Project Performance Report

Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	7/11/2023 - 7/10/2024
Project Title	Increasing the resilience of informal urban settlements in Fiji that are highly vulnerable to climate change and disaster risks
Project Summary	Fiji is located in the Pacific Ocean’s tropical cyclone belt. The island nation experiences frequent cyclones (on average, one cyclone per year) and with them damaging winds, rain and storm surges. Besides cyclones, the country suffers from other extreme events associated with climate change such as extreme rainfall, flooding, droughts and temperature extremes as well as sea-level rise.Being mountainous in its interior, cities and towns are mainly located on the coast and along rivers. The result is that Fiji’s towns and cities are particularly exposed to seaborne and riverine natural hazards, cyclones, storm surges, coastal and riverine erosion, landslides, floods and already occurring sea level rise due to climate change. Mangrove deforestation and coral reef extraction in order to accommodate urban development and for reasons of income generation are increasing the vulnerability of urban areas to coastal hazards, as both mangrove forests and coral reefs provide effective barriers against storm surges and cyclones. Of particularly critical concern are the residents of informal settlements in towns and cities as many such settlements are located in highly vulnerable areas, such as riverbanks and pockets of coastal land.The project will focus on informal settlements across four urban areas and towns in Fiji: Lautoka, Sigatoka, Nadi and Lami, which are located in the Greater Suva Urban Area.The overall objective of the project is to increase the resilience of informal urban settlements in Fiji that are highly vulnerable to climate change and disaster risks. This will be achieved by:1.Institutional strengthening for enhanced local climate response: Reduce vulnerability at the city-level to climate-related hazards and threats with a particular view to community level resilience2.Local (community/informal settlement) resilience strengthening: Strengthen awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes

	and capacity3.Enhancing resilience of community level physical, natural and socio-economic assets and ecosystems: Increase adaptive capacity with relevant development and natural resource sectors; Increase ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress4.Awareness raising, knowledge management and Communication: Project implementation is fully transparent. All stakeholders are informed of products and results and have access to these for replication.
Database Number	AF00000103
Implementing Entity (IE)	UN-Habitat
Type of IE	Multilateral Implementing Entity
Country(ies)	Fiji
Relevant Geographic Points (i.e. cities, villages, bodies of water)	6 settlements in Lami: Quaia, Wainiwokai, Kalekana, Wailekutu, Bilo, Vuniivi 2 settlements in Sigatoka: Vunikavika, Kulukulu 2 Settlements in Nadi: Korociri, Nawijikuma 6 settlements in Lautoka: California, Veidogo, Vunato, Navutu, Taiperia, Naqiroso
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	7/11/2018
Actual Mid-term Review Date (if applicable)	1/7/2020
Original Completion Date	10/7/2022
Revised Completion Date after approval of extension request (if applicable)	10/7/2027

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.30/24 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 $4,235,995 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) for the project should be updated, based on the climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments and the resulting community-based identification and design of adaptation activities, to remove any unidentified subproject and reflect all environmental and social risks inherent in the identified adaptation activities; and (ii) 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 August 2018 Midterm evaluation - submitted February 2021 PPR 3 & First no-cost extension request - submitted October 2021 PPR 4 & Second no-cost extension request - submitted May 2023 Third no-cost extension request - submitted February 2024 Fourth no-cost extension request - submitted June 2025 PPR 5 - submitted April 2026

List the Website address (URL) of project

Twitter account: Fiji Resilient Informal Settlements @FijiRIS - https://twitter.com/FijiRIS Facebook page: https://www.facebook.com/pg/FijiRIS/community/?ref=page_internal

Project Contacts			
National/Regional Project Manager/Coordinator	**Name**	**Email**	**Date**
National Project Manager	Samantha Poncabare	samantha.poncabare@un.org	12/1/2024
Government(s) DA	Sivendra Michael	Sivendra.michael@environment.gov.fj	1/1/2024
Implementing Entity	Roi Chiti	roi.chiti@un.org	6/1/2025
Executing Agency	Manasa Lesuma	manasa.lesuma@mhcd.gov.fj	6/1/2023

Financial Data

Disbursement of AF grant funds	
Cumulative total disbursement from Trustee to IE as of date ($)	$3,816,607.00
Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs as of date ($)	$594,623.50
Project disbursement rate (%)	42.43
Project execution rate (%)	15.23
Add any comments on AF Grant Funds	(Revised) Estimated cumulative total disbursement from IE to EEs ($): - PPR1: $108,539.46 - PPR2: $267,585.31 - PPR3: $471,737.21 - PPR4: $545,120.90 - PPR5: $595,189.69 - PPR6: $594,623.50
Investment Income ($)	$0.00

Cumulative Investment Income since inception ($)	$0.00

Expenditure Data

Output	Amount ($)
1.1 City-wide (updated) risk and vulnerability assessment conducted for participating towns	$2,907.00
1.2 Hazard maps produced	$0.00
1.3 City-wide climate change action plans developed for participating towns	$0.00
1.4 Urban planner/resilience officer established in three towns	$50,291.31
2.1 Assessment and planning tool for community vulnerability assessment and action planning developed	$0.00
2.2 Community-based climate vulnerability and informal settlements assessments	$0.00
2.3. Community-level resilience, recovery and upgrading plans developed in identified informal settlements	$0.00
2.4 Awareness raising activities for targeted population groups	$0.00
2.5 Training of targeted household and communities	$5,418.39
3.1 Physical, natural, and social assets and ecosystems developed or strengthened in response to climate change impacts	$5,414.17
4.1 Lessons learned and best practices regarding resilient urban community development/housing are generated, captured and distributed	$0.00
4.2 Regional Advocacy and replication	$0.00
IE fee ($)	$0.00
Execution cost ($)	$0.00

Planned Expenditure Schedule

Output	Projected Cost ($)	Estimated Completion Date
1.1 City-wide (updated) risk and vulnerability assessment conducted for participating towns	$0.00	7/10/2025
1.2 Hazard maps produced	$0.00	7/10/2025
1.3 City-wide climate change action plans developed for participating towns	$0.00	7/10/2025
1.4 Urban planner/resilience officer established in three towns	$0.00	7/10/2025
2.1 Assessment and planning tool for community vulnerability assessment and action planning developed	$0.00	7/10/2025
2.2 Community-based climate vulnerability and informal settlements assessments	$0.00	7/10/2025
2.3. Community-level resilience, recovery and upgrading plans developed in identified informal settlements	$0.00	7/10/2025
2.4 Awareness raising activities for targeted population groups	$0.00	7/10/2025
2.5 Training of targeted household and communities	$0.00	7/10/2025
3.1 Physical, natural, and social assets and ecosystems developed or strengthened in response to climate change impacts	$0.00	7/10/2025
4.1 Lessons learned and best practices regarding resilient urban community development/housing are generated, captured and distributed	$0.00	7/10/2025
4.2 Regional Advocacy and replication	$0.00	7/10/2025
IE fee ($)		$135.17

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 construction had not yet commenced during most of the reporting period. Site inspections and consultations confirmed that several proposed interventions are located in areas exposed to climate and drainage-related challenges, including high tide flooding, drainage congestion and seasonal access constraints. However, these assessments enabled the project to identify and integrate appropriate adaptation measures during the planning stage, thereby reducing the likelihood that climate and seasonal variability would adversely affect implementation. Risk Mitigation Measures Site inspections and consultations were undertaken to validate proposed interventions and adjust them to current site conditions. Priority interventions such as elevated footpaths, drainage clearing, drainage diversion and improved access routes were identified in consultation with communities and councils. Coordination with relevant technical agencies, including the Ministry of Waterways and the Ministry of Public Works, will continue to ensure that infrastructure designs adequately respond to site-specific climate and drainage risks before construction commences.
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: Capacity constraints remained a challenge, particularly due to the absence of Resilience Officers and delays in mobilizing dedicated project personnel. However, implementation capacity improved through support from Ministry staff, technical engagement with other agencies, and the mobilisation of UN-Habitat technical support. Risk Mitigation Measures The project continued to strengthen implementation capacity through technical missions, council-level workshops, training on climate change adaptation planning, and engagement with national technical agencies. Pending Resilience Officer payments were cleared, and the project explored options to re-establish local focal points and strengthen technical support

		through the Ministry of Public Works and other partners.
3. Institutional: Capacity constraints of local institutions may limit the effective implementation of interventions	Moderate	Status: Capacity constraints remained a challenge, particularly due to the absence of Resilience Officers and delays in mobilizing dedicated project personnel. However, implementation capacity improved through support from Ministry staff, technical engagement with other agencies, and the mobilisation of UN-Habitat technical support. Risk Mitigation Measures The project continued to strengthen implementation capacity through technical missions, council-level workshops, training on climate change adaptation planning, and engagement with national technical agencies. Pending Resilience Officer payments were cleared, and the project explored options to re-establish local focal points and strengthen technical support through the Ministry of Public Works and other partners.
4. Institutional/social Lack of commitment/buy-in from local communities may result in delay at intervention sites	Low	Status: Community buy-in remained generally strong. Site inspections confirmed that community leaders continued to identify priority interventions and, in several cases, communities expressed willingness to support implementation, including through labour contributions. Risk Mitigation Measures The project resumed direct engagement with communities through site inspections and consultations. Proposed interventions were validated with community leaders and council representatives to ensure that they reflected current community priorities. Continued community engagement will remain central during implementation, particularly for infrastructure works and maintenance arrangements.
5. Institutional/social: Disagreement amongst stakeholders with regards to adaptation measures (infrastructure) and site selection	Low	Status: Some changes in site conditions and community priorities were identified during the reporting period. Certain proposed interventions required adjustment due to settlement congestion, drainage constraints, high-tide flooding, or previous developments implemented by other actors. Risk Mitigation Measures The Ministry of Housing conducted site inspections and consultations to reassess priorities and validate proposed interventions. Intervention packages were revised where needed, including shifting some sites toward footpaths, drainage maintenance, elevated access routes, food gardens or storage solutions. Continued consultation with communities, councils and technical agencies will help avoid disagreement during implementation.
6. Institutional: Communities may not adopt activities during or after the AF project, including infrastructure maintenance	Low	Status: Site inspections and consultations undertaken during the reporting period identified some changes in site conditions and community priorities, requiring refinement of several proposed interventions. However, these adjustments were made through collaborative discussions with communities, local councils and government agencies, and no significant disagreements regarding intervention priorities or site selection were encountered. Risk Mitigation Measures The Ministry of Housing conducted joint site inspections and consultations to validate and update proposed interventions based on current site conditions and community priorities. Intervention packages were refined where appropriate, including adjustments to proposed footpaths, drainage improvements, elevated access routes, food gardens and storage facilities. Continued participatory planning and close coordination with communities, councils and relevant technical agencies will help maintain stakeholder consensus throughout implementation.
7. Financial: Complexity of financial management	High	Status: Financial and procurement risks remained high. Previous administrative delays continued to affect delivery, and consultancy

and procurement. Certain administrative processes could delay the project execution or could lack integrity		tenders for the three pilot sites exceeded the available budget, requiring alternative implementation arrangements. Risk Mitigation Measures The Ministry reviewed implementation options and shifted toward working with the Ministry of Public Works and Meteorological Services for detailed plans and possible construction support. UN-Habitat and the Ministry of Housing also continued discussions on financial and substantive reporting, project management arrangements, work planning and implementation mechanisms.
8. Institutional: Delays in project implementation, and particularly in the development of infrastructure interventions	High	Status: Implementation delays remained one of the most significant risks during the reporting period. Although the project was reactivated and progress was made on planning, consultations, site inspections and technical preparation, infrastructure works had not yet substantially commenced. In addition, consultancy bids received for the three pilot sites exceeded the available project budget, creating a risk of further delays to the implementation of community infrastructure and requiring alternative implementation arrangements to ensure that technical designs and construction activities could proceed within the available resources. Risk Mitigation Measures The project undertook a major reactivation effort, including the August 2023 Project Management Committee (PMC) meeting, technical mission, council workshops, stakeholder engagement, site inspections, and preparation of detailed implementation arrangements. The Ministry of Housing, with support from UN-Habitat, also explored alternative implementation mechanisms by engaging the Ministry of Public Works and Meteorological Services to prepare detailed engineering designs and support implementation. In parallel, the project reviewed implementation modalities, funding allocations, work planning, and sequencing of activities to maximise available resources, accelerate delivery, and maintain project quality and compliance.
9. Institutional: A lack of coordination between and within national government Ministries and Departments	High	Status: Some coordination challenges have been encountered between the two implementing ministries. Following project initiation, the original ministry was split into two separate entities: the Ministry of Housing and Community Development (MHCD) and the Ministry of Local Government (MLG). While the project is institutionally housed within MHCD, effective implementation requires regular engagement with MLG. To date, engagement from MLG has been more limited than anticipated, affecting inter-ministerial coordination. In addition, the involvement of the National Designated Authority (NDA) has largely been limited to participation in Project Management Committee (PMC) meetings. The primary NDA counterpart has recently left their position, creating a temporary coordination gap. Risk Mitigation Measures: The Project Management Committee, particularly the Chair, actively supports coordination between the two ministries and provides a formal platform for alignment. Regular PMC meetings and systematic circulation of meeting minutes ensure transparency, joint decision-making, and shared accountability among stakeholders. The project team has initiated close engagement with the newly appointed NDA focal point, including targeted briefings to ensure continuity and alignment. Regular updates are provided to the Ministry of Local Government to strengthen buy-in and ensure the active involvement of the Department of Town and Country Planning. Frequent technical team meetings involving staff from both ministries have been established to address operational matters

		collaboratively and improve day-to-day coordination. The project team will ensure that these coordination mechanisms continue under the new government administration.
10. Legal: Delays or barriers in gaining approval for infrastructure and housing due to delays in the development process or due to land tenure issues	Moderate	Status: Coordination improved during the reporting period but remained a moderate risk due to the number of institutions involved, including the Ministry of Housing, Ministry of Local Government, Climate Change Division, Ministry of Lands, Ministry of Public Works, councils and other technical agencies. Risk Mitigation Measures The PMC was reconvened to strengthen coordination and clarify roles. Council-level workshops and technical meetings were held to restart engagement across the four towns/cities. The project also engaged national agencies on hazard mapping, land consent, engineering designs and infrastructure implementation. Continued inter-ministerial coordination will be required to maintain implementation momentum.

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?

Yes. During the reporting period, significant risk mitigation measures were implemented to restart project implementation. These included the deployment of a UN-Habitat technical mission, reactivation of the Project Management Committee, stakeholder consultations, council workshops, site inspections, technical training, and strengthened coordination with national agencies. These measures improved government ownership, inter-institutional coordination, implementation planning and community engagement. While several institutional and coordination risks were reduced, implementation delays and financial/procurement risks remained high, as infrastructure works had not yet commenced and procurement and engineering arrangements continued to be finalized. The mitigation measures nevertheless established a strong foundation for implementation to accelerate during the subsequent reporting period.

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	Yes

management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Insufficient alignment with laws and technical standards, especially related to implementation of concrete interventions under component 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 and engineers were consulted during the project design phase to ensure compliance with all relevant laws and technical standards also for possible sub-projects. This has been completed again after identification of sub-projects under component 3. 2. Capacity building on legal and technical compliance (Management) It has been ensured that each person associated with the project is aware of domestic and international laws and compliance needs to SDG and Fiji technical standards requirements (see section E), especially for implementing sub-projects under component 3. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Sub-projects 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. 0 2. 0 3. 0 4. 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, UN-Habitat and the Ministry of Housing undertook extensive consultations with national ministries, technical agencies, utilities and local authorities to ensure that project activities remained aligned with national legislation, planning frameworks and technical standards. Technical meetings were held with the Ministry of Local Government, Climate Change Division, Department of Town and Country Planning, Water Authority of Fiji, Fiji Roads Authority, Energy Fiji Limited, iTaukei Land Trust Board, Ministry of Lands and Mineral Resources, Ministry of Rural and Maritime Development and Habitat for Humanity to validate planning approaches, identify applicable regulations and collect technical information required for the vulnerability assessments and adaptation planning process. 2. Capacity building on legal and technical compliance (Management) Capacity building was delivered through working sessions and workshops in Lautoka, Nadi, Sigatoka and Lami involving council staff, government agencies, community

	representatives and other stakeholders. The sessions strengthened understanding of climate adaptation planning processes, urban planning frameworks, hazard and vulnerability assessments, and alignment with national policies including the National Adaptation Plan (NAP), National Climate Change Policy (NCCP), Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and the Common Reporting Framework. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Throughout the reporting period, proposed activities and future sub-projects were screened through technical working sessions, municipal data collection, site visits and stakeholder consultations. The vulnerability assessment process considered hazard information, planning requirements, existing infrastructure, land use constraints and technical guidance from sector agencies to ensure that proposed interventions remained consistent with applicable legal and technical requirements before progressing to implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. During the reporting period no infrastructure works were implemented that would create legal or regulatory non-compliance. Project activities remained focused on assessments, stakeholder engagement, capacity building and adaptation planning. Monitoring indicates continued coordination with relevant authorities and completion of multiple technical consultations and risk assessments supporting compliance with applicable national legislation and technical standards. Some regulatory approvals for future infrastructure interventions will still be required during subsequent implementation phases.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue screening all future infrastructure interventions against applicable legislation, planning requirements and engineering standards before implementation. Coordination with relevant national authorities, municipal councils and technical agencies will continue throughout detailed design, procurement and implementation, while Project Management Committee oversight and safeguard monitoring will ensure continued compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy.
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	Unequal distribution among target population /

measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	communities and households of project benefits. This principle has been triggered for the planning and implementation process of sub-projects under component 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 considerations into project planning and monitoring (Management / Avoidance) Access and equity risk ‘triggers’ have been included in the vulnerability assessment (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 under component 3. This is to avoid discrimination and favoritism. 3. Screening of sub-projects for access and equity risks (Management / Avoidance) Sub-projects are being screened for this risk during the project.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Percentage of women, men, youth, elderly, people with disabilities, varying ethnic groups participating in vulnerability assessment and planning activities. 2. Number of participatory workshops held in each community. 3. Number of target population benefiting from provided services, infrastructure and ecosystems (under component 3), disaggregated by gender and groups.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. 0 2. 0 3. 0 4. 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 implemented an extensive participatory engagement process across Lautoka, Nadi, Sigatoka and Lami involving municipal councils, government agencies, service providers, community representatives and civil society organisations. Working sessions and participatory workshops enabled stakeholders to jointly identify climate risks, vulnerabilities, priority adaptation needs and locally appropriate responses, ensuring that adaptation planning reflected a broad range of perspectives before interventions were prioritised. 2. Integration of access and equity into vulnerability assessment and planning (Avoidance / Management) Access and equity considerations were integrated throughout the vulnerability assessment process by establishing municipal coordinating teams, identifying relevant stakeholder groups, collecting information from multiple sectors and incorporating community knowledge into climate risk assessments and adaptation planning. Stakeholder mapping and participatory exercises helped ensure that adaptation priorities reflected

	different community needs while supporting transparent and inclusive planning processes. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, proposed adaptation measures continued to be reviewed through technical assessments, stakeholder discussions and municipal planning exercises before inclusion in the vulnerability assessments and adaptation plans. This process helped ensure that proposed activities responded to community priorities while reducing the risk of exclusion or unequal distribution of project benefits. Other safeguard measures (Management) The project also strengthened institutional awareness of inclusive climate adaptation through national stakeholder interviews, municipal capacity-building workshops, technical training and continuous coordination with national ministries and service providers responsible for planning, water, transport, energy, land administration and climate change. These activities improved the evidence base supporting equitable adaptation planning across the four target municipalities.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. The participatory planning process successfully engaged a broad range of government institutions, municipal departments, utilities, technical agencies and community stakeholders across all four target municipalities. However, participation data was not systematically disaggregated for all vulnerable groups, including persons with disabilities and other socially marginalised populations. As implementation of physical interventions had not yet commenced, equitable access to future infrastructure investments will continue to require monitoring.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue promoting inclusive participation throughout detailed planning, infrastructure design and implementation by maintaining participatory consultation processes and stakeholder engagement across all target municipalities. Participation will continue to be monitored against the project’s access and equity indicators, with additional efforts made to strengthen disaggregated monitoring of women, youth, older persons, persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups. Community feedback mechanisms will continue to inform project implementation to ensure equitable access to project benefits.
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	Yes

management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	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 USP under component 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 with marginalised 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 unidentified sub-project to be developed under component 3. 2. Integration of vulnerable group considerations into project planning, management and monitoring (Management / Avoidance) ‘Related risk triggers’ will also be included in the planning and management and monitoring process for implementing all components but especially the sub-projects under component 3. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Sub-projects are being screened for this risk during the project.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Number of vulnerability assessments that incorporate risk assessments vis-à-vis the 15 principles. 2. Number of target population benefiting from provided services, infrastructure and ecosystems (under component 3), disaggregated by gender and groups.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. 0 2. 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Inclusive consultation with marginalised and vulnerable groups (Avoidance) During the reporting period, the project resumed stakeholder engagement through working sessions, participatory workshops and technical consultations across Lautoka, Nadi, Sigatoka and Lami. Stakeholder mapping and participatory discussions considered the needs of different community groups as part of the climate vulnerability assessment process, while site inspections enabled community representatives and local authorities to review proposed interventions and validate priorities based on current community needs. 2. Integration of vulnerable group considerations into project planning, management and monitoring (Management / Avoidance) The climate vulnerability assessment methodology incorporated social vulnerability considerations alongside climate hazards to better understand the differing exposure

	and adaptive capacity of communities. Information collected through stakeholder consultations, municipal workshops and technical meetings informed the identification of priority adaptation actions while supporting more inclusive planning and decision-making across the four participating municipalities. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Throughout the reporting period, proposed interventions continued to be screened through technical assessments, stakeholder consultations and municipal planning processes to ensure that future investments would not disproportionately affect vulnerable groups. Screening informed the refinement of proposed interventions before progressing to detailed design and implementation. Other safeguard measures (Management) Capacity-building activities, including municipal workshops, technical training and inter-agency coordination meetings, strengthened institutional understanding of inclusive climate adaptation planning. Engagement with national ministries, local councils, utilities and technical agencies helped integrate social vulnerability considerations into adaptation planning while promoting coordinated implementation across sectors.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. No adverse impacts on marginalised or vulnerable groups were identified during the reporting period, as activities focused primarily on planning, consultations and vulnerability assessments. While broad stakeholder participation was achieved across government institutions, councils and communities, participation data was not systematically disaggregated for all vulnerable groups, including persons with disabilities and other socially marginalised populations. Monitoring of participation and equitable access to project benefits will continue as infrastructure implementation progresses.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to ensure that vulnerability assessments, community consultations and participatory planning processes actively consider the needs of women, children, older persons, persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups. During implementation, participation and access to project benefits will continue to be monitored using disaggregated indicators where feasible, and targeted engagement will be undertaken where any gaps in participation or access are identified. Coordination with municipal councils and community representatives will continue to ensure that proposed interventions remain responsive to the needs of vulnerable populations.
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. Human rights-informed consultation and planning (Avoidance) Consultations have and will continue to capture issues related to human rights in target areas and ‘triggers’ to ensure compliance to UDHR standards have been included in the vulnerability assessments (i.e. specific questions) and the planning and management and monitoring process for implementing all components. 2. Capacity building on human rights standards (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. Compliance monitoring (Management) The UN-Habitat Human rights officers and PAG will check compliance.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Number of vulnerability assessments and action plans that highlight key human rights principles (including, but not limited to the right to adequate shelter, water and sanitation) with an emphasis on the most vulnerable rights holders.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Human rights-informed consultation and planning (Avoidance) During the reporting period, the project resumed stakeholder engagement through technical consultations, municipal workshops, working sessions and site inspections across the four participating municipalities. These participatory processes promoted inclusive engagement and informed the development of vulnerability assessments and adaptation planning while considering issues related to housing, basic services, climate resilience and community well-being. 2. Capacity building on human rights standards (Management) Capacity building activities, including the workshops on Planning for Climate Change Adaptation and Urban Resilience, strengthened institutional understanding of inclusive and climate-resilient urban planning aligned with national policies and international frameworks, including the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda. These activities reinforced planning approaches that support the rights to adequate

	housing, access to services and resilient urban development. 3. Compliance monitoring (Management) Project implementation continued to incorporate ESP considerations through technical reviews, stakeholder consultations and Project Management Committee oversight. Proposed project activities remained subject to screening and review prior to implementation to ensure continued compliance with UN-Habitat and Adaptation Fund safeguard requirements.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. No human rights concerns or grievances associated with project activities were identified during the reporting period. The project remained focused on planning, capacity building and stakeholder engagement, with vulnerability assessments and adaptation planning supporting consideration of issues related to adequate housing, access to services and climate resilience. Monitoring against this principle will continue as infrastructure implementation progresses.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue integrating human rights considerations into vulnerability assessments, adaptation planning, community consultations and infrastructure implementation. Continued stakeholder engagement, safeguard screening and Project Management Committee oversight will support compliance with the Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy and ensure that future interventions respect internationally recognised human rights principles, particularly the rights to adequate housing, water and sanitation for vulnerable communities.
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 sub-projects under component 3 but is also considered for the planning process (component 1 and 2).
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. Equal participation in project activities and stakeholder consultation (Avoidance / Management) The project will actively pursue equal participation in project activities and stakeholder consultation, e.g. through quota systems and /or organization of separate working groups during vulnerability

	assessments and planning and development processes. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Sub-projects are being screened for this risk during the project.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Number of gender assessments incorporated in vulnerability assessments and number of specific gender components in the action plans. 2. Number of community action plans and community infrastructures that focus on resilience of women / have a gender specific entry point. 3. Number of trainings / workshops / consultations with a particular gender dimension. 4. Number of target population benefiting from provided services, infrastructure and ecosystems (under component 3), disaggregated by gender and groups.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. 0 2. 0 3. 0 4. 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Equal participation in project activities and stakeholder consultation (Avoidance / Management) During the reporting period, the project resumed stakeholder engagement through municipal working sessions, participatory workshops, technical consultations and site inspections across Lautoka, Nadi, Sigatoka and Lami. Government agencies, municipal councils, service providers and community representatives participated in discussions to identify climate risks, validate adaptation priorities and inform future interventions. The participatory planning approach promoted equitable participation and considered the perspectives of different stakeholder groups throughout the planning process. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be reviewed through stakeholder consultations, vulnerability assessments and technical planning exercises to ensure that future infrastructure investments would be responsive to community needs and promote equitable access to project benefits. Gender considerations remained integrated into the planning process and will continue to inform implementation as infrastructure activities commence. Other safeguard measures (Management) The project also strengthened institutional capacity through the Planning for Climate Change Adaptation in Urban Areas training, municipal workshops and technical coordination meetings. These activities promoted inclusive planning approaches and reinforced consideration of gender and social inclusion alongside climate resilience within municipal adaptation planning and decision-making processes.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. Gender-disaggregated participation data was collected for the municipal workshops undertaken during the reporting period.

	Across the four participating municipalities, 84 stakeholders participated in the workshops, including 27 women (32.1%) and 57 men (67.9%). Female participation varied between municipalities, indicating that opportunities remain to strengthen balanced participation as implementation progresses. As infrastructure implementation had not yet commenced, monitoring of equitable access to project benefits will continue during subsequent reporting periods.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue promoting equitable participation of women and men throughout vulnerability assessments, community consultations, infrastructure design and implementation. Gender-disaggregated participation will continue to be monitored across project activities, with targeted outreach undertaken where participation by women or other underrepresented groups is limited. Future monitoring will also assess whether project benefits - including infrastructure investments and capacity-building activities - are equitably distributed across women and men.
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 international and national labour standards (Management) The project will monitor that international and national labour laws and codes are respected, for any work that may be carried out in relation to the project. This includes the eight International Labour Organization Convention (ILO) core labour standards related to fundamental principles and rights of workers, as well as ILO Convention No. 169, which concerns rights of indigenous and tribal peoples. Contracts will be reviewed periodically to ensure compliance with these laws. 2. Integration of labour standards into project agreements and contracts (Avoidance / Management) This will be done by ensuring transparency and accountability and by including standard clauses requiring the compliance with ILO conventions and country level standard in MoUs, AoC and contracts. 3. Occupational health and safety measures (Mitigation / Management) Ensure that ICSC international health and safety standards are

	clearly accessible and understood, e.g. by putting clearly visible signs detailing health and safety standards at project sites and by supplying protective equipment. 4. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Sub-projects are being screened for this risk during the project.
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	1.0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Compliance with international and national labour standards (Management) During the reporting period, project implementation focused on technical assessments, stakeholder engagement, municipal workshops and preparation for future implementation. Coordination with the Ministry of Housing and relevant government agencies continued to support the development of implementation arrangements that will comply with applicable national labour legislation and international labour standards once procurement and infrastructure activities commence. 2. Integration of labour standards into project agreements and contracts (Avoidance / Management) Preparatory implementation activities continued to incorporate safeguard requirements into project planning. Future procurement processes and contractual arrangements will continue to include provisions requiring compliance with applicable labour legislation, international labour standards and UN-Habitat requirements prior to commencement of implementation. 3. Occupational health and safety measures (Mitigation / Management) As physical infrastructure works had not yet commenced, occupational health and safety measures associated with construction activities were not yet required. However, occupational health and safety requirements continued to be considered during implementation planning and will be incorporated into future contractor obligations and site management procedures. 4. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Proposed sub-projects continued to be screened during technical assessments and implementation planning to ensure that labour standards and occupational health and safety requirements will be addressed prior to implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. No labour-related incidents or occupational health and safety issues were identified during the reporting period, as physical infrastructure works and contractor mobilization had not yet commenced. Compliance with labour standards and occupational health and safety requirements will become increasingly

	important during subsequent implementation phases involving procurement and construction.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue incorporating labour standards, occupational health and safety requirements and contractual safeguard provisions into procurement documentation, contracts and implementation arrangements before infrastructure works commence. Contractor compliance will be monitored throughout implementation to ensure adherence to applicable national legislation, ILO core labour standards and project occupational health and safety requirements.
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 sub-projects under component 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 with indigenous communities (Avoidance) Consultations have and will continue to capture all issues and needs of all communities (iTaukei, as the indigenous people, make up the majority of the population nationwide and in the target areas) and particular impacts on- and needs of indigenous people and other communities will be assessed through the vulnerability assessments, especially related to access to sub-project to be developed under component 3. 2. Application of UNDRIP and FPIC principles (Management / Avoidance) The project will be consistent with UNDRIP, and particularly with regard to Free, Prior, Informed Consent (FPIC) during project design, implementation and expected outcomes related to the impacts affecting the communities of indigenous peoples by including standard clauses requiring the compliance with above and Fiji standard in MoUs, AoC and contracts. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Sub-projects are being screened for this risk during the project.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Number of consultations that address concerns of indigenous communities directly into considerations. 2. Number of Vulnerability Assessments, Action Plans and Project Designs that consider the concerns of indigenous peoples. 3. Number of target population benefiting from provided services,

	infrastructure and ecosystems (under Component 3), disaggregated by gender and groups.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. 0 2. 0 3. 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Inclusive consultation with indigenous communities (Avoidance) During the reporting period, the project undertook stakeholder consultations, municipal workshops, working sessions and site inspections across the four participating municipalities to inform vulnerability assessments and adaptation planning. Community engagement processes were designed to capture local priorities and strengthen participation in the identification and validation of proposed adaptation interventions. Technical consultations also included the iTaukei Land Trust Board (TLTB), recognising its important role in land administration and engagement with iTaukei communities. 2. Application of UNDRIP and FPIC principles (Management / Avoidance) Implementation planning continued to promote inclusive and transparent stakeholder engagement consistent with national consultation processes. Coordination with municipal councils, national ministries, TLTB and other technical agencies supported the integration of community perspectives into adaptation planning and future implementation arrangements. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be screened through technical assessments, vulnerability assessments and stakeholder consultations to ensure that future activities appropriately consider community needs, land-related considerations and culturally appropriate implementation approaches prior to infrastructure implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. No adverse impacts on indigenous communities were identified during the reporting period. Project activities focused on participatory planning, stakeholder engagement and technical assessments, with consultations including agencies responsible for indigenous land administration and local governance. As infrastructure implementation had not yet commenced, continued monitoring of culturally appropriate engagement and equitable access to project benefits will remain important during subsequent implementation phases.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue engaging indigenous communities and relevant institutions throughout vulnerability assessments, detailed design and infrastructure implementation. Consultation processes will continue to be undertaken in a culturally appropriate manner and, where applicable, in accordance with the principles of Free, Prior and

	Informed Consent. Continued coordination with the iTaukei Land Trust Board, municipal councils and community representatives will support inclusive decision-making and ensure that future interventions remain responsive to community priorities.
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 have been analyzed in depth before selecting target areas the nature of informal settlements is that they are located in precarious locations which may require resettlement (on site) to move people out of harm's way. Due process involving the entire community and other relevant stakeholders will be applied. This principle has been triggered for the planning and implementation process of sub-projects under component 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. Exclusion of involuntary resettlement from project interventions (Avoidance) No sub-project will be approved where there is the possibility, however small, of forced eviction. MoUs, AoC and contracts will include standard clauses stating that target communities will not be involuntary resettled, also after the project. 2. Integration of resettlement considerations into project planning (Management / Avoidance) Involuntary resettlement 'triggers' have been included in the vulnerability assessment and the planning and management and monitoring process for implementing all components but especially the sub-projects under component 3. 3. Participatory consideration of climate-related resettlement (Management) Consideration of resettlement due to high risks related to climate change will involve the entire community and other relevant stakeholders. 4. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Sub-projects are being screened for this risk during the project. 5. Monitoring and governance arrangements (Management) Other possible safeguard measures include: • In depth monitoring of all action plans, project designs and project implementation. • In case of proposed resettlement, set up of community, local government and national committees to manage voluntary, fair and equitable resettlement.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact	1. Number of MoUs / AoCs with particular clauses

identified.	ruling out involuntary resettlement. 2. Number of community, local government and national committees to manage voluntary, fair and equitable resettlement.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. 0 2. 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Exclusion of involuntary resettlement from project interventions (Avoidance) During the reporting period, the project undertook technical site inspections, stakeholder consultations and participatory workshops to validate proposed interventions in the pilot settlements. The assessment process focused on identifying adaptation measures that could improve resilience while allowing communities to remain safely in place wherever feasible. Proposed interventions—including drainage improvements, elevated footpaths, retaining structures and improved access—were reviewed with this objective in mind. 2. Integration of resettlement considerations into project planning (Management / Avoidance) Resettlement considerations continued to be incorporated into the climate vulnerability assessment and adaptation planning process. Site inspections identified changing settlement conditions, exposure to flooding, drainage constraints and infrastructure needs, allowing proposed interventions to be refined while considering technical feasibility, climate risks and community priorities before implementation. 3. Participatory consideration of climate-related resettlement (Management) Community consultations, municipal workshops and technical discussions enabled local authorities, technical agencies and community representatives to jointly review adaptation options for each pilot settlement. This participatory process ensured that potential land and tenure considerations were discussed openly before infrastructure designs progressed. 4. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be screened through technical assessments, stakeholder consultations and site validation exercises to minimise any potential need for involuntary resettlement. No proposed intervention requiring involuntary resettlement was identified during the reporting period. 5. Monitoring and governance arrangements (Management) Project Management Committee oversight, technical coordination with the Ministry of Housing, municipal councils and relevant government agencies, together with continued stakeholder engagement, supported ongoing review of proposed interventions prior to implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. Site assessments confirmed that some settlements remain exposed to flooding, coastal processes and other climate hazards;

	however, no proposed intervention during the reporting period required involuntary resettlement or forced displacement. The project instead continued to prioritise adaptation measures that strengthen resilience while allowing communities to remain in place wherever technically feasible. Continued monitoring of land tenure and site conditions will be required as infrastructure designs are finalised.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue screening all proposed interventions to avoid involuntary resettlement wherever possible. Technical designs, vulnerability assessments and community consultations will continue to examine opportunities to reduce climate risks through in-situ adaptation measures before considering any relocation options. Should voluntary relocation become necessary to address unacceptable climate risks, it will only be considered following transparent consultation with affected communities, relevant government agencies and landowners, and in accordance with national legislation and the project's safeguard requirements.
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 not sited or designed adequately might have negative environmental impacts on natural habitats The initial screening and vulnerability assessment found that the risk of negative environmental impacts on natural habitats is low because interventions under component 3 will focus on enhancing ecosystems and developing infrastructure and services in urban locations where no natural habitats are present. However, this principle will still be screened for the planning and implementation process of sub-projects under component 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 (Management / Avoidance) Natural habitat 'triggers' (i.e. location, characteristic and value) have been included in the vulnerability assessment and the planning and management and monitoring process for implementing all components but especially the sub-projects under component 3 (also assessing up- and downstream impacts). 2. Compliance with environmental legislation and standards (Avoidance / Management) The project will ensure compliance to international and national plans and laws and standards by including standard clauses requiring the compliance with international

	and national plans and laws and standards in MoUs, AoC and contracts. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Sub-projects are being screened for this risk during the project.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Vulnerability assessments, action plans and project designs that consider ecosystems, ecosystem management and ecosystem-based adaptation.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Integration of natural habitat considerations into project planning (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, climate vulnerability assessments, municipal workshops and technical site inspections considered the interaction between the built environment and surrounding natural systems. Assessments examined drainage networks, waterways, flood-prone areas, coastal processes and existing green infrastructure to identify adaptation options that strengthen resilience while avoiding adverse impacts on natural habitats. Ecosystem-based adaptation approaches were considered alongside engineered solutions where appropriate. 2. Compliance with environmental legislation and standards (Avoidance / Management) Technical consultations with relevant national agencies, including the Ministry of Lands and Mineral Resources, Water Authority of Fiji, Fiji Roads Authority and other sector stakeholders, informed project planning and supported alignment with applicable environmental legislation, technical standards and planning requirements. These consultations helped ensure that future interventions will be developed in accordance with relevant national policies and environmental safeguards. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be screened through vulnerability assessments, technical reviews and stakeholder consultations to identify potential environmental impacts and opportunities to integrate ecosystem-based adaptation into project design. No interventions likely to result in significant adverse impacts on natural habitats were identified during the reporting period.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. The proposed interventions are located within existing urban and peri-urban settlements and primarily focus on improving drainage, access and climate resilience. No significant impacts on natural habitats were identified during the reporting period. Continued screening will nevertheless be undertaken during detailed design to ensure that future infrastructure activities avoid or minimise any indirect impacts on surrounding ecosystems.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that	The project will continue incorporating ecosystem

will be taken	considerations into vulnerability assessments, detailed design and sub-project screening. Technical coordination with relevant environmental and sector agencies will continue throughout implementation to ensure that interventions comply with national environmental legislation and, where appropriate, incorporate ecosystem-based adaptation measures that enhance resilience while protecting natural habitats.
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 lead to 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 because interventions under component 3 will focus on enhancing ecosystems and developing infrastructure and services in human settlements without major natural habitats. However, this principle will still be screened for the planning and implementation process of USP under component 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 (Management / Avoidance) Biological diversity ‘triggers’ have been included in the vulnerability assessment and the planning and management and monitoring process for implementing all components but especially the sub-projects under component 3 (also assessing up- and downstream impacts and consulting experts). 2. Capacity building on biodiversity conservation (Management) Project Managers to have read and understood the Convention prior to project implementation. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Sub-projects are being screened for this risk during the project.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Vulnerability assessments, action plans and project designs that consider ecosystems, ecosystem management and ecosystem-based adaptation.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Integration of biodiversity considerations into project planning (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, biodiversity considerations were incorporated into climate vulnerability assessments, municipal workshops and technical site inspections undertaken across the four participating municipalities. Assessments examined environmental conditions, drainage systems, waterways, coastal

	processes and ecosystem functions to identify adaptation measures that strengthen climate resilience while avoiding adverse impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services. 2. Capacity building on biodiversity conservation (Management) Technical workshops, stakeholder consultations and inter-agency coordination strengthened awareness of ecosystem-based adaptation and environmentally sustainable urban planning among participating institutions. Engagement with national ministries, technical agencies and municipal councils supported consideration of biodiversity conservation and ecosystem management within future adaptation planning and project design. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be screened through vulnerability assessments, technical reviews and stakeholder consultations to minimise potential impacts on biodiversity. No interventions likely to result in significant adverse impacts on biological diversity were identified during the reporting period.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. Project activities continued to focus on planning, vulnerability assessments and identification of adaptation measures within existing urban settlements. No significant impacts on biological diversity were identified during the reporting period. Continued screening during detailed design will ensure that future infrastructure interventions avoid or minimise any potential impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem functions.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue integrating biodiversity considerations into vulnerability assessments, detailed design and sub-project screening. Technical coordination with relevant government agencies and continued application of ecosystem-based adaptation principles will help ensure that future interventions protect biodiversity while strengthening climate resilience within the project areas.
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	1. Integration of climate change considerations into project planning (Management / Avoidance) Maladaptation and greenhouse gas ‘triggers’ have been included in the vulnerability assessment and the

safeguard measures by activity.	planning and management and monitoring process for implementing all components but especially the sub-projects under component 3. 2. Capacity building on climate change policies and guidelines (Management) Climate Change policies and guidelines to be explained to and understood by executing entities and project personnel prior to implementation and monitored by project manager.
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 that contribute to national climate change policies and programmes. 3. Project reporting that contributes to the NDC reporting. 4. Number of projects that specifically consider the climate change (mitigation and adaptation) co-benefits.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. 0 2. 0 3. 0 4. 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Integration of climate change considerations into project planning (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, climate change considerations formed the core of project implementation. Climate vulnerability assessments, municipal working sessions, stakeholder consultations and technical site inspections were undertaken across the four participating municipalities to identify climate hazards, assess exposure and vulnerability, and develop locally appropriate adaptation measures. Proposed interventions were reviewed to reduce flood risk, improve drainage, strengthen resilience to sea level rise and enhance climate resilience while avoiding maladaptation. 2. Capacity building on climate change policies and guidelines (Management) The project delivered a Training on Planning for Climate Change Adaptation in Urban Areas, attended by 33 participants representing national government, local government, service providers and civil society organisations. In addition, the project convened a workshop on the Urban Dimension of Fiji’s Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), strengthening understanding of the relationship between urban resilience, climate adaptation and national climate policy. These activities strengthened institutional capacity to apply climate-informed planning approaches and supported alignment with Fiji’s climate change policies and international commitments.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. During the reporting period, project activities focused on climate vulnerability assessments, adaptation planning and capacity building rather than physical implementation. No evidence of maladaptation or increased greenhouse gas emissions associated with

	project activities was identified. Proposed interventions continued to be refined through technical assessments and stakeholder consultations to maximise climate adaptation benefits and minimise unintended environmental impacts.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue integrating climate risk assessments into vulnerability assessments, detailed design and sub-project screening to ensure that future infrastructure investments contribute to long-term climate resilience while avoiding maladaptation. Capacity building on climate adaptation planning will continue throughout implementation, together with continued alignment of project outputs with Fiji’s climate change policies, National Adaptation Plan, Nationally Determined Contributions and other relevant national frameworks.
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 sub-projects under component 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. Promotion of local materials and resource-efficient construction (Mitigation / Management) The project will use local materials for construction where possible. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Sub-projects will be screened for this risk during the project.
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. 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Promotion of local materials and resource-efficient construction (Mitigation / Management) During the reporting period, technical assessments, municipal workshops and site inspections informed the identification and refinement of proposed adaptation interventions. Resource efficiency considerations formed part of implementation planning by promoting practical, locally appropriate solutions that can be delivered using available materials and

	construction approaches suited to the local context. Selection of construction materials will be finalised during the detailed design phase. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be screened through vulnerability assessments, technical reviews and stakeholder consultations to identify opportunities to minimise pollution and promote efficient use of resources during future implementation. As physical works had not yet commenced, these considerations remained integrated into the planning and design process.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. No pollution or inefficient resource use associated with project activities was identified during the reporting period, as physical infrastructure implementation had not yet commenced. Continued screening during detailed design will help minimise construction waste, promote efficient use of materials and identify opportunities to utilise locally available resources.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	Pollution prevention and resource efficiency considerations will continue to be integrated into detailed design, procurement and implementation planning. The project will promote the use of locally available materials where technically appropriate, minimise construction waste and continue screening proposed interventions to reduce potential environmental impacts 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 3 will focus on improving health and access to basic services. However, this principle will still be screened for the planning and implementation process of sub-projects under component 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 (Management / Avoidance) Health ‘triggers’ have been included in the vulnerability assessment and the planning and management and monitoring process for implementing all components but especially the sub-projects under component 3. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Sub-projects are being screened for this risk during the project.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact	1. Number of vulnerability assessments, action plans

identified.	and project designs that consider public health concerns.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Integration of public health considerations into project planning (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, public health considerations were integrated into the climate vulnerability assessments, municipal workshops and technical site inspections undertaken across the four participating municipalities. Stakeholder consultations identified climate-related public health risks associated with flooding, inadequate drainage, limited access, waterlogging and other infrastructure deficiencies, informing the identification and refinement of adaptation measures intended to improve community resilience and living conditions. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be screened through technical assessments, stakeholder consultations and vulnerability assessments to ensure that future infrastructure investments contribute positively to public health while avoiding unintended adverse impacts. Priority interventions—including drainage improvements, improved pedestrian access and related resilience measures—were reviewed to strengthen public health outcomes and reduce climate-related risks to communities.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. No adverse public health impacts associated with project activities were identified during the reporting period, as physical infrastructure implementation had not yet commenced. Instead, project planning focused on identifying interventions expected to reduce flood-related health risks and improve access to basic services. Continued monitoring will be undertaken during implementation to ensure that construction activities do not create temporary public health risks.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	Public health considerations will continue to inform vulnerability assessments, detailed design and sub-project implementation. Future interventions will continue to be screened to maximise public health benefits, particularly through improved drainage, safer access, reduced flood exposure and enhanced resilience of informal settlements. Construction activities will also be monitored to minimise temporary impacts on community health and safety.
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	Yes

impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
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 component 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 impacts on physical and cultural heritage (Avoidance) Ensure avoidance of project site location on or near a UNESCO World Heritage Site or other locally important heritage sites. 2. Integration of cultural heritage considerations into project planning (Management / Avoidance) Cultural heritage 'triggers' have been included in the vulnerability assessment and the planning and management and monitoring process for implementing all components but especially the unidentified sub-projects under component 3. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Sub-projects are being screened for this risk during the project.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Screened and assessed in tandem with the principle on Indigenous Peoples. 2. Percentage of workshops that involve representative numbers of all ethnic/cultural groups.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. 0 1. 0
Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Avoidance of impacts on physical and cultural heritage (Avoidance) During the reporting period, technical site inspections, stakeholder consultations and municipal workshops informed the refinement of proposed adaptation interventions across the four participating municipalities. Site selection and project planning continued to avoid known physical and cultural heritage sites while ensuring that proposed interventions remained appropriate to the local context. 2. Integration of cultural heritage considerations into project planning (Management / Avoidance) Consideration of physical and cultural heritage continued to be incorporated into the vulnerability assessment and adaptation planning process. Consultations with municipal councils, government agencies and local stakeholders supported the identification of local planning constraints and informed the refinement of proposed interventions prior to implementation. 3. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be screened through technical assessments, stakeholder consultations and site validation exercises. No physical or cultural heritage sites requiring specific mitigation measures were identified during the

	reporting period.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. No adverse impacts on physical or cultural heritage were identified during the reporting period. Project activities remained focused on planning, vulnerability assessments and site validation within existing urban settlements, and no known heritage sites were affected by proposed interventions.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	Physical and cultural heritage considerations will continue to be integrated into vulnerability assessments, detailed design and sub-project screening. Future interventions will continue to avoid impacts on known heritage sites, and any previously unidentified heritage features encountered during implementation will be managed in accordance with national legislation and project safeguard procedures.
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 leading to soil degradation or conversion of productive lands that provide valuable ecosystem services. The initial screening and vulnerability assessment found that the risk of soil degradation or conversion of productive lands that provide valuable ecosystem services is low because interventions under component 3 will focus on reducing degradation and ecosystem enhancement. However, this principle will still be screened for the planning and implementation process of sub-projects under component 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 (Management / Avoidance) Lands and soil ‘triggers’ have been included in the vulnerability assessment and the planning and management and monitoring process for implementing all components but especially the unidentified sub-projects under component 3. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Sub-projects are being screened for this risk during the project.
List the monitoring indicator(s) for each impact identified.	1. Number of vulnerability assessments, action plans and projects that consider land and soil conservation (in the context of urban agriculture, flood prevention, landslides etc.). 2. Number of training events that incorporate soil conservation, prevention of landslips etc.
State the baseline condition for each monitoring indicator	1. 0 2. 0

Describe each safeguard measure that has been implemented during the reporting period	1. Integration of land and soil conservation into project planning (Management / Avoidance) During the reporting period, climate vulnerability assessments, technical site inspections and stakeholder consultations considered land degradation, erosion, slope instability and flood-related impacts when identifying and refining adaptation measures. Proposed interventions—including improved drainage, retaining structures, slope stabilisation measures and community food gardens—were assessed for their potential to reduce erosion, improve stormwater management and strengthen long-term land stability. 2. Screening of project activities (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be screened through vulnerability assessments, technical reviews and site validation exercises to minimise potential impacts on land and soil resources. Site-specific conditions, including drainage patterns, erosion risks and topography, informed the refinement of proposed interventions prior to implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remain low. No adverse impacts on land or soil resources were identified during the reporting period, as physical infrastructure implementation had not yet commenced. Instead, project planning prioritised interventions intended to reduce erosion, improve drainage and strengthen resilience to flooding and slope instability. Continued monitoring during implementation will ensure that construction activities do not result in unnecessary soil disturbance or land degradation.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue integrating land and soil conservation considerations into vulnerability assessments, detailed design and sub-project screening. Future infrastructure interventions will incorporate appropriate erosion control, stormwater management and slope stabilisation measures where required, while construction activities will be monitored to minimise soil disturbance and protect surrounding land resources.

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	NA

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.	NA

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, strengthened implementation arrangements for the Environmental and Social Policy through dedicated technical support, stakeholder consultations, climate vulnerability assessments, municipal workshops, technical site inspections and Project Management Committee oversight. Although the Project-level Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) had not yet been developed during the reporting period, these arrangements informed project planning and subsequently contributed to the development of the ESMP. They also established the institutional and technical basis for the subsequent Environmental and Social Policy screening of the previously unidentified sub-projects (USPs) which would be undertaken once the proposed interventions are being finalized.
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 Ministry of Housing, as the Executing Entity, participated in stakeholder consultations, technical working sessions, municipal workshops, climate vulnerability assessments, site inspections and Project Management Committee meetings. The Ministry coordinated with municipal councils and relevant national agencies—including the Ministry of Local Government, the Climate Change Division, the Department of Town and Country Planning, the Ministry of Lands and Mineral Resources, Water Authority of Fiji, Fiji Roads Authority, Energy Fiji Limited and the iTaukei Land Trust Board—to integrate environmental and social considerations into the identification and refinement of proposed interventions prior to implementation. As the project-level Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) had not yet been developed during the reporting period, these arrangements informed project planning and subsequently contributed to the development of the ESMP. They also established the institutional and 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 and impacts?	Yes
Were grievances received during the reporting period?	No

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

Comments

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
Strengthened Awareness and ownership of adptation and climate risk reduction processes at the community level with particular emphasis on women, youth, older people and other people in vulnerable situtations.	Outcome	Percentage of targeted population aware of perdicted adverse impacts of climate change and of appropriate responses, disaggregated by gender and age.	0	Mid-term (30%), End 50%	Good
Community-based climate vulnerability and informal settlements assessments, including hazard maps, in target informal settlements.	Output	No. and type of risk reduction actoins or strategies introduced at local level - no. of assessments conducted. The assessments will look at gender differentiated vulnerabilities to climate risks.	0	16	Good
Community-level resilience, recoverya and upgrading plans developed in targeted informal settlements.	Output	No. and type of risk reduction actoins or strategies introduced at local level - no. of plans developed. Roles and Responsibilities of women are identified in the plans.	0	16	Good
Increased adaptive capacity with relevant development and natural resource sectors and increased ecosystem resilience in response to	Outcome	Physical infrastructure improved to withstand climate change and variability-induced stress (AF indicator 4.2.) and Ecosystem	0	6,000 (50% women)	Satisfactory

climate change and variability-induced stress		services and natural assets maintained or improved under climate change and variability-induced stress (AF indicator 5) - number of settlements, people and women that have access to improved or newly constructed resilient infrastructure and/or ecosystem services and natural resource			
Lessons learned and best practices regarding resilient urban community development/ housing are generated, captured and distributed to other communities, civil society, and policy-makers in government appropriate mechanisms	Output	No. and type of risk reduction actoins or strategies introduced at local level - no. of plans developed. Roles and Responsibilities of women are identified in the plans.	0	16	Good

Section 2: Quality during implementation and at exit

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

Gender equality and women's empowerment issues	Rated result for the reporting period	Provide justification of the rating provided
Female participation	Good	FRIS activities, such as workshops, encouraged women’s participation by providing specific materials and activities for children while mothers and parents attended sessions, including

		drawing and craft activities. The urban container farming pilot activities under FRIS were specifically requested by female-headed households as a way to support family-friendly income generation and subsistence farming opportunities. The initiative has been very well received by participants, and FRIS plans to further expand these activities through to the end of the project implementation period.
Women's economic empowermnet: many communities reported the challenging situation for women to combine formal employment and childcare/ family duties	Good	Referral to GBV hotline, staff attended a GBV training session and is now included in awareness sessions as part of capacity building
GBV mentioned by some participants during workshops	Good	Referral to GBV hotline, staff attended a GBV training session and is now included in awareness sessions as part of capacity building

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 Environmenat and Social Safeguards, Gender and Youth Strategy (ESGY) has been developed and Executing Entities have been trained. The project manager oversees project implemetation and ensures that the policy is upheld and outputs comply with the requirements. The FRIS participatory approach includes guidelines on how to adopt a gender based approach in the design and implementation of field activities (including conduction of workshops, etc.)
Have the implementation arrangements at the IE been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
What arrangements have been put in place by each Executing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP?	The Executing Entities have to comply with the ESGY strategy, ensure to collect gender disaggregated data, ensure women's representation and that the gender dimension of climate change is integrated in their work packages.
Have the implementation arrangements at the EE(s) been effective during the reporting period?	Yes
Have any capacity gaps affecting GP compliance been identified during the reporting period and if so, what remediation was implemented?	Yes **Comments:** While no major capacity gaps affecting compliance with the ESGY Strategy were identified, continued technical oversight and quality assurance were required as project activities resumed. UN-Habitat worked closely with the Ministry of Housing and project partners to ensure that stakeholder consultations, vulnerability assessments, site inspections and implementation planning were carried out in accordance with the ESGY Strategy and Environmental and Social Policy requirements.

Section 4: Grievances	
Was a grievance mechanism established capable and known to stakeholders to accept grievances and	Yes

complaints related to gender equality and women's empowerment?	
Were grievances received during the reporting period?	No

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

Comments

Rating

Implementing Entity

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Comments	Rating
1.1.1 Conducting city-wide risk and vulnerability assessment	Outcome 1, Outcome 2	Draft VRA of at least two towns delivered in August 2019. City-level activities on developing CVRA & climate action plans to be held in August 2023. Final city-wide CVRA to be completed by November 2025.	Delayed	Draft VRA of at least two towns delivered in August 2019. City-level activities on developing CVRA & climate action plans to be held in August 2023. Final city-wide CVRA to be completed by November 2025.	Marginally Satisfactory
1.2.1 Producing hazard maps	Outcome 1, Outcome 2	Perception hazard maps delivered in December 2019. DRR baselines delivered in August 2019. Final hazard maps will be completed by November 2025.	Delayed	Perception hazard maps delivered in December 2019. DRR baselines delivered in August 2019. Final hazard maps will be completed by November 2025.	Marginally Satisfactory
1.3.1 Developing city-wide climate change action plans	Outcome 1,	City-level activities on developing	Delayed	City-level activities on	Marginally Satisfactory

	Outcome 3	CVRA & climate action plans have been held in August 2023. A framework for city-level CVRAAP has been delivered in early 2024. Final city-wide climate action plan to be completed by November 2025.		developing CVRA & climate action plans have been held in August 2023. A framework for city-level CVRAAP has been delivered in early 2024. Final city-wide climate action plan to be completed by November 2025.	
1.4.1 Urban Planner / Resilience officer established	Outcome 1, Outcome 3	4 resilience officers were stationed in Councils between 2020 and 2021.	Completed		Highly Satisfactory
2.1.1 Develop assessment and planning tool	Outcome 1, Outcome 2	Final VAAP Tool delivered by August 2019.	Completed		Highly Satisfactory
2.2.1 Community based vulnerability assessment	Outcome 1, Outcome 2	16 Community-level vulnerability assessments and action plans delivered by March 2021.	Completed		Highly Satisfactory
2.3.1 Developing community-level resilience, recovery and upgrading plans in identified informal settlements (community action plans (CAPs)) supported by a ‘gender and inclusion assessment’ of the resulting actions to take forward into component 3.	Outcome 2	16 Community-level vulnerability assessments and action plans delivered by March 2021.	Completed		Highly Satisfactory
2.4.1 Involving targeted population groups in adaptation, risk reduction and awareness activities	Outcome 2	Awareness raising ongoing with 19 community-level trainings taking place until March 2021. Completion by November 2025.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
2.5.1 Community capacity development - resilient livelihoods	Outcome 6	Capacity development strategy delivered in March 2021. Awareness raising ongoing with 24 awareness raising sessions taking	Ontrack		Satisfactory

		place until March 2021. Completion by November 2025.			
3.1.1. Developing or strengthening currently vulnerable physical, natural, and social assets and ecosystems in response to climate change impacts, including variability, based on identified and prioritized needs as articulated in the community resilience strategy, with consideration of the following sectors and options (which are aligned with national priority sectors and options:3.1.1. Developing or strengthening currently vulnerable physical, natural, and social assets and ecosystems in response to climate change impacts, including variability, based on identified and prioritized needs as articulated in the community resilience strategy	Outcome 4	Preparation ongoing (selection of sub-projects based on community VAAPs completed, preparation of sub-projects proposal ongoing, implementation of infrastructure works by November 2025). Site visits and community consultations to re-validate options proposed in the CVRAAPs were carried between January and June 2024.	Delayed	Preparation ongoing (selection of sub-projects based on community VAAPs completed, preparation of sub-projects proposal ongoing, implementation of infrastructure works by November 2025). Site visits and community consultations to re-validate options proposed in the CVRAAPs were carried between January and June 2024.	Unsatisfactory
4.1.1 Lessons learned and best practices regarding resilient urban community development/ housing are generated, captured and distributed to other communities, civil society, and policy-makers in government appropriate mechanisms.	Outcome 8	Website established by Aug 2019. Advocacy material produced (months 12, 24, 36, 48) Ongoing: FB and Twitter accounts are active, advocacy material available. Newsletter produced.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
4.2.1 Regional Advocacy and replication	Outcome 7	Complete by May 2024. Contribution to the organization of the Pacific Urban Forum in 2019 and virtual Pacific Urban Forum in 2021 and Pacific Urban Forum 6 in September 2023; participation at high	Ontrack		Satisfactory

		level officials in tripartite conference in Brussels, presentation of FRIS and engagament in various regional conferences and seminars.			

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.

Overall project implementation improved during the reporting period following the resolution of key administrative constraints that had affected progress during previous reporting periods. While infrastructure implementation remained behind schedule, significant progress was achieved in advancing the technical preparation required for implementation. City-wide consultations, municipal workshops, climate vulnerability assessments, technical working sessions and site inspections enabled the project to validate and refine proposed interventions, strengthen coordination among national and local stakeholders, and improve alignment with community priorities and evolving climate risks. Outputs under Components 1, 2 and 4 continued to progress satisfactorily, while Component 3 remained delayed due to the additional technical work required to reassess intervention priorities and prepare infrastructure packages for implementation. Rather than proceeding with outdated proposals, the project prioritized updating site assessments and strengthening the technical evidence base to improve the quality, sustainability and climate resilience of future investments. Going forward, priority actions include completing the Environmental and Social Policy screening of the previously unidentified sub-projects (USPs), finalizing technical designs, initiating procurement and commencing infrastructure implementation. Continued coordination between UN-Habitat, the Ministry of Housing, municipal councils and technical agencies will remain essential to accelerate delivery while ensuring that interventions comply with national standards and the Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy.

Executing Entity / Project Coordinator

Project components/outcomes	**Alignment with AF outcomes**	**Expected Progress**	**Progress to date**	**Rating**	
1.1.1 Conducting city-wide risk and vulnerability assessment	Outcome 1, Outcome 2	Draft VRA of at least two towns delivered in August 2019. City-level activities on developing CVRA & climate action plans to be held in August 2023. Final city-wide CVRA to be completed by November 2025.	Delayed	Draft VRA of at least two towns delivered in August 2019. City-level activities on developing CVRA & climate action plans to be held in August 2023. Final	Marginally Satisfactory

				city-wide CVRA to be completed by November 2025.	
1.2.1 Producing hazard maps	Outcome 1, Outcome 2	Perception hazard maps delivered in December 2019. DRR baselines delivered in August 2019. Final hazard maps will be completed by November 2025.	Delayed	Perception hazard maps delivered in December 2019. DRR baselines delivered in August 2019. Final hazard maps will be completed by November 2025.	Marginally Satisfactory
1.3.1 Developing city-wide climate change action plans	Outcome 1, Outcome 3	City-level activities on developing CVRA & climate action plans have been held in August 2023. A framework for city-level CVRAAP has been delivered in early 2024. Final city-wide climate action plan to be completed by November 2025.	Completed		Highly Satisfactory
1.4.1 Urban Planner / Resilience officer established	Outcome 1, Outcome 3	4 resilience officers were stationed in Councils between 2020 and 2021.	Completed		Highly Satisfactory
2.1.1 Developing an assessment and planning tool for community vulnerability assessment and action planning.	Outcome 1, Outcome 2	Final VAAP Tool delivered by August 2019.	Completed		Highly Satisfactory
2.2.1 Community-based climate vulnerability and informal settlements assessments, including hazard maps, conducted, in informal settlements in Lami, Sigatoka, Nadi and Lautoka.	Outcome 1, Outcome 2	16 Community-level vulnerability assessments and action plans delivered by March 2021.	Completed		Highly Satisfactory
2.3.1 Developing community-level resilience, recovery and upgrading plans in identified informal settlements (community action plans (CAPs)) supported by a ‘gender and inclusion assessment’ of the resulting	Outcome 2	16 Community-level vulnerability assessments and action plans delivered by March 2021.	Completed		Highly Satisfactory

actions to take forward into component 3.					
2.4.1 Involving targeted population groups in adaptation, risk reduction and awareness activities	Outcome 2	Awareness raising ongoing with 19 community-level trainings taking place until March 2021. Completion by May 2024.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
2.5.1 Targeted household and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts	Outcome 6	Capacity development strategy delivered in March 2021. Awareness raising ongoing with 24 awareness raising sessions taking place until March 2021. Completion by November 2025.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
3.1.1. Developing or strengthening currently vulnerable physical, natural, and social assets and ecosystems in response to climate change impacts, including variability, based on identified and prioritized needs as articulated in the community resilience strategy, with consideration of the following sectors and options	Outcome 4	Preparation ongoing (selection of sub-projects based on community VAAPs completed, preparation of sub-projects proposal ongoing, implementation of infrastructure works by November 2025). Site visits and community consultations to re-validate options proposed in the CVRAAPs were carried between January and June 2024.	Delayed	Preparation ongoing (selection of sub-projects based on community VAAPs completed, preparation of sub-projects proposal ongoing, implementation of infrastructure works by November 2025). Site visits and community consultations to re-validate options proposed in the CVRAAPs were carried between January and June 2024.	Unsatisfactory
4.1.1 Lessons learned and best practices regarding resilient urban community development/ housing are generated, captured and distributed to other	Outcome 8	Website established by Aug 2019. Advocacy material produced (months 12, 24, 36, 48) Ongoing: FB and Twitter accounts are	Ontrack		Satisfactory

communities, civil society, and policy-makers in government appropriate mechanisms		active, advocacy material available. Newsletter produced.			
4.1.2 Regional Advocacy	Outcome 7	Complete by May 2024. Contribution to the organization of the Pacific Urban Forum in 2019 and virtual Pacific Urban Forum in 2021 and Pacific Urban Forum 6 in September 2023; participation at high level officials in tripartite conference in Brussels, presentation of FRIS and engagament in various regional conferences and seminars	Ontrack		Satisfactory

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

Name	Email	Institution
Manasa	Lesuma	manasa.lesuma@mhcd.gov.fj

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

The Ministry of Housing significantly strengthened implementation during the reporting period by leading stakeholder consultations, municipal workshops, technical working sessions and site inspections across the four target municipalities. Working closely with UN-Habitat and relevant national agencies, the Ministry coordinated the review of Community Action Plans, validated proposed interventions and incorporated updated information on settlement conditions, drainage, flooding and community priorities into project planning. Although infrastructure implementation had not yet commenced, these activities substantially improved the technical readiness of the project and established the basis for finalizing intervention packages and undertaking the subsequent Environmental and Social Policy screening of the previously unidentified sub-projects (USPs). The Ministry also strengthened coordination with municipal councils and sector agencies to facilitate future implementation and ensure compliance with national technical standards. The Ministry's priority for the next reporting period is to complete detailed technical designs, finalize USP screening, commence procurement and accelerate implementation of infrastructure works while maintaining strong coordination with UN-Habitat, local authorities and participating communities.

Other

Project components/outcomes	Alignment with AF outcomes	Expected Progress	Progress to date	Rating	
NA	Outcome 1	NA	Ontrack		Satisfactory

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.

Overall implementation performance improved during the reporting period, with the project transitioning from resolving administrative constraints to advancing technical implementation. Positive progress was achieved under Components 1 and 2 through the completion of extensive stakeholder consultations, technical working sessions, municipal workshops, climate vulnerability assessments and refinement of community resilience planning across the four target municipalities. Component 4 also remained on track through continued regional advocacy, knowledge exchange and support to the Pacific Urban Forum. However, Output 3.1 remained delayed as infrastructure implementation had not yet commenced. The principal risks affecting implementation continued to relate to delays in mobilizing infrastructure interventions following the project extension, evolving site conditions requiring technical reassessment, and the time required to coordinate multiple national agencies, municipal councils and communities before finalizing intervention packages. While these risks affected implementation timelines, they were managed through strengthened technical coordination, targeted stakeholder engagement and detailed site validation exercises undertaken during the reporting period. In response to the Mid-Term Review recommendations, the project strengthened implementation planning by undertaking comprehensive technical missions, reviewing and validating proposed interventions in each target municipality, expanding coordination with relevant national agencies and municipal councils, and ensuring that proposed infrastructure investments reflected updated climate risks, community priorities and technical requirements. These activities also established the technical basis for the subsequent Environmental and Social Policy screening of the previously unidentified sub-projects (USPs) and the development of the project Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) in later reporting periods. During the next reporting period, priority actions will focus on completing the Environmental and Social Policy screening of the previously unidentified sub-projects (USPs), finalizing detailed technical designs, mobilizing procurement processes and commencing construction of priority infrastructure interventions under Output 3.1. Continued coordination between UN-Habitat, the Ministry of Housing, municipal councils and technical agencies will remain essential to accelerate implementation while ensuring full compliance with national technical standards and the Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy.

Project Indicators

List of indicators

Type of Indicator (indicators towards Objectives, Outcomes, etc…)	Indicator	Baseline	Progress Since Inception	Target for Project End
Outcomes	1 Local capacity strengthened to build resilience based on	1 (Nadi)	1 (Nadi)	4 Local authorities integrate resilience in local planning

	relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to stakeholders in a timely manner			schemes 1
Outputs	1.1 No. and type of projects that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments – city-wide assessments	2 (Lami and Nadi)	2 (Lami and Nadi)	2 city-wide assessments (new) 2 assessments updated
Outputs	1.2 Number of Hazard maps produced – city-wide	1	1	4 city-wide (included relevant types of hazards)
Outputs	1.3 Number of city-wide climate change action plans developed	1	1	4
Outputs	1.4 Urban planner / Resilience officer established	0	4	4
Outcomes	2 Percentage of targeted population aware of predicted adverse impacts of climate change, and of appropriate responses – disaggregated by gender and age	0	2423 (64% of total target) of which 1043 are women (43% of total target)	3750 people (50 % of total beneficiaries) of which 875 are women (50% of total target)
Outputs	2.1 No. and type of risk reduction actions or strategies introduced at local level – number of assessment and planning tools developed	0	1	1
Outputs	2.2 "No. and type of risk reduction actions or strategies introduced at local level – number of assessments conducted The assessments will look at gender-differentiated vulnerabilities to climate risks "	0	16	16
Outputs	2.3 No. and type of risk reduction actions or strategies	0	16	16

	introduced at local level – number of plans developed			
Outputs	2.4 No. and type of risk reduction actions or strategies introduced at local level – number of target population people participating in assessments and awareness activities	0	25 Sessions 341 (231 women - 68%)	16 (at least one per settlement) Target population: 2640 (of which at least 50% of women)
Outputs	2.5 No. and type of risk reduction actions or strategies introduced at local level – number of trainings provided and target group people attending them	0	18 Trainings 235 (128 women - 54%)	16 (at least one per settlement) Target population: 1920 (of which at least 50% of women)
Outcomes	3 Physical infrastructure improved to withstand climate change and variability-induced stress and Ecosystem services and natural assets maintained or improved under climate change and variability-induced stress - number of settlements, people and women that have access to improved or newly constructed resilient infrastructure and/or ecosystem services and natural resources	0	0	6.000 people of which at least 50 percent women
Outputs	3.1 No. and type of health or social infrastructure developed or modified to respond to new conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by type)	To be defined at base-line	0	Details to be defined during the project - after community prioritization and selection of interventions
Outputs	3.1 No. of physical assets strengthened or constructed to	0	0	To be defined during the project - after community

	withstand conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by asset types)			prioritization and selection of interventions
Outputs	3.1 No. and type of natural resource assets created, maintained or improved to withstand conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by type of assets)	0	0	To be defined during the project - after community prioritization, selection of interventions and gender inclusion assessment
Outcomes	4 Project outcomes are of relevance to other stakeholders	0	6	4
Outputs	4.1 Total no of knowledge management products (number of Gender-specific lessons included)	0	40 (20 gender specific)	81 (52 gender specific)
Outputs	4.2 No of materials and presentations	0	5	4

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, implementation arrangements continued to be refined to strengthen the delivery of Component 3. Following the validation of proposed interventions through site inspections and stakeholder consultations, the Ministry of Housing, UN-Habitat and municipal councils organized a series of technical workshops to further review, prioritize and package interventions for implementation. These discussions enabled infrastructure proposals to be refined in response to updated settlement conditions, technical

		feasibility, municipal priorities and climate risks, strengthening implementation readiness while maintaining the project's original objectives and expected outcomes.
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been effective in avoiding unwanted negative impacts?	Challenges & Opportunities	Yes. Environmental and social safeguard measures continued to be effectively integrated into project planning throughout the reporting period. Technical workshops, stakeholder consultations, site inspections and coordination with relevant government agencies were used to identify and manage potential environmental and social risks while refining proposed interventions. As procurement and construction activities had not yet commenced, no significant environmental or social safeguard incidents or unintended negative impacts were identified during the reporting period. These arrangements also strengthened preparedness for the subsequent Environmental and Social Policy screening of the previously unidentified sub-projects prior to implementation.
How have gender considerations been taken into consideration during the reporting period? What have been the lessons learned as a consequence of inclusion of such considerations on project performance or impacts? List lessons learned specific to gender, detailing measures and project/programme-specific indicators highlighting the role of women as key actors in climate change adaptation.	Challenges & Opportunities	Gender considerations continued to be integrated into implementation planning and stakeholder engagement throughout the reporting period. Municipal technical workshops, community consultations and site visits promoted the participation of women alongside other community representatives in validating intervention priorities. Technical discussions considered the different impacts of climate change on women, men and vulnerable groups, particularly in relation to safe access, sanitation, drainage, community facilities and public spaces. Workshop participation records indicate that women

		represented approximately one-third of participants across the four municipal workshops, while women continued to play an active role in community consultations and implementation planning. These processes helped ensure that proposed interventions reflected inclusive priorities and supported equitable access to future project benefits.
Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays?	Challenges & Opportunities	While implementation progressed during the reporting period, Component 3 continued to experience delays associated with finalizing infrastructure intervention packages prior to procurement. Updated site inspections, municipal technical workshops and coordination with relevant government agencies identified the need to further refine intervention designs to reflect current settlement conditions, drainage constraints, technical feasibility and previous investments undertaken by other partners. Rather than proceeding with outdated proposals, the Ministry of Housing and UN-Habitat prioritized technical validation and stakeholder consensus to improve implementation quality and reduce delivery risks. These activities strengthened implementation readiness and prepared the project for procurement and subsequent infrastructure implementation.
What implementation issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected progress?	Challenges & Opportunities	The reporting period reinforced the importance of iterative planning and close coordination between national government, municipal councils, technical agencies and communities before infrastructure implementation. Municipal technical workshops proved particularly valuable in bringing together engineering, planning, environmental and service providers to jointly

		review proposed interventions and identify practical implementation constraints early in the process. The reporting period also demonstrated that combining technical assessments with community validation improves the quality, ownership and long-term sustainability of adaptation interventions, while reducing the likelihood of costly design changes during implementation.

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?	The reporting period demonstrated that effective climate adaptation requires continuous collaboration between national government, municipal councils, technical agencies and communities throughout implementation planning. Extensive consultations, municipal workshops, technical working sessions and site inspections confirmed that adaptation priorities remain dynamic and benefit from iterative review before implementation. The reporting period also reinforced that integrating technical expertise from multiple sectors—including planning, transport, water, energy, land management and climate change—improves the quality, feasibility and sustainability of proposed adaptation measures. These collaborative processes strengthened implementation readiness while maintaining alignment with community priorities.
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?	NA
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	NA

environmental and social aspects in developing and implementing concrete projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	
Concrete Adaptation Interventions	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in implementing concrete adaptation interventions that would be relevant to the design and implementation of future projects/programmes implementing concrete adaptation interventions?	Although construction activities had not yet commenced, the reporting period generated important lessons regarding preparation of climate adaptation investments. Site inspections and consultations demonstrated that intervention priorities should be revisited before implementation to account for changing settlement conditions, previous investments by other partners, evolving community priorities and technical feasibility. Working directly with municipal councils and technical agencies also strengthened local ownership and improved coordination for future implementation. The reporting period highlighted that investing sufficient time in implementation planning and technical validation reduces implementation risks and provides a stronger foundation for successful delivery of adaptation infrastructure.
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?	The collaborative planning approach adopted during the reporting period, including community consultations, municipal technical workshops, multi-agency coordination and site validation, provides a practical model for designing climate adaptation investments in informal settlements elsewhere in Fiji. The approach demonstrates how community priorities can be combined with technical review to produce more robust and implementable adaptation investments.
Knowledge Management	
How has existing information/data/knowledge been used to inform project development and implementation? What kinds of information/data/knowledge were used?	Existing information was used to support the development of the Local Climate Action Planning Framework and refinement of proposed climate-resilient infrastructure interventions. The project drew on community vulnerability assessments, Community Action Plans (CAPs), the VAAP methodology, available spatial datasets, hazard information, municipal planning documents, engineering information, and field verification undertaken through site inspections and stakeholder consultations. The city-level workshops provided an important platform for validating available information, identifying remaining data gaps and strengthening the technical basis for subsequent local climate action planning.
Has the existing information/data/knowledge been made available to relevant stakeholder? If so, what chanels of dissemination have been used?	Yes. Existing information and project-generated knowledge were shared through city-level workshops, Project Management Committee meetings, technical working sessions, stakeholder consultations, field visits and coordination meetings with national agencies and municipal councils. These forums supported the collaborative development of the Local Climate Action Planning Framework and informed implementation planning and infrastructure prioritization.
Please list any knowledge products generated and include hyperlinks whenever posssible	Relevant publications can be found here: https://fukuoka.unhabitat.org/en/?s&category_name=related-

(e.g. project videos, project stories, studies and technical reports, case studies, tranining manuals, handbooks, strategies and plans developed, etc.)	publications&tag=fiji
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	The project's learning objectives continued to be progressively achieved during the reporting period. Three learning objectives were substantially achieved: * Improved understanding of implementation requirements for climate-resilient infrastructure through technical working sessions, municipal workshops and site inspections; * Strengthened institutional coordination between national ministries, municipal councils, utility providers and other stakeholders involved in project implementation; and * Improved validation of community priorities through stakeholder consultations and field verification of proposed interventions. Several learning objectives made significant progress and are expected to be fully achieved during implementation: * Improved integration of climate change considerations into municipal planning and infrastructure prioritization; * Improved technical understanding of locally appropriate climate adaptation measures through training on Planning for Climate Change Adaptation in Urban Areas and the Urban Dimension of NDC workshop; * Improved knowledge sharing between national agencies, municipal councils and communities through workshops, technical meetings and Project Management Committee discussions; and * Strengthened implementation readiness for climate-resilient infrastructure investments. Learning objectives related to on-the-ground implementation remain partially achieved, as construction activities had not yet commenced during the reporting period. These include: * Demonstration of climate-resilient infrastructure interventions; * Generation of implementation lessons from completed adaptation investments; and * Documentation of operational lessons on infrastructure construction, maintenance and long-term resilience outcomes.
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.	While significant progress was made in compiling and validating existing information during the city-level workshops, several datasets requested from national agencies and municipal councils had not yet been fully retrieved during the reporting period. In particular, some spatial, planning and infrastructure datasets remained incomplete or unavailable, requiring the project to rely on multiple information sources and field verification to support planning. These remaining data gaps will need to be addressed to strengthen the evidence base for the Local Climate Action Planning Framework and subsequent implementation of infrastructure interventions. Future projects would benefit from establishing formal data-sharing agreements early in implementation, adopting common geospatial data standards across institutions, and strengthening centralized data management systems to improve the accessibility and interoperability of climate, planning and infrastructure information.
Has the identification of learning objectives	Yes. The identification of learning objectives has helped

contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	guide project implementation by ensuring that technical studies, stakeholder engagement and capacity development activities remained focused on the knowledge required to deliver climate-resilient interventions. During the reporting period, learning objectives informed the development of the Local Climate Action Planning Framework through city-level workshops, strengthened coordination between national agencies and municipal councils, and supported the validation of community priorities and proposed infrastructure interventions. Although physical implementation had not yet commenced, these learning processes strengthened institutional capacity, improved implementation readiness and established a stronger evidence base for subsequent infrastructure delivery.
Innovation	
Describe any innovative practices or technologies that figured prominently in this project.	None at this stage.
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 at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	6000	50	30
Target performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	124655	49.99	36.85
Target performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	130655	49.995000000000005	33.425
Performance at mid-term	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	2423	43	32
Performance at mid-term	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	175344	51.94	36
Performance at mid-term	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	177767	47.47	34
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			Inland flooding	
Performance at completion				

Output 1.1 Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated

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

	No. of projects/programme that conduct and update risk and vulnerability	Sector	Scale	Status

	assessments			
Baseline information	2	Multi-sector	Local	2: Undertaking or updating of assessments in progress
Target performance at completion	4	Multi-sector	Local	3: Risk and vulnterability assessments completed or updated
Performance at mid-term	4	Multi-sector	Local	2: Undertaking or updating of assessments in progress
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	0	4: Response capability		Local	0
Target performance at completion	16	4: Response capability	Hurricane	Local	4
Performance at mid-term			Hurricane		
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	14	50	Multi-sector	2: Low capacity
Target performance at completion	14	50	Multi-sector	4: High capacity
Performance at mid-term	6	80	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	14	50	Public
Performance at mid-term	6	80	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	Public	Local	Multi-sector	2: Low capacity
Target performance at completion	Public	Local	Multi-sector	4: High capacity
Performance at mid-term	Public	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	0	Local	Multi-sector	1: No capacity
Target performance at completion	4	Local	Multi-sector	3: Medium capacity
Performance at mid-term		Local	Multi-sector	
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	25	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	2: Partially not aware
Target performance at completion	6000	50	5: Fully aware
Performance at mid-term	2423	43	4: Mostly 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	
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	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strenghtened))	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))	
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		Urban development
Baseline information	0		Disaster risk reduction
Baseline information	0		Multi-sector
Target performance at completion	4		Urban development
Target performance at completion	4		Disaster risk reduction
Target performance at completion	16		Multi-sector
Performance at mid-term	0		Urban development
Performance at mid-term	0		Disaster risk reduction
Performance at mid-term	16		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	Land
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	Mangroves	3	ha rehabilitated	1: Ineffective
Baseline information	Catchment area/Watershed/Aquifer	1	ha rehabilitated	1: Ineffective
Target performance at completion	Mangroves	3	ha rehabilitated	4: Effective
Target performance at completion	Catchment area/Watershed/Aquifer	3	ha rehabilitated	4: Effective
Performance at mid-term				
Performance at completion				

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

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

	No. of targeted households	% of female headed households	Improvement level
Baseline information	0	0	1: No improvement
Target performance at completion	300	50	4: High improvement
Performance at mid-term	60	68	3: Moderate improvement
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	0			
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	3: Some
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	Multi-sector	National	Other policy
Target performance at completion	4	Multi-sector	Local	Urban policy
Performance at mid-term	2	Urban development	National	
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			