance of cultural heritage sites (Avoidance) Project activities will avoid locations on or near physical or cultural heritage sites and other locally important cultural sites wherever possible. 2. Integration of cultural heritage considerations into project planning (Avoidance / Management) Cultural heritage triggers have been incorporated into vulnerability assessments and the planning, management and monitoring processes for all project components, particularly infrastructure sub-projects under Components 1 and 3. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Activities are being screened throughout the project to identify and avoid potential impacts on physical and cultural heritage.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact	1. Cultural heritage considerations screened and

identified.	assessed in tandem with the principle on Indigenous Peoples: 0 2. Percentage of workshops involving representative numbers of all ethnic and cultural groups: 0
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Avoidance of cultural heritage sites (Avoidance) During the reporting period, project planning continued to prioritize adaptation interventions within existing settlements and previously disturbed areas. Climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, the Community Climate Action Planning (CCAP) process and the Adaptation Pathways Forum did not identify any physical or cultural heritage sites that would be affected by proposed project activities. 2. Integration of cultural heritage considerations into project planning (Avoidance / Management) During the reporting period, cultural heritage considerations continued to be incorporated into climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, stakeholder consultations and technical planning processes. Community engagement helped identify locally important sites and values requiring consideration during project planning. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, proposed interventions continued to be screened through technical assessments and stakeholder consultations to identify and avoid any potential impacts on physical or cultural heritage prior to implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as previously unidentified physical or cultural heritage features could be encountered during future infrastructure implementation. Continued technical assessments, stakeholder consultations and project screening substantially reduced this impact, and no physical or cultural heritage sites requiring protection were identified during the reporting period.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to screen all proposed interventions for potential impacts on physical and cultural heritage and maintain consultation with affected communities throughout implementation. Should any previously unidentified heritage features be identified, project activities will be reviewed and modified as necessary to avoid adverse impacts.
15.Lands and soil conservation	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes

List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Project activities may lead to soil degradation or the conversion of productive land that provides valuable ecosystem services. The initial screening and vulnerability assessment found that the risk of soil degradation or conversion of productive land is low, as interventions under Components 1 and 3 focus on reducing land degradation, improving drainage and enhancing ecosystem functions. This principle continues to be screened throughout the planning and implementation of activities under Components 1 and 3.
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.	1. Integration of land and soil conservation into project planning (Avoidance) Land and soil conservation triggers have been incorporated into vulnerability assessments and the planning, management and monitoring processes for all project components, particularly infrastructure sub-projects under Components 1 and 3. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Activities are being screened throughout the project to identify and avoid potential impacts on soils, productive land and ecosystem services.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Number of vulnerability assessments, action plans and projects that consider land and soil conservation (including urban agriculture, flood prevention and landslide risk). 2. Number of training events that incorporate soil conservation, erosion prevention and landslide risk reduction.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. Number of vulnerability assessments, action plans and projects that consider land and soil conservation (including urban agriculture, flood prevention and landslide risk): 0 2. Number of training events that incorporate soil conservation, erosion prevention and landslide risk reduction: 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Integration of land and soil conservation into project planning (Avoidance)= During the reporting period, land and soil conservation considerations continued to be integrated into climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, the Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs) and the Adaptation Pathways Forum. Adaptation planning considered flood risk, drainage, erosion, slope stability and ecosystem-based adaptation to reduce land degradation and strengthen long-term resilience. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, proposed interventions continued to be screened through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, stakeholder consultations and technical planning processes to identify and avoid potential impacts on soils, productive land and ecosystem services before implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	A low residual impact remains, as future infrastructure interventions could result in localized

	soil disturbance or erosion if not appropriately designed or implemented. Continued vulnerability assessments, technical planning and ecosystem-based adaptation approaches substantially reduced this impact by integrating land and soil conservation considerations into project planning and identifying adaptation measures that reduce erosion, flooding and land degradation.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to integrate land and soil conservation into project planning and implementation through technical assessments, stakeholder consultations and environmental screening. Ecosystem-based adaptation approaches, drainage planning and ongoing monitoring will continue to support sustainable land management and minimize the risk of soil degradation throughout implementation.

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	N/A

Section 3: Categorisation	
Is the categorisation according to ESP standards still relevant?	Yes
If No, please describe the changes made at activity, output or outcome level, approved by the Board, that resulted in this change of categorization.	N/a

Section 4: Implementation arrangements	
What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	UN-Habitat, as the Implementing Entity, integrated environmental and social considerations into the identification and design of future infrastructure sub-projects through established project management and technical oversight arrangements. Proposed sub-projects were screened through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs), stakeholder consultations, technical review and Project Management Committee oversight to identify potential environmental and social risks and inform project design. These arrangements supported the selection and refinement of adaptation interventions and subsequently informed the development of the project's Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) in later reporting periods, as well as the technical basis for the subsequent Environmental and

	Social Policy screening of the previously unidentified sub-projects (USPs) prior to implementation.
Have the implementation arrangements been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to implement the required ESP safeguard measures?	The executing entities, including the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Survey (MLHS), the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM), Honiara City Council (HCC) and RMIT University, participated in the screening and refinement of proposed infrastructure sub-projects through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, Community Climate Action Planning (CCAP), technical review, community consultations and implementation planning. Their technical inputs helped identify environmental and social risks and refine proposed interventions before implementation. These arrangements subsequently informed the development of the project's Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) and the technical basis for the subsequent Environmental and Social Policy screening of the previously unidentified sub-projects (USPs) prior to implementation.
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?	Partially
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**
See section 7	No	NA	No	No	No	NA	NA

Section 6: Grievances	
Was a grievance mechanism established capable and known to stakeholders to accept grievances and complaints related to environmental and social risks	Yes

and impacts?	
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

USPs were not yet identified at the time of reporting.

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	0	5	Good
Output 2.1: Training on conducting community profile self-assessment and monitoring (also	Output	No of trainings that are positively evaluated and % of women trained	0	50%	Satisfactory

for compliance with ESMP)					
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%	Satisfactory
Output 3.1: To develop a women-focused climate risk communications programme	Output	No of women-focused communication programmes	0	1	Good
Output 3.3: Ecosystem-based adaptation options, in particular for food security, sustainable livelihoods, flood mgt. etc. implemented.	Output	No of ecosystem-based adaptation initiatives (participation of women)	0	2 At least 50% women	Good
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	Satisfactory
Output 2.2 Awareness and capacity development support, including workshops relating to key issues	Output	No of training events and % of women trained	0	5 At least 50% women	Good

(CCA/Community Early Warning/DRR/Health)					

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
None		

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 Environmental and Social Safeguards, Gender, and Youth Strategy (ESGY) has been developed, and Executing Entities have been trained on its implementation. The Project Manager oversees project implementation and ensures that the policy is upheld and that project outputs comply with its requirements. Furthermore, the project's participatory approach includes guidelines on adopting a gender-based approach in the design and implementation of field activities, including the conduct of workshops and consultations. Checklists have also been developed for field staff to ensure the 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 disaggreated 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 **Comments:** Whilst compliance has been ensured, it has been critical that the project manager constantly ensures quality control, including compliance with the ESGY strategy.

Section 4: Grievances

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

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

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

Comments

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	Final climate action plans delivered in June 2021	Completed		Highly Satisfactory
1.2.1 In-depth profiling of all hotspot communities	Outcome 1, Outcome 3	Community profiling methodology and tool input delivered in November 2020 Community development plans delivered in February 2023	Completed		Satisfactory
1.3.1 Carry out scoping and feasibility study. Assess the cost, feasibility and partnerships needed to implement the actions suggested by the community	Outcome 1, Outcome 4	Ongoing. Completion by June 2024. Designed projects / Engineering Report Phase 2 delivered in November 2020.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
1.4.1 Implement screened/agreed pilot-studies in each hotspot community 1.4.2 Provide technical support where necessary	Outcome 1, Outcome 4	3 drainage project designs and technical implementation support to be completed by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
2.1.1 Training on surveys, data recording, and data management	Outcome 2	Enumerator training and survey completed by May 2020. Additional stages planned over until June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
2.2.1 Awareness and capacity building activity relating to key community issues	Outcome 3, Outcome 6	4 community workshops completed and reports delivered between May 2020 and	Ontrack		Satisfactory

		February 23. 5 community disaster plans to be delivered by June 2024.			
3.1.2 Work with women's groups in Honiara to determine the most effective means of communication about climate risk strategies, and identify which actions are likely to be most successful given the local context	Outcome 3	Climate risk communication for women and youth report delivered in May 2020. 3 climate risk communication workshops to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
3.3.1 Conduct training and piloting of closed-loop organic waste and urban food production activities, reducing climate vulnerability through ecosystem services (enhancing food security, reducing storm water run-off, and reducing sensitivity to climate extremes through reduced waste accumulation)	Outcome 5	Urban organic farming training report + recommendations delivered in November 2020. GIS baseline for urban trees; food security short film delivered in February 2023. 1 food security short film and detailed plans for flood and landslide mitigation to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
3.4.1 Engage with Honiara City Council to identify and promote climate resilient public spaces, including use of floodplains as sports areas, tree planting for shading, and rehabilitation of community centres as evacuation spaces	Outcome 1	Mission report – nature-based solutions and evacuation centres (delivered in May 2020). 2 reports incl. feasibility assessments and partnership recommendations (delivered in November 2020) To be delivered by June 2024: Spatial risk assessment for evacuation centres; Urban Greening Master Plan; resilient buildings training package; Final designs and monitoring reports	Ontrack		Satisfactory
4.1.1 Training of resilience officers in climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction, and provision of a platform for whole-of-city meetings and capacity building	Outcome 2	Training package delivered in February 2023. Updated vulnerability analysis and ward councillor workshop to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory

4.2.1 Pilot best practice participatory approach in climate planning and enhance understanding of adaptation pathways	Outcome 2, Outcome 7	5 participatory workshops on climate planning adaptation pathways to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
4.3.1 Assess appropriate land administration system options that account for both Western and Customary laws in relation to urban growth, tenure rights, and resettlement decisions	Outcome 2	Final Land Administration report delivered in November 2020. Urban planning diploma and assessment of good land administration actions to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		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	Capacity Development report delivered in November 2020. Updated report to be provided by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
5.2.1 Initiate new MoUs between Government departments, Solomon Islands National University (SINU), and RMIT University/UN-Habitat to support training workshops and new teaching and learning opportunities	Outcome 2	Course design for SINU and professionals (curriculum and training material) delivered in November 2020.	Completed		Satisfactory
5.2.2 Develop tailored capacity building workshops for professional staff (HCC and focal Ministries) at RMIT University	Outcome 2	RMIT GIS training and report delivered in February 2023.	Completed		Satisfactory
6.1.1 Develop climate change adaptation training and knowledge exchange programmes between HCC staff and ward councillors	Outcome 2	Training report delivered in June 2021	Completed		Satisfactory
6.2.1 Advocacy materials	Outcome 8	Continuous Different formats (brochures, posters, banners and presentations) were developed to share information on project acvitities, implementation and safeguard strategies targeting different kind	Ontrack		Satisfactory

		of stakeholders from community members to academia and officials.			
6.3.1 Develop and maintain a city-wide knowledge sharing mechanism in collaboration with HCC and the two key ministries	Outcome 8	Continuous. Knowledge sharing platform to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
6.4.1 Conduct and document a participatory joint learning event based on annual activity reviews and disseminate project findings and recommendations	Outcome 8	Continuous. Project learning mechanism to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
5.2.3 Deliver a two-week workshop course on planning, land administration, and GIS risk mapping for HCC and Solomon Islands Ministry staff	Outcome 7	Professional short course held in Melbourne to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
5.4.1 Develop a formal mechanism for managing cross-boundary urban resilience issues between Guadalcanal Province and HCC, considering resource flows, people movement, and long-term urban expansion	Outcome 7	Final report, mechanisms for cross-border cooperation (MoU drafting between Guadalcanal Province and HCC) delivered in February 2023. Partnership networks report to be delivered in June 2024.	Ontrack		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	Policy and stakeholder mapping report delivered in November 2020.	Completed		Satisfactory
3.1.1 Development of theatre performances, radio broadcasts, and community newsletters	Outcome 3	Radio recordings, video recordings delivered in May 2020	Completed		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. Shortlisting of RO completed; New Zealand Volunteer joined HCC and project team as Urban Planning and Resilience Advisor and will support project for	Delayed	Hiring process complete by month 9. Shortlisting of RO completed; New Zealand Volunteer joined HCC and project team as Urban Planning	Marginally Unsatisfactory

		2 years. Resilience Officers were expected to be hired once activities were back on track after COVID-19 related break, but the recruitments were delayed.		and Resilience Advisor and will support project for 2 years. RO will be hired once activities are back on track after COVID-19 related break, hence recruitment process needs to start again	
3.3.2 Translate/apply the Climate Change Child-Centred Adaptation approach to schools and youth programmes in Honiara	Outcome 2, Outcome 3	Climate risk communication for women and youth report delivered in May 2020. 4 climate risk communication comic books developed in partnership with Honiara Youth Council to be delivered by June 2024. 3 climate risk communication workshops to be delivered by June 2024. Mechanism for integration in schools and youth programmes to be developed by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory

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

Name	**Email**
Samantha Poncabare	samantha.poncabare@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.

Throughout project implementation, UN-Habitat maintained effective technical oversight and adaptive management despite significant implementation challenges arising from the COVID-19 pandemic, recruitment delays and institutional constraints affecting infrastructure delivery. The Implementing Entity successfully coordinated technical assistance, quality assurance and stakeholder engagement across national and local partners, while ensuring continued compliance with the Adaptation Fund’s fiduciary, environmental and social safeguard requirements. During the reporting period, UN-Habitat continued to implement the recommendations of the Mid-Term Review by strengthening coordination among executing entities, supporting the refinement of Community Climate Action Plans, updating technical planning processes and providing ongoing implementation support for infrastructure preparation. Technical guidance, capacity development and regular coordination with government counterparts helped maintain project momentum despite delays affecting construction activities. Although several implementation-focused outputs, particularly Outputs 1.4, 3.3 and 3.4, progressed more slowly than originally anticipated, UN-

Habitat responded through adaptive project management, continued technical support, strengthened coordination mechanisms and regular monitoring of implementation risks. These measures helped preserve the quality of project preparation while ensuring that infrastructure investments remained aligned with community priorities, technical standards and environmental and social safeguard requirements. Going forward, UN-Habitat will continue to prioritize close implementation support to the executing entities, strengthen coordination among implementing partners, accelerate procurement and delivery of the remaining infrastructure investments, and consolidate the project's knowledge products, institutional capacity and lessons learned to maximize long-term sustainability and replication of climate-resilient urban development approaches in Solomon Islands.

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	Final climate action plans delivered in June 2021	Ontrack		Satisfactory
1.2.1 In-depth profiling of all hotspot communities	Outcome 1, Outcome 3	Community profiling methodology and tool input delivered in November 2020 Community development plans delivered in February 2023	Completed		Satisfactory
1.3.1 Carry out scoping and feasibility study. Assess the cost, feasibility and partnerships needed to implement the actions suggested by the community	Outcome 1, Outcome 4	Ongoing. Completion by June 2024. Designed projects / Engineering Report Phase 2 delivered in November 2020.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
1.4.1 Implement screened/agreed pilot-studies in each hotspot community 1.4.2 Provide technical support where necessary	Outcome 1, Outcome 4	3 drainage project designs and technical implementation support to be completed by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
2.1.1 Training on surveys, data recording, and data management	Outcome 2	Enumerator training and survey completed by May 2020. Additional stages planned over until June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
2.2.1 Awareness and capacity building activity relating to key community issues	Outcome 3, Outcome 6	4 community workshops completed and reports delivered between May 2020 and February 23.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
3.1.2 Work with women's groups in Honiara to determine the most effective means of communication about climate risk strategies, and identify which actions are likely to be most successful given the local context	Outcome 3	Climate risk communication for women and youth report delivered in May 2020. 3 climate risk communication workshops to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
3.3.1 Conduct training and	Outcome 5	Urban organic farming	Ontrack		Satisfactory

piloting of closed-loop organic waste and urban food production activities, reducing climate vulnerability through ecosystem services (enhancing food security, reducing storm water run-off, and reducing sensitivity to climate extremes through reduced waste accumulation)		training report + recommendations delivered in November 2020. GIS baseline for urban trees; food security short film delivered in February 2023. 1 food security short film and detailed plans for flood and landslide mitigation to be delivered by June 2024.			
3.4.1 Engage with Honiara City Council to identify and promote climate resilient public spaces, including use of floodplains as sports areas, tree planting for shading, and rehabilitation of community centres as evacuation spaces	Outcome 1	Mission report – nature-based solutions and evacuation centres (delivered in May 2020). 2 reports incl. feasibility assessments and partnership recommendations (delivered in November 2020) To be delivered by June 2024: Spatial risk assessment for evacuation centres; Urban Greening Master Plan; resilient buildings training package; Final designs and monitoring reports	Ontrack		Satisfactory
4.1.1 Training of resilience officers in climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction, and provision of a platform for whole-of-city meetings and capacity building	Outcome 2	Training package delivered in February 2023. Updated vulnerability analysis and ward councillor workshop to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
4.2.1 Pilot best practice participatory approach in climate planning and enhance understanding of adaptation pathways	Outcome 2, Outcome 7	2 participatory workshops on climate planning adaptation pathways to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
4.3.1 Assess appropriate land administration system options that account for both Western and Customary laws in relation to urban growth, tenure rights, and resettlement decisions	Outcome 2	Final Land Administration report delivered in November 2020. Urban planning diploma and assessment of good land administration actions to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		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	Capacity Development report delivered in November 2020. Updated report to be provided by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
5.2.1 Initiate new MoUs between Government departments, Solomon Islands National University (SINU), and RMIT University/UN-Habitat to	Outcome 2	Course design for SINU and professionals (curriculum and training material) delivered in November 2020.	Ontrack		Satisfactory

support training workshops and new teaching and learning opportunities					
5.2.2 Develop tailored capacity building workshops for professional staff (HCC and focal Ministries) at RMIT University	Outcome 7	RMIT GIS training and report delivered in February 2023.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
5.4.1 Develop a formal mechanism for managing cross-boundary urban resilience issues between Guadalcanal Province and HCC, considering resource flows, people movement, and long-term urban expansion	Outcome 7	Final report, mechanisms for cross-border cooperation (MoU drafting between Guadalcanal Province and HCC) delivered in February 2023. Partnership networks report to be delivered in June 2024.	Ontrack		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	Policy and stakeholder mapping report delivered in November 2020.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
6.1.1 Develop climate change adaptation training and knowledge exchange programmes between HCC staff and ward councillors	Outcome 2	Training report delivered in June 2021	Ontrack		Satisfactory
6.2.1 Advocacy materials	Outcome 3	Continuous Different formats (brochures, posters, banners and presentations) were developed to share information on project acvitities, implementation and safeguard strategies targeting different kind of stakeholders from community members to academia and officials.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
6.3.1 Develop and maintain a city-wide knowledge sharing mechanism in collaboration with HCC and the two key ministries	Outcome 8	Continuous. Knowledge sharing platform to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
6.4.1 Conduct and document a participatory joint learning event based on annual activity reviews and disseminate project findings and recommendations	Outcome 8	Continuous. Project learning mechanism to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
5.2.3 Deliver a two-week workshop course on planning, land administration, and GIS risk mapping for HCC and Solomon Islands Ministry staff	Outcome 7	Professional short course held in Melbourne to be delivered by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
3.1.1 Development of theatre performances, radio broadcasts, and community newsletters	Outcome 3	Radio recordings, video recordings delivered in May 2020	Ontrack		Satisfactory

3.3.2 Translate/apply the Climate Change Child-Centred Adaptation approach to schools and youth programmes in Honiara	Outcome 2, Outcome 3	Climate risk communication for women and youth report delivered in May 2020. 4 climate risk communication comic books developed in partnership with Honiara Youth Council to be delivered by June 2024. 3 climate risk communication workshops to be delivered by June 2024. Mechanism for integration in schools and youth programmes to be developed by June 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory

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

Name	Email	Institution
Darryn McEvoy	darryn.mcevoy@rmit.edu.au	RMIT

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

Overall, RMIT University has performed satisfactorily in delivering its technical assistance responsibilities and has made a substantial contribution to the project's overall objectives. Since project inception, RMIT has delivered key analytical studies, climate change vulnerability assessments, Community Climate Action Plans, GIS and spatial analysis, land administration and governance studies, technical guidance, professional training programmes and knowledge products that have strengthened the evidence base for climate-resilient urban development in Honiara. These outputs have enhanced the technical capacity of national and local institutions and provided the foundation for the design and implementation of community adaptation interventions. Progress towards several implementation-focused outputs, particularly Outputs 1.4 (pilot infrastructure implementation), 3.3 (ecosystem-based adaptation and closed-loop organic waste activities) and 3.4 (climate-resilient public spaces), has been slower than originally anticipated due to external factors, including the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, institutional coordination challenges and dependencies on government-led implementation processes. While these factors were largely outside RMIT's direct control, RMIT continued to provide technical support, refine infrastructure designs, maintain stakeholder engagement and adapt its work programme to support continued project implementation. The recommendations of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) have been progressively implemented through strengthened technical planning, continued capacity development, enhanced stakeholder engagement, refinement of adaptation planning methodologies, and ongoing support to government counterparts to improve implementation readiness. By June 2023, these actions had strengthened the project's technical foundation and helped position the remaining activities for implementation as implementation constraints were progressively addressed. Going forward, priority should be placed on accelerating the implementation of the remaining infrastructure activities under Outputs 1.4, 3.3 and 3.4, strengthening coordination between implementing partners and government agencies, ensuring that technical designs are translated efficiently into implementation, and consolidating project knowledge, training materials and lessons learned to support long-term institutional capacity and the replication of project approaches beyond the life of the project.

Other

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

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

Name	Email

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

Overall Rating

Overall rating

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.

Since project inception, significant progress has been made in establishing the technical, institutional and knowledge foundations required to strengthen climate resilience in Honiara's informal settlements. The project successfully completed key baseline studies, community profiling, climate change vulnerability assessments, Community Climate Action Plans, policy analyses, GIS and capacity development activities, curriculum development, professional training programmes and stakeholder engagement processes. These outputs have strengthened the evidence base for climate-resilient urban planning, enhanced institutional capacity across national and local government, and informed the identification, screening and prioritization of community adaptation interventions. The project also made steady progress in implementing the recommendations of the Mid-Term Review (MTR). By June 2023, technical planning had been strengthened through updated community planning processes and improved coordination among project partners, while continued capacity development, stakeholder engagement and refinement of adaptation planning methodologies helped strengthen implementation readiness and institutional ownership. Progress towards several implementation-focused outputs, particularly Output 1.4 (pilot infrastructure implementation), Output 3.3 (ecosystem-based adaptation and closed-loop organic waste activities) and Output 3.4 (climate-resilient public spaces), was slower than originally anticipated due to the cumulative impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, recruitment delays and institutional coordination challenges associated with infrastructure delivery. The project responded by adapting implementation approaches, maintaining technical support and stakeholder engagement, refining infrastructure priorities through participatory planning processes, and strengthening coordination among implementing partners and government counterparts. Throughout implementation, environmental and social considerations remained integrated into project planning and delivery, and no significant environmental or social safeguard issues requiring corrective action were identified. Going forward, priority should be placed on accelerating delivery of the remaining infrastructure activities under Outputs 1.4, 3.3 and 3.4 through strengthened coordination between implementing partners, Honiara City Council and relevant government ministries, while maintaining robust technical oversight and community engagement. The project should also continue consolidating knowledge products, institutional capacity and lessons learned to support the long-term sustainability and replication of climate-resilient urban development approaches in Solomon Islands.

Project Indicators

List of indicators

Type of Indicator (indicators towards	Indicator	Baseline	Progress Since Inception	Target for Project End

Objectives, Outcomes, etc…)				
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	5	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	5	5
Outputs	1.3 Action plans and detailed proposals for prioritized community level concrete climate action are available	0	5	5
Outputs	1.4 Concrete climate actions implemented	0	1 type (nbs)	10
Outcomes	2. A majority of community members (including women and youth) are empowered to directly contribute to local resilience building	0	32	60%
Outputs	2.1 No of trainings	0	12 (73% women)	5 At least 50%

	that are positively evaluated and % of women trained			women
Outputs	2.2 No of workshops	0	4	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	2	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	1	2 at least 50% women
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 (30% women)	2 at least 50% women
Outputs	4.2 No of ward level structure established	0	0	2
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	0	1	1

	needs assessments			
Outputs	5.2 No. of capacity development workshops	1	3	3
Outputs	5.3.1Resilience 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	1	1
Outputs	5.5 No of policy reviews	0	1	1
Outcomes	6. All stakeholders are well aware of programme as documented through pre and post project survey	0	50	100
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	During the reporting period, the project strengthened the integration of activities across project components to improve implementation readiness and maximise long-term impact. Greater emphasis was placed on ensuring that climate change vulnerability assessments, Community Climate Action Plans (CCAPs), engineering assessments, governance

		activities and capacity development informed one another and supported the identification of priority adaptation interventions. Capacity development also remained a central focus, targeting national and local government, community representatives and academic institutions to strengthen long-term ownership of project outcomes. The project continued to coordinate closely with complementary UN-Habitat initiatives, including the Integration of Nature-Based Solutions in Honiara project, to maximise technical synergies and optimise the use of available resources.
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts?	Challenges & Opportunities	Yes. Environmental and social considerations continued to be integrated into project planning and implementation through climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments, Community Climate Action Plans, stakeholder consultations, technical reviews and regular coordination among project partners. These arrangements supported the early identification and management of potential environmental and social risks during project planning and implementation. No significant environmental or social impacts requiring corrective action were identified during the reporting period.
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.	Opportunities	Gender considerations continued to be integrated throughout project implementation by promoting equitable participation in consultations, training activities and decision-making processes. Community engagement approaches were adapted to encourage meaningful participation by women, recognising local cultural norms that can limit women’s

		participation in mixed-group discussions. Where appropriate, separate discussions and facilitation approaches were used to create safe spaces for women to express priorities and concerns. Gender-balanced field teams and gender-sensitive consultation methods also contributed to more inclusive data collection and planning processes. These approaches strengthened understanding of the differentiated impacts of climate change and improved the responsiveness of Community Climate Action Plans to the needs of women and other vulnerable groups.
Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays?	Challenges & Opportunities	The project responded proactively to implementation challenges by strengthening technical planning, maintaining close engagement with Honiara City Council, the Ministry of Infrastructure Development and other government counterparts, and exploring alternative implementation approaches to sustain progress. This included prioritising partnerships with local NGOs and community-based organisations to facilitate delivery of smaller-scale adaptation activities where appropriate, while continuing to advance planning and coordination for larger infrastructure investments. Nevertheless, implementation of larger infrastructure interventions continued to experience delays during the reporting period due to the institutional coordination required among multiple government agencies. The longer-term impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and earlier administrative delays also continued to influence implementation timelines.
What implementation issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected	Challenges & Opportunities	The project demonstrated the value of combining

progress?		multidisciplinary technical expertise with strong local partnerships. Collaboration between government agencies, RMIT University, World Vision Solomon Islands and local stakeholders strengthened the quality of technical outputs and supported integrated planning across multiple sectors. At the same time, implementation highlighted the importance of maintaining sufficient in-country technical capacity and regular coordination among implementing partners, particularly for infrastructure activities involving multiple government agencies. The experience also reinforced the need to establish realistic implementation schedules that account for institutional coordination processes and administrative requirements when delivering complex urban resilience projects.

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

Yes

Climate Resilience Measures	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing climate adaptation measures that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	A key lesson from the reporting period is that effective climate adaptation requires integrating technical analysis with continuous community engagement throughout project design and implementation. Climate change vulnerability assessments and Community Climate Action Plans proved valuable for translating scientific information into locally relevant adaptation priorities while strengthening community ownership. The project also demonstrated that combining engineering expertise, ecosystem-based approaches, governance support and community participation results in more robust and implementable adaptation solutions. Implementation further highlighted the importance of maintaining sufficient local technical capacity and flexible implementation arrangements. Large-scale adaptation interventions require sustained coordination among national and local government institutions, while smaller-scale interventions can often be implemented more efficiently through

	partnerships with local organisations. Future programmes should therefore incorporate sufficient time and resources for institutional coordination alongside technical implementation.
What is the potential for the climate resilience measures undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	
Readiness Interventions (Applicable only to NIEs that received one or more readiness grants)	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in accessing and implementing climate finance readiness support that would be relevant to the preparation, design and implementation of future concrete adaptation projects/programmes?	N/A
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?	N/A
Concrete Adaptation Interventions	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing concrete adaptation interventions that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes implementing concrete adaptation interventions?	The reporting period reinforced the importance of investing in community governance before implementing physical adaptation measures. Community committees and participatory planning processes strengthened local ownership of adaptation priorities and created more transparent decision-making processes. The project also demonstrated that climate adaptation in Solomon Islands must respond to the specific environmental, social and land tenure characteristics of individual settlements. While adaptation interventions need to be locally tailored, the planning methodologies developed through the project, including climate vulnerability assessments, Community Climate Action Plans and participatory planning processes, provide a scalable framework that can be adapted to other settlements and 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?	Although implementation of larger infrastructure interventions was still ongoing during the reporting period, the project developed a range of planning tools, technical methodologies and governance approaches with strong replication potential. Climate vulnerability assessments, Community Climate Action Plans, participatory planning methodologies and technical guidance can be adapted for application in other settlements within Honiara and in comparable urban contexts across Solomon Islands and the wider Pacific region.
Knowledge Management	

How has existing information/data/knowledge been used to inform project development and implementation? What kinds of information/data/knowledge were used?	Project implementation drew upon existing national and local planning frameworks, previous urban resilience studies, the Honiara Urban Resilience and Climate Action Plan (HURCAP), government datasets and community knowledge. These sources were complemented by climate change vulnerability assessments, household surveys, technical studies and stakeholder consultations undertaken through the project. The combination of scientific analysis and local knowledge strengthened evidence-based planning and supported the identification of context-specific adaptation priorities.
Has the existing information/data/knowledge been made available to relevant stakeholder? If so, what chanels of dissemination have been used?	Knowledge generated through the project continued to be shared with government agencies, communities, academic institutions and development partners through technical workshops, stakeholder meetings, newsletters, conferences, training activities and online platforms.
Please list any knowledge products generated and include hyperlinks whenever posssible (e.g. project videos, project stories, studies and technical reports, case studies, tranining manuals, handbooks, strategies and plans developed, etc.)	RMIT Ocean Cities Studio: https://www.tracevisual.com.au/ocean-cities-studio-2020/ RMIT Repository: https://www.rmit.edu.au/research/centres-collaborations/centre-for-urban-research/current-projects/climate-resilient-urbanisation-in-the-asia-pacific-region
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	Progress towards the project’s learning objectives continued during the reporting period. Learning objectives relating to community vulnerability assessment, climate-sensitive planning, community participation and knowledge sharing were substantially achieved through the completion of technical studies, Community Climate Action Plans and stakeholder engagement activities. Learning objectives linked to implementation of physical adaptation interventions remained in progress, reflecting the phased implementation approach and the delays experienced in infrastructure delivery.
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.	One of the main challenges continued to be managing and sharing large spatial datasets, technical reports and household survey information among multiple project partners with varying levels of internet connectivity and technical capacity. To address these constraints, the project continued to use multiple data-sharing platforms and offline storage solutions, enabling project partners to access technical information using the most appropriate method for their local context.
Has the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	Yes. The learning objectives helped guide project implementation by ensuring that technical studies, capacity development and community engagement activities generated practical knowledge that could directly inform project planning and implementation. In particular, improved understanding of community vulnerabilities and climate risks strengthened the

	quality of Community Climate Action Plans and supported more evidence-based adaptation planning.
Innovation	
Describe any innovative practices or technologies that figured prominently in this project.	* Integration of scientific climate risk assessment with community knowledge to inform adaptation planning. * Development of Community Climate Action Plans linking vulnerability assessments directly to locally identified adaptation priorities. * Remote technical collaboration between international specialists and in-country project teams to maintain implementation during periods of restricted travel. * Integration of engineering, governance, GIS and community engagement into a single climate adaptation planning framework. * Use of university design studios and applied research to support innovative urban resilience solutions and strengthen local technical capacity.
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	0	0	0
Baseline information	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	0	0	0
Baseline information	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0	0
Target performance	Direct beneficiaries	6000	50	30

at completion	supported by the project			
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	0	0	Inland flooding	1: Ineffective
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/programmes 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 at completion	5	Multi-sector	Local	3: Risk and vulnterability assessments completed or updated
Performance at mid-term	5	Multi-sector	Local	3: Risk and vulnterability 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	0	Public
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	Local	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 owernship 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: Stengthened 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 completion	Multi-sector	Local	4: Mostly responsive (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/strenghtened))	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/strenghtened))	1:Not improved
Baseline information	Urban development	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strenghtened))	1:Not improved
Target performance at completion	Multi-sector	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strenghtened))	4: Mostly Improved
Target performance at completion	Multi-sector	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strenghtened))	4: Mostly Improved
Target performance at completion	Multi-sector	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strenghtened))	4: Mostly Improved
Target performance at completion	Multi-sector	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strenghtened))	3: Moderately improved
Performance at mid-term	Multi-sector	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strenghtened))	1:Not improved
Performance at mid-term	Multi-sector	1: Health and Social Infrastructure (developed/improved)	1:Not improved
Performance at mid-term	Disaster risk reduction	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strenghtened))	1:Not improved
Performance at mid-term	Urban development	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strenghtened))	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 strengthned 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/rehabilitat	Unit	Effectiveness of protection/rehabilitation
Baseline information	Catchment area/Watershed/Aquifer	2	ha rehabilitated	1: Ineffective
Baseline information	Coasts	2	km rehabilitated	1: Ineffective
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		ha rehabilitated	
Performance at mid-term	Coasts		km rehabilitated	
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	1	Urban development	Local	Urban policy
Target performance at completion	2	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, saled up, encourages and/or accelerated

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

	No. of innovative practices/ tools technologies	**Sector**	**Status**	**Effectiveness**
Baseline information				
Target performance at completion				
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

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