Project Performance Report

Overview

Period of Report (Dates)	7/10/2024 - 7/10/2025
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	11/26/2024
Implementing Entity	Roi Chiti	roi.chiti@un.org	5/31/2025
Government(s) DA	Sivendra Michael	Sivendra.michael@environment.gov.fj	1/1/2024
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 - PPR7: $594,623.50
Investment Income ($)	$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	$0.00
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	$0.00
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	$0.00
3.1 Physical, natural, and social assets and ecosystems developed or strengthened in response to climate change impacts	$0.00
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 ($)	$135.17
Execution cost ($)	$0.00

Planned Expenditure Schedule

Output	Projected Cost ($)	Estimated Completion Date
1.1 City-wide (updated) risk and vulnerability assessment conducted for participating towns	$9,899.67	7/11/2026
1.2 Hazard maps produced	$0.00	7/11/2026
1.3 City-wide climate change action plans developed for participating towns	$0.00	7/11/2026
1.4 Urban planner/resilience officer established in three towns	$0.00	7/11/2026
2.1 Assessment and planning tool for community vulnerability assessment and action planning developed	$0.00	7/11/2026
2.2 Community-based climate vulnerability and informal settlements assessments	$0.00	7/11/2026
2.3. Community-level resilience, recovery and upgrading plans developed in identified informal settlements	$0.00	7/11/2026
2.4 Awareness raising activities for targeted population groups	$0.00	7/11/2026
2.5 Training of targeted household and communities	$0.00	7/11/2026
3.1 Physical, natural, and social assets and ecosystems developed or strengthened in response to climate change impacts	$240,168.92	7/11/2026
4.1 Lessons learned and best practices regarding resilient urban community development/housing are generated, captured and distributed	$0.00	7/11/2026
4.2 Regional Advocacy and replication	$0.00	7/11/2026

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 works had not substantially commenced; however, site inspections identified climate, drainage and access constraints affecting some proposed interventions. Mitigation: Site assessments and consultations were used to update interventions to current conditions, with relevant technical agencies engaged in design and planning.
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: Government commitment remained strong, but implementation capacity was constrained by staffing gaps and the institutional/contractual issues affecting the overarching AoC. Mitigation: The Ministry continued project preparation, coordination with councils and partners, and worked closely with UN-Habitat to resolve the AoC issues, which were successfully addressed by June 2025.
3. Institutional: Capacity constraints of local institutions may limit the effective implementation of interventions	Moderate	Status: Capacity constraints remained, particularly following the end of the Resilience Officers' mandates and limited dedicated project staffing. Mitigation: Technical support, council engagement and capacity-building continued, while arrangements were developed to strengthen implementation capacity through the Ministry, councils and technical partners.
4. Institutional/social Lack of commitment/buy-in from local communities may result in delay at intervention sites	Low	Status: Community support remained strong, with communities continuing to participate in consultations and identification of priority interventions. Mitigation: Site inspections and consultations with communities and councils were used to validate and update proposed interventions.

5. Institutional/social: Disagreement amongst stakeholders with regards to adaptation measures (infrastructure) and site selection	Low	Status: Changes in site conditions required adjustment of some proposed interventions, but no significant stakeholder disagreements were encountered. Mitigation: Interventions were reviewed jointly with communities, councils and technical agencies to ensure they reflected current needs and site conditions.
6. Institutional: Communities may not adopt activities during or after the AF project, including infrastructure maintenance	Low	Status: Community engagement remained positive, although arrangements for longer-term maintenance will need to be strengthened as infrastructure implementation progresses. Mitigation: Communities and councils continued to participate in intervention planning, with maintenance considerations incorporated into discussions and designs.
7. Financial: Complexity of financial management and procurement. Certain administrative processes could delay the project execution or could lack integrity	High	Status: Financial risk remained high. Issues affecting the overarching UN-Habitat–Ministry AoC resulted in no expenditure during the reporting period and delayed further implementation. Mitigation: UN-Habitat and the Ministry worked to resolve the AoC issues, successfully addressed by June 2025. The Ministry also finalized the deliverables required to trigger the fourth tranche of almost USD 1 million.
8. Institutional: Delays in project implementation, and particularly in the development of infrastructure interventions	High	Status: Implementation delays remained a major risk, with physical works not yet progressing at the required scale. Mitigation: Despite the AoC constraint, the Ministry continued preparing implementation arrangements with USP and the four municipal councils and advanced technical planning for resilience interventions.
9. Institutional: A lack of coordination between and within national government Ministries and Departments	High	Status: Coordination remained challenging following the separation of Housing and Local Government into two ministries and changes in key government counterparts. Mitigation: The PMC, technical meetings and regular engagement between the Ministry, MLG, NDA, councils and UN-Habitat continued to support coordination and clarify responsibilities.
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: Approvals and land-related requirements remained a moderate risk due to the number of institutions involved and site-specific requirements. Mitigation: The Ministry continued coordination with councils, Lands, Public Works and other agencies to address approvals, land issues and technical requirements during intervention planning.

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. Risk mitigation measures were actively employed during the reporting period, including sustained coordination between UN-Habitat and the Ministry of Housing to resolve issues affecting the overarching Agreement of Cooperation (AoC); continued preparation of implementation arrangements with USP and the four municipal councils; technical coordination and site-level consultations; and completion of the requirements necessary to trigger the fourth tranche of project funding. These measures resulted in important progress, particularly the successful resolution of the overarching AoC issues towards the end of the reporting period in June 2025. However, the principal financial and implementation risks had not yet substantially reduced by the end of the reporting period, as no expenditure was recorded and physical implementation remained behind schedule. Inter-ministerial coordination and institutional capacity also remained important constraints. The mitigation measures undertaken during PPR7 therefore primarily established the institutional, contractual and financial conditions necessary for these risks to be reduced during the subsequent implementation 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 management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Insufficient alignment with laws and technical standards, especially related to implementation of concrete interventions under 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. Continued technical and regulatory screening (Avoidance) Building on the screening undertaken during previous reporting periods, proposed infrastructure interventions continued to be reviewed through site inspections, technical discussions and coordination with relevant ministries, municipal councils and technical agencies. This ensured that changing site conditions and applicable planning, land and technical requirements were considered before implementation. 2. Validation and adjustment of interventions (Avoidance / Management) Site inspections and stakeholder consultations were used to reassess proposed interventions against current conditions. Where required, intervention packages were adjusted to address issues such as drainage constraints, high-tide flooding, settlement congestion, existing infrastructure and other site-specific considerations. 3. Institutional and technical coordination (Management) Although physical implementation was constrained during the reporting period, coordination continued between the Ministry of Housing, municipal councils, UN-Habitat and relevant technical agencies to prepare interventions for implementation and identify outstanding technical, regulatory and approval requirements.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remained low. No substantial infrastructure works were undertaken during the reporting period due to the institutional and financial constraints affecting implementation. Consequently, no significant legal or regulatory non-compliance was identified. Continued screening and site validation helped ensure that proposed interventions remained consistent with applicable requirements, although some site-specific approvals and technical clearances will be required as works progress.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	As implementation resumes following resolution of the overarching AoC issues, the project will ensure that all interventions are screened against applicable legal, planning and technical requirements prior to construction. Outstanding site-specific approvals and clearances will be addressed in coordination with municipal councils and relevant government and technical agencies.
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	Yes

assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Unequal distribution among target population / 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. Continued inclusive consultation and planning (Avoidance) Community representatives, municipal councils and relevant stakeholders continued to be engaged through site inspections and consultations to validate priority interventions and ensure that changing community needs and site conditions were reflected in project planning. 2. Integration of access and equity considerations (Avoidance / Management) Proposed interventions continued to be reviewed to ensure that project benefits would respond to identified vulnerabilities and remain accessible to different groups within the target communities. Adjustments to proposed interventions were made where necessary based on community feedback and current site conditions. 3. Screening of interventions (Management / Avoidance) Technical and participatory review of proposed interventions continued prior to implementation, helping to

	identify potential access or equity concerns and reduce the risk of exclusion or unequal distribution of project benefits.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remained low. Community engagement continued despite delays in physical implementation, and no significant access or equity concerns were identified. However, as infrastructure works had not substantially commenced, equitable access to the resulting project benefits could not yet be fully assessed and will require continued monitoring during implementation.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue inclusive community engagement as interventions move into implementation, with particular attention to women, youth, older persons, persons with disabilities and other potentially vulnerable groups. Access to and distribution of project benefits will be monitored as infrastructure works progress, and interventions will be adjusted where necessary to address identified barriers or inequities.
3.Marginalized and vulnerable Groups	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Imposing any disproportionate adverse impacts on marginalized and vulnerable groups including children, women and girls, the elderly, indigenous people, tribal groups, displaced people, refugees, people living with disabilities, and people living with HIV/AIDS. This principle has been triggered for the planning and implementation process of 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 and site validation (Avoidance) Community consultations and site inspections continued to consider the needs and priorities of different groups within the target settlements, including women, children, older persons, persons with disabilities and other potentially vulnerable groups. Community representatives and councils participated in validating proposed interventions against current needs and site conditions. 2. Integration of social vulnerability into planning (Management / Avoidance) Social vulnerability considerations continued to inform the review and refinement of proposed resilience interventions. Changes to interventions were considered where necessary to ensure that future investments remained responsive to community needs and did not disproportionately disadvantage vulnerable groups. 3. Continued screening of interventions (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be screened through technical review and stakeholder consultation before implementation, including consideration of potential impacts on vulnerable groups and equitable access to anticipated project benefits.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remained low. No adverse impacts on marginalized or vulnerable groups were identified during the reporting period. As substantial physical implementation had not yet commenced, monitoring remained focused on participation, planning and ensuring that proposed interventions appropriately considered social vulnerability. Continued monitoring will be required as infrastructure implementation progresses.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue to consider the needs of vulnerable groups during detailed planning and implementation. Participation and access to project benefits will be monitored, and targeted consultation will be undertaken where potential gaps or barriers are identified.
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	Yes

impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	
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) Community consultations, site inspections and technical reviews continued to support inclusive planning and consideration of issues related to adequate housing, access to basic services, safety and climate resilience. 2. Safeguard screening and oversight (Management) Proposed interventions continued to be screened for environmental and social risks prior to implementation. Coordination between the Ministry of Housing, UN-Habitat, councils and communities supported continued alignment with the Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy and applicable human rights principles.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remained low. No human rights concerns or project-related grievances were identified during the reporting period. As substantial physical implementation had not yet commenced, monitoring remained focused on planning, consultation and safeguard screening. Continued monitoring will be required as infrastructure activities progress.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	Human rights considerations will continue to be integrated into community consultation, detailed planning and infrastructure implementation. Safeguard monitoring and stakeholder engagement will be maintained to identify and address any potential impacts or grievances as implementation

	progresses.
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. Gender-responsive consultation and planning (Avoidance / Management) Community consultations, site inspections and planning activities continued to promote inclusive participation and consider the different needs and priorities of women and men in the target settlements. 2. Integration of gender considerations into intervention planning (Management / Avoidance) Proposed resilience interventions continued to be reviewed through community and technical consultations, with gender and social inclusion considerations informing the validation and refinement of intervention priorities.

Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remained low. No adverse gender-related impacts were identified during the reporting period. Previous gender-disaggregated monitoring demonstrated participation by both women and men, although opportunities remain to strengthen women's participation as implementation progresses. As substantial infrastructure implementation had not yet commenced, equitable access to the resulting project benefits will require continued monitoring.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue promoting the meaningful participation of women throughout planning and implementation and, where feasible, maintain gender-disaggregated monitoring. Particular attention will be given to ensuring that women can participate in decision-making and benefit equitably from resilience investments.
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. Integration of labour standards into implementation arrangements (Avoidance / Management) As implementation arrangements with USP, municipal councils and other partners were developed, applicable labour standards and safeguard requirements continued to be incorporated into project planning and contractual arrangements. 2. Occupational health and safety planning (Management) Although substantial infrastructure works had not yet commenced, occupational health and safety requirements continued to be considered in preparation for implementation, including requirements to be applied during construction and site management. 3. Safeguard screening (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be screened to ensure that relevant labour and occupational health and safety requirements would be addressed prior to implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remained low. No significant project-related labour or occupational health and safety incidents were identified during the reporting period. As substantial infrastructure implementation had not yet commenced, labour and OHS risks remained limited but will require increased monitoring once works accelerate.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	Applicable labour standards and occupational health and safety requirements will continue to be incorporated into implementation arrangements and contracts. Compliance will be monitored as infrastructure works commence, with any identified issues addressed through the relevant Ministry, council or implementing partner arrangements.
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	1. Inclusive consultation with indigenous communities (Avoidance) Consultations have and

that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	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 and culturally appropriate consultation (Avoidance) Community consultations and site inspections continued to ensure that local priorities, including those of iTaukei communities, were considered in the validation and refinement of proposed resilience interventions. 2. Consideration of land and customary interests (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be reviewed for relevant land and customary considerations. Coordination with municipal councils and relevant authorities supported identification of land-related requirements before implementation. 3. Screening of interventions (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be screened through technical assessments and stakeholder consultations to identify potential impacts on Indigenous communities and ensure that activities remained responsive to local priorities.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remained low. No significant adverse impacts on Indigenous communities were identified during the reporting period. As substantial infrastructure implementation had not yet commenced, continued monitoring of land-related considerations, culturally appropriate engagement

	and equitable access to project benefits will be required as implementation progresses.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	The project will continue culturally appropriate engagement with affected communities and relevant institutions during detailed planning and implementation. Land and customary considerations will continue to be screened before works commence, with additional consultation undertaken where required.
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 identified.	1. Number of MoUs / AoCs with particular clauses 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. Avoidance of involuntary resettlement (Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to prioritize in-situ resilience measures that enable communities to remain safely in place wherever feasible. Site inspections and consultations were used to validate interventions and identify any potential land, access or displacement implications before implementation. 2. Screening and participatory planning (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be screened through technical assessments and community and council consultations. Where site conditions or priorities had changed, interventions were refined to minimize potential impacts and avoid involuntary resettlement or displacement.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remained low. No proposed intervention requiring involuntary resettlement or forced displacement was identified during the reporting period. While some settlements remain exposed to flooding and other climate hazards, the project continued to prioritize in-situ adaptation measures. Land tenure, access and potential displacement risks will continue to be monitored as interventions progress to implementation.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	All interventions will continue to be screened for potential displacement or resettlement impacts before implementation. In-situ adaptation will remain the preferred approach wherever technically feasible. Any emerging land or displacement concerns will be addressed through consultation with affected communities and relevant authorities and in accordance with applicable 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. Environmental screening of proposed interventions (Avoidance / Management) Site inspections and technical reviews continued to consider drainage systems, waterways, flood-prone areas, coastal processes and surrounding natural systems when validating and refining proposed interventions. 2. Integration of natural habitat considerations into planning (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be screened for potential impacts on natural habitats and opportunities to incorporate appropriate ecosystem-based approaches. Adjustments were made where necessary to respond to current environmental and site conditions.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remained low. Proposed interventions remained primarily within existing urban and peri-urban settlements, and no interventions likely to result in significant adverse impacts on natural habitats were identified during the reporting period. Continued environmental screening will be required as interventions move into implementation.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	Environmental screening will continue during detailed design and prior to implementation. Where

	potential impacts on waterways, coastal areas or other natural systems are identified, appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures will be incorporated in consultation with relevant technical and environmental authorities.
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. Biodiversity considerations in intervention planning (Avoidance / Management) Technical reviews and site inspections continued to consider environmental conditions, waterways, drainage systems and ecosystem functions when proposed interventions were validated and refined. 2. Screening of proposed interventions (Avoidance / Management) Proposed interventions continued to be screened for potential impacts on biodiversity as part of technical and environmental review. No activities likely to result in significant adverse impacts on biological diversity were identified.

Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remained low. Activities during the reporting period were primarily focused on planning and preparation within existing urban and peri-urban settlements, and no significant impacts on biological diversity were identified. Continued screening will be required as interventions progress into physical implementation.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	Biodiversity considerations will continue to be incorporated into intervention screening and detailed design. Where potential impacts are identified, appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures will be incorporated before implementation in coordination with relevant authorities.
11.Climate change	
Are environmental or social risks present as per table II.K (II.L for REG) of the proposal?	Yes
During project/programme formulation, an impact assessment was carried out for the risks identified. Have impacts been identified that require management actions to prevent unacceptable impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	Project activities cause maladaptation either in the project sites or upstream or downstream or increase greenhouse gases.
List here the safeguard measures (i.e. avoidance, management or mitigation) identified for each impact that are supposed to be (or had to be) implemented during the reporting period. Please break down the safeguard measures by activity.	1. Integration of climate change considerations into project planning (Management / Avoidance) Maladaptation and greenhouse gas ‘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. 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. Continued integration of climate risk into intervention planning (Management / Avoidance) Climate risk remained central to the review and refinement of proposed interventions. Site inspections and technical consultations considered flooding, drainage, coastal exposure and other

	climate hazards to ensure that interventions responded to current and projected risks. 2. Screening of interventions (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be screened to minimize maladaptation and ensure consistency with the project’s climate resilience objectives.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remained low. No evidence of maladaptation or significant additional greenhouse gas emissions associated with project activities was identified. As substantial physical implementation had not yet commenced, continued climate-risk screening will be required as interventions move into implementation.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	Climate-risk considerations will continue to inform detailed design and implementation, with interventions reviewed to ensure that they strengthen long-term resilience and avoid maladaptation.
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. Resource efficiency and pollution considerations in planning (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be reviewed with consideration of efficient use of materials, construction feasibility and potential pollution or waste impacts. 2. Screening of proposed activities (Management / Avoidance) Technical reviews continued to identify opportunities to minimize

	construction waste and environmental impacts before physical implementation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remained low. As substantial infrastructure works had not commenced, no significant pollution, construction waste or inefficient resource use associated with project activities was identified.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	Pollution prevention, waste management and resource efficiency requirements will be incorporated into detailed design, procurement and implementation arrangements as works commence.
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 identified.	1. Number of vulnerability assessments, action plans 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 intervention planning (Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to consider public health risks associated with flooding, inadequate drainage, waterlogging, unsafe access and infrastructure deficiencies. 2. Screening of interventions (Management / Avoidance) Site inspections and consultations supported the refinement of interventions intended to improve drainage, access and settlement resilience while avoiding unintended public health impacts.
Describe the residual impact for each impact	Residual impacts remained low. No adverse public

identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	health impacts associated with project activities were identified. As physical implementation remained limited, monitoring focused primarily on ensuring that proposed interventions would contribute positively to community health and safety.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	Public health considerations will continue to inform detailed design and implementation, particularly regarding drainage, flood exposure, safe access and construction-related community 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 impacts? (as per II.K/II.L)	Yes
List the identified impacts for which safeguard measures are required (as per II.K/II.L)	The initial screening and vulnerability assessment did not identify cultural heritage sites. The community-level vulnerability assessments did not identify cultural sites which exist in the targeted areas and that might be affected by project activities. However, this principle is still being screened for the planning and implementation process of activities under 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. Screening for physical and cultural heritage (Avoidance) Proposed interventions continued to be reviewed through site inspections and stakeholder consultations to identify and avoid potential impacts on known physical or cultural heritage. 2. Integration into site planning (Management / Avoidance) Local context and relevant cultural considerations continued to inform site selection and refinement of

	proposed interventions.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remained low. No known physical or cultural heritage sites requiring specific mitigation were identified as being affected by proposed project interventions during the reporting period.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	Heritage considerations will continue to be screened before implementation. Any previously unidentified heritage features encountered during works will be managed in accordance with applicable national requirements and project safeguards.
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 considerations into intervention planning (Management / Avoidance) Site inspections and technical reviews continued to consider erosion, drainage, slope stability, flooding and other land-related conditions when refining proposed interventions. 2. Screening of interventions

	(Management / Avoidance) Proposed interventions were reviewed against site-specific topography, drainage patterns and erosion risks to minimize unnecessary soil disturbance or land degradation.
Describe the residual impact for each impact identified - if any - using the monitoring indicator(s)	Residual impacts remained low. No significant adverse impacts on land or soil resources were identified, as substantial physical implementation had not yet commenced. Continued monitoring will be required during construction.
Describe remedial action for residual impacts that will be taken	Land and soil conservation considerations will continue to inform detailed design and implementation, including appropriate drainage, erosion control and slope stabilization measures where required.

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.	

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 Implementing Entity, continued to provide technical oversight and support for application of the Environmental and Social Policy through technical review, stakeholder coordination and Project Management Committee oversight. Proposed interventions and implementation arrangements continued to be reviewed to ensure environmental and social considerations were incorporated prior to physical implementation. During the reporting period, implementation was constrained by issues affecting the overarching Agreement of Cooperation with the Ministry of Housing. Nevertheless, UN-Habitat continued working with the Ministry to resolve these issues and prepare the institutional and contractual arrangements required for implementation. The AoC issues were successfully addressed towards the end of the reporting period, providing the basis for implementation to accelerate.

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 continued to coordinate with municipal councils, communities and relevant technical agencies to validate proposed interventions and address environmental, social, land and technical considerations prior to implementation. Site-level and technical planning informed the preparation of implementation arrangements with USP for Component 1 and the municipal councils for Component 3.
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 disaggregati 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	0	16	Good

		developed. Roles and Responsibilities of women are identified in the plans.			
Increased adaptive capacity with relevant development and natural resource sectors and increased ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress	Outcome	Physical infrastructure improved to withstand climate change and variability-induced stress (AF indicator 4.2.) and Ecosystem 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	0	6,000 (50% women)	Satisfactory
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	Although implementation was constrained during the reporting period, gender and social inclusion considerations continued to inform project planning and preparation for the next phase of implementation. Further attention will be given to monitoring women's participation as activities accelerate.
Women's economic empowermnet: many communities reported the challenging situation for women to combine formal employment and childcare/ family duties	Good	Previous project activities promoted practical and livelihood-oriented approaches responsive to women's needs. As implementation resumes, the project will continue to seek inclusive approaches that enable women to participate in and benefit from project activities.
GBV mentioned by some participants during workshops	Satisfactory	GBV had previously been identified as an issue through community engagement and therefore remains an important consideration for socially inclusive implementation. A dedicated GBV hotline has not yet been established under the reporting period. The project will continue to consider GBV risks through community engagement and safeguard monitoring and will seek coordination with appropriate existing national or local services where referral or specialist support is required.

Section 3: Implementation arrangements

What arrangements have been put in place by the Implementing Entity during the reporting period to comply with the GP	UN-Habitat continued to oversee compliance with the project's Environmental and Social Safeguards, Gender and Youth Strategy (ESGY), including integration of gender considerations into stakeholder engagement, safeguard screening and implementation planning. Technical oversight supported the Ministry of Housing in maintaining gender-responsive and inclusive approaches despite delays in physical implementation.
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 Ministry of Housing continued to apply the ESGY Strategy through inclusive community engagement and project planning, with attention to women's participation and the different needs of women, men and vulnerable groups. Gender considerations were maintained in the preparation of implementation arrangements and proposed interventions.
Have the implementation arrangements at the EE(s)	Yes

been effective during the reporting period?	
Have any capacity gaps affecting GP compliance been identified during the reporting period and if so, what remediation was implemented?	Yes **Comments:** No major compliance gaps were identified; however, implementation delays and limited dedicated project capacity constrained systematic gender monitoring. UN-Habitat continued to provide technical oversight, while the Ministry maintained gender considerations in stakeholder engagement and implementation planning. Strengthened gender-disaggregated monitoring will be required as implementation accelerates.

Section 4: Grievances	
Was a grievance mechanism established capable and known to stakeholders to accept grievances and complaints related to gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes
Were grievances received during the reporting period?	No

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

Comments

Rating

Implementing Entity					
Project components/outcomes	**Alignment with AF outcomes**	**Expected Progress**	**Progress to date**	**Comments**	**Rating**
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 risk and vulnerability assessment to be delivered by November 2026.	Delayed	Significant progress was achieved across all Component 1 outputs through August 2023. Towards the end of 2024, preparations began to establish an agreement between the Ministry of Housing and the University of the South Pacific (USP) to complete the remaining activities under	Marginally Satisfactory

				Component 1. However, finalization of this arrangement was affected by delays associated with the broader Agreement of Cooperation (AoC) between UN-Habitat and the Ministry of Housing, as well as additional time required to establish the necessary sub-contractual arrangements with USP. As a result, the implementation timeline for the remaining Component 1 activities was revised, with implementation expected to take place between November 2025 and 2026.	
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 2026.	Delayed	Significant progress was achieved across all Component 1 outputs through August 2023. Towards the end of 2024, preparations began to establish an agreement between the Ministry of Housing and the University of the South Pacific (USP) to complete the remaining activities under Component 1. However, finalization of this arrangement was affected by delays associated with the broader Agreement of Cooperation (AoC) between UN-Habitat and the	Marginally Satisfactory

				Ministry of Housing, as well as additional time required to establish the necessary sub-contractual arrangements with USP. As a result, the implementation timeline for the remaining Component 1 activities was revised, with implementation expected to take place between November 2025 and 2026.	
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 change action plans to be delivered by November 2026.	Delayed	Significant progress was achieved across all Component 1 outputs through August 2023. Towards the end of 2024, preparations began to establish an agreement between the Ministry of Housing and the University of the South Pacific (USP) to complete the remaining activities under Component 1. However, finalization of this arrangement was affected by delays associated with the broader Agreement of Cooperation (AoC) between UN-Habitat and the Ministry of Housing, as well as additional time required to establish the necessary sub-contractual arrangements with USP. As a result, the implementation timeline for the	Marginally Satisfactory

				remaining Component 1 activities was revised, with implementation expected to take place between November 2025 and 2026.	
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 May 2027.	Delayed	Renewed attention is also required for Component 2, particularly community-level risk reduction and awareness activities. Resilience officers established during 2020–2021 previously supported these activities, but their mandates have since ended. Clear focal points should therefore be re-established within the Ministry and participating municipal councils.	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 place until March 2021. Completion by May 2027.	Delayed	Renewed attention is also required for Component 2, particularly community-level risk reduction and awareness activities. Resilience officers established during 2020–2021 previously supported these activities, but their mandates have since ended. Clear focal points should therefore be re-established within the Ministry and participating municipal councils.	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 (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 May 2027). Site visits and community consultations to re-validate options proposed in the CVRAAPs were carried in early 2024 & 2025.	Delayed	Renewed attention is also required for Component 2, particularly community-level risk reduction and awareness activities. Resilience officers established during 2020–2021 previously supported these activities, but their mandates have since ended. Clear focal points should therefore be re-established within the Ministry and participating municipal councils.	Marginally Satisfactory
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). FB and Twitter accounts currently not active. 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 level officials in tripartite conference in Brussels, presentation of FRIS and engagement 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**
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.

The project is rated Marginally Satisfactory, recognizing that while no expenditure was recorded during the reporting period and implementation of physical activities remained significantly delayed, important institutional, contractual and financial preparatory progress was achieved to address longstanding bottlenecks and enable implementation to resume. Since project inception, the project has made important progress in community engagement, resilience planning, technical assessments, awareness-raising and capacity-building across the target settlements. However, implementation has been affected by significant delays, including challenges related to the overarching Agreement of Cooperation (AoC) between UN-Habitat and the Ministry of Housing. During the PPR7 reporting period, these issues prevented the transfer and expenditure of project funds and resulted in zero expenditure being recorded. The resolution of the overarching AoC issues towards the end of the reporting period, in June 2025, therefore represented an important milestone and created the conditions necessary for implementation to resume and accelerate during the subsequent period. Despite the absence of expenditure, the project team continued to advance key preparatory activities. In particular, efforts continued to establish contractual arrangements with the University of the South Pacific (USP) for Component 1 and with the four participating municipal councils for Component 3. This work was important to ensure that implementation mechanisms would be ready to operationalize once the overarching contractual and financial constraints were resolved. A further significant achievement was the Ministry of Housing’s sustained effort to finalize and submit the outstanding deliverables required to trigger the fourth tranche of UN-Habitat funding, valued at almost USD 1 million. This was particularly important given that the previous project funding had been transferred in 2021, with approximately USD 300,000 in cumulative funding received up to that point. The progress made towards meeting the requirements for the fourth tranche therefore represented an important step towards restoring the financial basis for full-scale implementation. Nevertheless, the absence of expenditure and limited implementation of resilience investments during the reporting period remain significant concerns. The prolonged contractual and funding constraints have contributed to an accumulated implementation backlog, increasing pressure on the remaining project timeframe. In addition, while considerable effort was invested in establishing downstream implementation arrangements, these had not yet translated into implementation at the scale required by the end of the reporting period. Going forward, priority should be given to capitalizing immediately on the resolution of the overarching AoC issues by completing the requirements for and facilitating the release of the fourth funding tranche; finalizing and operationalizing the contractual arrangements with USP and the four municipal councils; and establishing a detailed, time-bound implementation plan to accelerate delivery across the target settlements. Close monitoring of expenditure and physical implementation should be maintained to ensure that renewed availability of funds translates rapidly into tangible results at community level. Particular attention should also be given to strengthening Ministry and council-level implementation capacity and ensuring that Components 2 and 4 are progressively reactivated alongside the acceleration of infrastructure and resilience interventions.

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 risk and vulnerability assessment to be delivered by November 2026.	Delayed	Significant progress was achieved across all Component 1 outputs through August 2023. Towards the end of 2024, preparations began to establish an agreement between the Ministry of Housing and the University of the South Pacific (USP) to complete the remaining activities under Component 1. However, finalization of this arrangement was affected by delays associated with the broader Agreement of Cooperation (AoC) between UN-Habitat and the Ministry of Housing, as well as additional time required to establish the necessary sub-contractual arrangements with USP. As a result, the implementation timeline for the remaining	Marginally Satisfactory

				Component 1 activities was revised, with implementation expected to take place between November 2025 and 2026.	
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 2026.	Delayed	Significant progress was achieved across all Component 1 outputs through August 2023. Towards the end of 2024, preparations began to establish an agreement between the Ministry of Housing and the University of the South Pacific (USP) to complete the remaining activities under Component 1. However, finalization of this arrangement was affected by delays associated with the broader Agreement of Cooperation (AoC) between UN-Habitat and the Ministry of Housing, as well as additional time required to establish the necessary sub-contractual arrangements with USP. As a result, the implementation timeline for the remaining Component 1 activities was revised, with implementation expected to take place between November 2025 and 2026.	Marginally Satisfactory
1.3.1 Developing city-wide climate change action plans	Outcome 1,	City-level activities on developing	Delayed	Significant progress was achieved across	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 change action plans to be delivered by November 2026.		all Component 1 outputs through August 2023. Towards the end of 2024, preparations began to establish an agreement between the Ministry of Housing and the University of the South Pacific (USP) to complete the remaining activities under Component 1. However, finalization of this arrangement was affected by delays associated with the broader Agreement of Cooperation (AoC) between UN-Habitat and the Ministry of Housing, as well as additional time required to establish the necessary sub-contractual arrangements with USP. As a result, the implementation timeline for the remaining Component 1 activities was revised, with implementation expected to take place between November 2025 and 2026.	
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	Outcome 1, Outcome 2	16 Community-level vulnerability assessments and	Completed		Highly Satisfactory

assessments, including hazard maps, conducted, in informal settlements in Lami, Sigatoka, Nadi and Lautoka.		action plans delivered by March 2021.			
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 May 2027.	Delayed	Renewed attention is also required for Component 2, particularly community-level risk reduction and awareness activities. Resilience officers established during 2020–2021 previously supported these activities, but their mandates have since ended. Clear focal points should therefore be re-established within the Ministry and participating municipal councils.	Satisfactory
2.5.1 Targeted household and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts	Outcome 6	Awareness raising ongoing with 19 community-level trainings taking place until March 2021. Completion by May 2027. Site visits and community consultations to re-validate options proposed in the CVRAAPs were carried in early 2024 & 2025.	Delayed	Renewed attention is also required for Component 2, particularly community-level risk reduction and awareness activities. Resilience officers established during 2020–2021 previously supported these activities, but their mandates have since ended. Clear focal points should therefore be re-established within the Ministry and	Satisfactory

				participating municipal councils.	
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 May 2027). Site visits and community consultations to re-validate options proposed in the CVRAAPs were carried in early 2024 & 2025.	Delayed	Renewed attention is also required for Component 2, particularly community-level risk reduction and awareness activities. Resilience officers established during 2020–2021 previously supported these activities, but their mandates have since ended. Clear focal points should therefore be re-established within the Ministry and participating municipal councils.	Marginally Satisfactory
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). FB and Twitter accounts currently not active. Newsletter produced.	Ontrack		Satisfactory
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 engagement 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	Ministry of Housing

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

The project is rated Marginally Satisfactory. Since project inception, the Ministry of Housing, working with UN-Habitat, participating municipal councils, communities and other partners, has made important progress in resilience planning, community engagement, technical assessments, awareness-raising and capacity-building across the 16 target informal settlements. However, the Ministry acknowledges that overall implementation has been significantly slower than originally anticipated and that limited physical and financial progress was achieved during this reporting period. A major constraint during the reporting period was the need to resolve issues associated with the overarching Agreement of Cooperation (AoC) between the Ministry and UN-Habitat. As these issues affected the transfer and utilization of project resources, no expenditure was recorded during the reporting period. The Ministry and UN-Habitat worked closely to address the outstanding requirements, and the successful resolution of these issues towards the end of the reporting period, in June 2025, represented an important step towards restoring full project implementation. Despite these constraints, the Ministry continued to advance the project using the resources and institutional capacity available. In particular, considerable efforts were made to prepare the implementation arrangements required for the next phase of delivery, including contractual arrangements with the University of the South Pacific (USP) for Component 1 and arrangements with the four participating municipal councils for Component 3. The Ministry also dedicated significant effort to completing and submitting the outstanding technical, financial and administrative deliverables required to enable the release of the fourth tranche of project funding of almost USD 1 million. This represented a particularly important milestone given that the previous tranche of funding had been received in 2021, with approximately USD 300,000 in cumulative project funding transferred up to that point. Although the fourth tranche had not yet translated into expenditure during PPR7, the progress made in fulfilling the requirements for its release established an essential foundation for renewed implementation. The Ministry recognizes that the accumulated delays have placed additional pressure on the remaining implementation timeframe. The immediate priority for the next reporting period is therefore to capitalize on the resolution of the overarching AoC issues and the progress made towards securing the fourth tranche. This should include finalizing and operationalizing arrangements with USP and the four municipal councils, ensuring that available resources are transferred and utilized without further delay, strengthening the Ministry’s implementation capacity, and closely monitoring physical and financial progress against a revised and time-bound implementation plan.

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.

The project is rated Marginally Satisfactory, recognizing the important progress made in addressing longstanding institutional and implementation bottlenecks, while acknowledging that overall implementation remained significantly behind schedule and that no expenditure was recorded during the reporting period. Since project inception, the project has delivered important results in community engagement, resilience planning, technical assessments, awareness-raising and institutional capacity-building across the 16 target settlements. However, progress towards the implementation of physical resilience interventions has been substantially slower than anticipated. During the PPR7 reporting period, implementation was particularly affected by issues associated with the overarching Agreement of Cooperation (AoC) between UN-Habitat and the Ministry of Housing. These issues constrained the transfer and utilization of project resources and contributed to zero expenditure being recorded during the reporting period. UN-Habitat and the Ministry worked closely to address the outstanding requirements, with the overarching AoC issues successfully resolved towards the end of the reporting period in June 2025. Importantly, these constraints did not prevent the Executing Entity from continuing preparatory work required to enable implementation to resume. The Ministry continued efforts to establish contractual arrangements with the University of the South Pacific (USP) for the completion of Component 1 activities and implementation arrangements with the four participating municipal councils under Component 3. These arrangements are critical to expanding implementation capacity and accelerating delivery once funding becomes available. UN-Habitat also recognizes the considerable efforts made by the Ministry to finalize and submit the technical, financial and administrative deliverables required for the release of the fourth tranche of project funding, valued at almost USD 1 million. This is particularly significant given that the previous tranche was released in 2021, with approximately USD 300,000 in cumulative project funding transferred up to that point. Progress towards meeting the requirements for this substantially larger tranche therefore represented an important step towards restoring the financial and operational basis for full project implementation. Nevertheless, UN-Habitat considers the absence of expenditure and continued delays in translating project planning into tangible resilience investments to be significant concerns. The accumulated delays have increased pressure on the remaining implementation period and will require substantially accelerated delivery once the outstanding financial and contractual arrangements are operational. For the next reporting period, UN-Habitat recommends prioritizing the release and timely utilization of the fourth tranche; full operationalization of the arrangements with USP and the four municipal councils; strengthening of Ministry and council-level implementation capacity; and establishment of a detailed, time-bound implementation schedule linked to physical and financial milestones. UN-Habitat should maintain close implementation and financial monitoring with the Executing Entity to ensure that the resolution of the overarching AoC bottleneck translates rapidly into measurable progress across the project components.

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 relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to	1 (Nadi)	1 (Nadi)	4 Local authorities integrate resilience in local planning schemes 1

	stakeholders in a timely manner			
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 introduced at local level – number of plans developed	0	16	16
Outputs	2.4 No. and type of	0	25 Sessions 341	16 (at least one per

	risk reduction actions or strategies introduced at local level – number of target population people participating in assessments and awareness activities		(231 women - 68%)	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 withstand conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by asset	0	0	To be defined during the project - after community prioritization and selection of interventions

	types)			
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 address delays affecting Component 3. While issues with the overarching Agreement of Cooperation between UN-Habitat and the Ministry of Housing prevented expenditure, the project continued technical coordination, validation of proposed interventions and preparation of implementation arrangements with municipal councils. Resolution of the AoC issues towards the end of the reporting period provided the basis for implementation to resume.
Have the environmental and social safeguard measures that were taken been effective in avoiding unwanted negative	Challenges & Opportunities	Yes. Environmental and social safeguards continued to be integrated through technical

impacts?		review, site inspections, stakeholder consultations and screening of proposed interventions. No significant adverse environmental or social impacts were identified during the reporting period. As physical implementation remained limited, continued safeguard screening and monitoring will be required as works commence.
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 stakeholder engagement and implementation planning. Women participated in community consultations and planning processes, and gender considerations informed discussions on access, sanitation, drainage, community facilities and climate resilience. The reporting period reinforced the importance of maintaining women’s participation as activities transition from planning to implementation and of strengthening gender-disaggregated monitoring during subsequent implementation.
Were there any delays in implementation? If so, include any causes of delays. What measures have been taken to reduce delays?	Challenges & Opportunities	Yes. Implementation was significantly delayed by issues affecting the overarching Agreement of Cooperation between UN-Habitat and the Ministry of Housing, resulting in no expenditure during the reporting period. Nevertheless, the Ministry continued preparing contractual arrangements with USP and municipal councils and completed the requirements necessary to request the 4th tranche of project funding. The AoC issues were successfully resolved towards the end of the reporting period, removing a major barrier to implementation.
What implementation issues/lessons, either positive or negative, affected	Challenges & Opportunities	Yes. Implementation, particularly Component 3,

progress?		remained delayed primarily due to issues affecting the overarching Agreement of Cooperation between UN-Habitat and the Ministry of Housing, which prevented expenditure during much of the reporting period. Technical coordination and preparation nevertheless continued, including validation of interventions and engagement with municipal councils. Resolution of the AoC issues towards the end of the period enabled implementation arrangements to resume. In addition, the reporting period reinforced the value of coordination with complementary initiatives supporting local government capacity. The SDG Localization initiative, implemented from October 2024 to October 2025, engaged municipal councils across Fiji with an emphasis on sustainable urban development and climate resilience. In Lautoka, the placement of an Australian volunteer planner within the City Council strengthened local strategic planning capacity and created useful synergies with FRIS. This experience demonstrated the value of coordinating related initiatives to strengthen municipal capacity and avoid working in isolation.

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 reinforced that effective climate adaptation requires both strong technical preparation and functioning institutional arrangements. Continued consultation with communities, municipal councils and technical agencies helped ensure that proposed interventions remained responsive to changing settlement conditions and community

	priorities despite implementation delays. A key lesson was that institutional and contractual arrangements should be resolved early, as delays can significantly affect the transition from planning to physical implementation. Maintaining stakeholder coordination and technical preparation during such delays can nevertheless preserve implementation readiness and facilitate subsequent delivery. In addition, complementarity with the SDG Localization initiative also strengthened municipal engagement on climate resilience, particularly in Lautoka, where embedded planning support contributed to stronger local planning capacity relevant to FRIS implementation.
What is the potential for the climate resilience measures undertaken by the project/programme to be replicated and scaled up both within and outside the project area?	
Readiness Interventions (Applicable only to NIEs that received one or more readiness grants)	
What have been the lessons learned, both positive and negative, in accessing and implementing climate finance readiness support that would be relevant to the preparation, design and implementation of future concrete adaptation projects/programmes?	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 environmental and social aspects in developing and implementing concrete projects/programmes for enhanced resilience to climate change?	NA
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 physical implementation remained delayed, continued site validation and technical preparation reinforced that intervention priorities need to be reassessed before construction to account for changing settlement conditions, previous investments, community priorities and technical feasibility. The reporting period also demonstrated that maintaining technical and community engagement during implementation delays is important to preserve readiness and reduce risks once financing and institutional arrangements are resolved.
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 project's participatory and multi-agency approach has strong potential for replication across informal settlements in Fiji. Combining community priorities with municipal coordination, technical assessment and site validation provides a practical model for developing locally appropriate and implementable climate 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 continued to inform technical preparation and refinement of project interventions. Community Action Plans (CAPs), vulnerability assessments, available spatial and hazard data, municipal planning information, engineering information and findings from site inspections were used to validate proposed investments and identify changes in settlement conditions. This information supported continued technical preparation while implementation arrangements were being resolved.
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 continued to be shared through Project Management Committee meetings, technical coordination, stakeholder consultations, site visits and engagement with municipal councils and relevant national agencies. These exchanges supported validation of interventions and maintained implementation readiness during the reporting period.
Please list any knowledge products generated and include hyperlinks whenever posssible (e.g. project videos, project stories, studies and technical reports, case studies, tranining manuals, handbooks, strategies and plans developed, etc.)	Relevant project publications and knowledge products are available through UN-Habitat’s Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific website. Additional implementation knowledge and lessons continue to be generated through technical assessments, stakeholder consultations and implementation of adaptation interventions.
If learning objectives have been established, have they been met? Please describe.	The project’s learning objectives continued to be progressively achieved. Technical coordination, site validation and stakeholder engagement strengthened understanding of climate-resilient infrastructure requirements, community priorities and implementation constraints. Learning objectives related to physical implementation remained only partially achieved due to delays affecting Component 3. However, continued technical preparation and resolution of the overarching AoC issues strengthened readiness for implementation and subsequent generation of operational lessons.
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.	Some challenges remained in accessing complete and up-to-date spatial, infrastructure and planning information across institutions. Site verification and consultation with municipal councils, communities and technical agencies therefore remained important for validating available information and addressing data gaps. The experience reinforces the value of strengthened inter-agency data sharing, consistent geospatial information and systematic updating of settlement-level infrastructure data.
Has the identification of learning objectives contributed to the outcomes of the project? In what ways have they contributed?	Yes. Learning objectives helped maintain focus on technical validation, institutional coordination and community engagement despite implementation delays. These processes strengthened implementation readiness and ensured that proposed interventions continued to respond to current settlement conditions and community priorities.

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	0.00	0.00
Baseline information	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	0	0.00	0.00
Baseline information	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	0	0.00	0.00
Target performance at completion	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	6000	50.00	30.00
Target performance at completion	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the project	124655	49.99	36.80
Target performance at completion	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	130655	49.99	33.40
Performance at mid-term	Direct beneficiaries supported by the project	2423	43.00	32.00
Performance at mid-term	Indirect beneficiaries supported by the	175344	51.94	36.00

	project			
Performance at mid-term	Total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)	177767	47.47	34.00
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	0.00	0.00

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	0.00		
Target performance at completion	6000	50.00	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/programmes that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments	Sector	Scale	Status
Baseline information	2	Multi-sector	Local	2: Undertaking or updating of assessments in progress
Target performance at completion	4	Multi-sector	Local	2: Undertaking or updating of assessments in progress
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	Hurricane	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	50.00	Multi-sector	2: Low capacity
Target performance at completion	14	50.00	Multi-sector	4: High capacity
Performance at mid-term	6	80.00	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	0.00	Public
Target performance at completion	14	50.00	Public
Performance at mid-term	6	80.00	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	0.00	Multi-sector
Target performance at completion	100.00	Multi-sector
Performance at mid-term	25.00	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	50.00	2: Partially not aware
Target performance at completion	6000	50.00	5: Fully aware
Performance at mid-term	2423	43.00	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	4: Mostly responsive (Most defined elements)
Performance at mid-term	Multi-sector	Local	
Performance at completion			

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

	Sector	Targeted asset	Changes in asset (quantitative or qualitative)
Baseline information	Multi-sector	2: Physical asset (produced/improved/strenghtened))	1:Not improved
Baseline information	Multi-sector	2: Physical asset	1:Not improved

		(produced/improved/strenghtened))	
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		Disaster risk reduction
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	0.00	1: No improvement
Target performance at completion	300	50.00	4: High improvement
Performance at mid-term	60	68.00	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				
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			