



**CARIBBEAN COMMUNITY
CLIMATE CHANGE CENTRE**

Building Resilience. Securing Our Future.

Climate Actions for Building Resilience in Coastal Communities (CABRIC) in the Caribbean EDA Facility

Annex 23a – Methodology for estimating beneficiaries *Date:*

May 12, 2026

Prepared by E Co.

This report has been prepared for The Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC) – as part of the work to finalise the Funding Proposal Package for submission to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) for an Enhanced Direct Access (EDA) Funding Proposal titled, 'Climate Actions for Building Resilience in Coastal Communities in the Caribbean (CABRIC Caribbean)'

Published by: E Co.

Team leader: Ellie La Trobe-Hogan, E Co. ellie@ecoltdgroup.com

Authors: Remus Bandacu

Last edited: 15 September 2026

Status: Final

Disclaimer: This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose. We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties. This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it. The views expressed in this report are those of E Co. staff and associates and they are not necessarily those of the commissioning party of anyone else.

Content

1.	Introduction.....	3
1.1	Background.....	3
2.	Identification of beneficiaries	4
3.	Project impacts and benefits	6
3.1	Note on estimations of EDA facility portfolio	6
3.2	Explanation of indicator mapping	7

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Caribbean coastal communities face a multitude of climate impacts due to their positioning and proximity to the sea. In addition to hurricanes, storms, riverine flooding, landslides, heatwaves and the increasing unpredictability of precipitation; coastal communities are also affected by storm surges, coastal erosion and the long-term impact of sea surface temperature increases, and ocean acidification, affecting the distribution and productivity of fisheries. The effect of these impacts is complex and multifaceted: Ecosystem functioning is reduced, not only from the direct impact of such hazards, but also the need to derive livelihood income and food security. Social structures are challenged due to physical and psychological health impacts of these hazards, but also due to the impacts on education and livelihoods driving migration, and the resultant consequence of such pressures on women including grievous bodily harm (GBH) and psychological abuses. Livelihood resilience itself is dependent on both ecological and social resilience is impaired further with the impacts of climate hazards, particularly for the production sector of agriculture and fisheries. Where livelihoods are not adapted to such impacts, resilience is further destabilised. Without understanding and access to climate risk information to adapt livelihoods and social services, including accessible and appropriate education, adaptive capacity to climate disasters is undermined.

The CABRIC Caribbean (Climate Actions for Building Resilience in Coastal Communities in the Caribbean) EDA facility programme will operate in five countries of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM): **Bahamas, Belize, Grenada, Jamaica and St Lucia** and will support the built capacity and long-term empowerment of community level action to address climate adaptation needs and multi-dimensional vulnerability in coastal areas. The EDA facility will provide grants to Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), local Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), and Local Authorities (LAs) for activities that address livelihood and social vulnerability, with an emphasis on gender transformation and inclusion.

The CABRIC Caribbean will address the complexities that underpin the interaction of social-livelihood-ecological resilience through addressing the barriers to the institutional and technical capacity at the CSO, local NGO, and LA level, whilst empowering communities to understand climate risk and gender equality, disability, and social inclusion (GEDSI) solutions in building gender transformative climate resilient livelihoods (including: climate smart agriculture, ecosystem based fisheries, coastal Nature based Solutions and circular economy) and inclusive social structures with climate risk integrated into their services (including last mile early warning systems (EWS), climate risk planning & monitoring into health services, climate related mental health supports, and inclusive climate disaster shelters & access. It will provide finance to those CSO, NGO grassroots organizations and LAs to implement community led solutions in coastal communities, whilst supporting the process including Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning. Knowledge sharing is a key component of CABRIC, building on existing structures, and setting up a lasting legacy of both in country, between country and regional knowledge sharing.

To achieve this, the programme is organised into three components:

Component 1: Institutional and operational capacity

Component 2: Grant facility for community-based adaptation measures with implementing support

Component 3: Climate information, knowledge sharing and public awareness

The Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC) is the AE and an EE of the CABRIC programme and as mandated by the countries directly establish and manage an EDA facility for grassroots actors to address the repeated impacts of climate hazards to vulnerable coastal communities. CABRIC's overall impact will be improving the climate resilience of the most vulnerable people, through livelihood security, health, wellbeing, food and water security, and co-benefits for ecosystems and gender and social inequities.

Theory of Change statement: **IF** NGOs, CSOs, and LAs are empowered through strengthened institutional and operational capacity for climate-responsive GEDSI integrated planning, climate information and lessons learned are shared, and climate finance flows to the grassroots level are increased; **THEN** a paradigm shift is catalysed towards locally-led, gender-transformative climate action that secures long-term livelihood and ecosystem sustainability across the Caribbean; **BECAUSE** climate resilience for coastal communities in participating countries is improved and multidimensional vulnerability to climate risks is reduced through the implementation of accessible, community-driven adaptation initiatives.

2. Identification of beneficiaries

The CABRIC programme identifies beneficiaries across multiple stakeholder groups who will receive direct and indirect adaptation benefits through programme interventions. Given the Enhanced Direct Access (EDA) modality, where specific subproject interventions are determined through a demand-driven process, beneficiary identification follows a portfolio-level approach that will be refined as proposals are received and approved.

Beneficiary	Rationale	Involvement / benefits
Vulnerable coastal community members	Coastal communities across the five CABRIC countries face severe and increasing climate vulnerability due to their geographic exposure to multiple hazards including hurricanes, storm surge, sea-level rise, coastal erosion, flooding, and the impacts of ocean warming on fisheries and marine ecosystems. These communities experience compounding vulnerabilities where climate impacts interact with existing social and economic challenges, particularly affecting women, youth, persons with disabilities, and marginalised groups. Livelihoods dependent on agriculture, fisheries, and tourism are increasingly precarious, while social structures face strain from climate-related health impacts, displacement, and economic disruption. Without targeted adaptation support, these communities will continue to experience declining resilience and increasing losses from climate events.	Community members will directly benefit from subprojects funded through the EDA facility (Output 2.1) across two thematic areas: (1) gender-transformative livelihood security, including climate-smart agriculture, ecosystem-based fisheries, coastal nature-based solutions, and circular economy initiatives; and (2) health, wellbeing and social resilience, including last-mile early warning systems, climate-integrated health services, mental health support, and inclusive climate disaster shelters. Beneficiaries will receive tangible adaptation support tailored to local contexts and needs, as determined through the community-led proposal process. The programme's beneficiary estimates for Output 2.1 are based on a modelled portfolio of six representative intervention types calibrated to the EFA investment allocations, rather than a flat population percentage. Benefits are distributed across GCF Adaptation Results Areas 1–4.
CSO, NGO, and LA staff	Civil society organisations and NGOs in the Caribbean play a critical role in channelling climate finance to vulnerable communities, yet face significant institutional and technical capacity gaps. Many organisations lack the skills to develop bankable project proposals aligned with international climate finance requirements, interpret and apply climate data, mainstream GEDSI considerations, and implement robust monitoring and evaluation systems. Smaller community-based organisations are particularly constrained, limiting the ability of grassroots actors to access and effectively deploy adaptation funding.	CSO, NGO, and LA staff will benefit from comprehensive capacity building throughout the programme. Under Output 1.1, staff will receive training on climate adaptation project development, including climate data interpretation, GEDSI mainstreaming, and proposal writing through workshops and write-shops. Under Output 2.2, a broader group of implementation staff including field coordinators, M&E officers, and finance personnel will receive training on project implementation, safeguards compliance, and adaptive management. Participants will also benefit from ongoing technical assistance through the CABRIC helpdesk, peer learning exchanges, and access to standardised tools and templates. This capacity building will enable organisations to more effectively serve vulnerable coastal communities both during and beyond the programme.

Beneficiary	Rationale	Involvement / benefits
Central government officials and technical staff	Government institutions in CABRIC countries require strengthened capacity to develop and implement climate-resilient coastal policies that address multidimensional vulnerabilities. Policymakers and technical staff currently lack systematic approaches to interpret climate data, assess coastal vulnerabilities through a gender and social inclusion lens, and translate this analysis into integrated policy frameworks. Existing coastal zone management policies have gaps in gender-inclusive provisions and multi-hazard approaches, limiting the effectiveness of national adaptation responses.	Government officials and technical staff will receive direct capacity building under Output 1.2 on climate data interpretation, GEDSI analysis, and coastal vulnerability assessment. Senior policymakers from relevant ministries (e.g., Environment, Planning, Coastal Zone Management, Fisheries, Tourism) will be supported in developing draft national integrated coastal resilience policy frameworks with implementation roadmaps. Technical staff will benefit from institutionalised training curricula and knowledge management systems, participation in a regional Community of Practice network, and access to regional guidance documents and best practice toolkits. This capacity building will enable more effective, inclusive, and evidence-based coastal climate policy across the five countries.
Poverty-affected coastal communities in CABRIC countries	Low-income households in the coastal zones of the five CABRIC countries face the greatest structural barriers to climate adaptation: they are disproportionately concentrated in the most hazard-exposed areas, lack savings buffers and access to formal insurance or credit, and have no realistic capacity to self-relocate or invest in private structural protection. They are therefore the population most dependent on an enabling national policy environment to access adaptation support, and the population with the greatest marginal gain from the Coastal Resilience Frameworks produced under Output 1.2. Higher-income coastal residents retain meaningful capacity to adapt independently and are excluded from the indirect beneficiary count.	Poverty-affected coastal communities (estimated at approximately 608,000 individuals, derived as national population × coastal population share × national poverty rate) will benefit indirectly from the strengthened national coastal policy frameworks developed under Output 1.2. Benefits include improved targeting of public climate finance toward the most vulnerable communities, stronger legal and regulatory protections from climate hazards through climate-responsive zoning and managed retreat frameworks, and greater formal accountability of national governments to marginalised coastal communities through the institutional coordination mechanisms embedded in co-designed Coastal Resilience Frameworks.

3. Project impacts and benefits

The project is expected to impact a total of **51,559 direct beneficiaries** (of which 27,564 are female), and **931,323 indirect beneficiaries** (of which 470,984 are female). The breakdown per country is as follows:

Country	Direct		Indirect	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Bahamas	4,444	5,392	35,815	39,316
Belize	3,986	5,050	59,163	57,992
Grenada	4,064	3,987	21,292	21,207
Jamaica	6,370	6,893	320,275	328,097
St Lucia	5,131	6,242	23,793	24,372
Total	23,995	27,563	460,339	470,984

It is expected that the project will contribute to the following GCF Adaptation Results Areas (ARAs) and IRMF indicators:

- **ARA 1: Most vulnerable people and communities**
 - Core indicator 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached
 - Supplementary indicator 2.1: Beneficiaries (female/male) adopting improved and/or new climate resilient livelihood options (number of individuals)
- **ARA2: Health, well-being, food and water security**
 - Core indicator 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached
 - Supplementary indicator 2.2: Beneficiaries (female/male) with improved food security
- **ARA 3: Infrastructure and built environment**
 - Core indicator 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached
 - Core indicator 3: Value of physical assets made more resilient to the effects of climate change and/or more able to reduce GHG emissions
 - Supplementary indicator 2.4: Beneficiaries (female/male) covered by new or improved early warning systems
 - Supplementary indicator 3.1: Change in expected losses of economic assets due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic area of the GCF intervention
- **ARA 4: Ecosystems and ecosystem services**
 - Core indicator 2: Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached
 - Core indicator 4: Hectares of natural resource areas brought under improved low-emission and/or climate-resilient management practices

3.1 Note on estimations of EDA facility portfolio

The CABRIC programme employs an Enhanced Direct Access (EDA) modality, which presents inherent challenges for ex-ante beneficiary estimation. Unlike traditional project modalities where specific interventions, locations, and target beneficiaries are defined during project design, the EDA approach is fundamentally demand-driven: CSOs, NGOs and LAs will submit proposals responding to locally-identified climate vulnerabilities and community needs, and the actual portfolio of funded subprojects will only be known once proposals are received, evaluated, and approved through successive calls for proposals over the programme's six-year duration.

This demand-driven approach is a deliberate design choice that ensures subprojects are contextually appropriate, community-owned, and responsive to the diverse and evolving adaptation needs across the five CABRIC countries. However, it means that at the time of programme approval, there is uncertainty regarding the specific types of interventions that will be proposed and funded, the geographic distribution of subprojects within and across countries, the number and size of individual subprojects, and the beneficiary reach of each subproject, which will vary significantly based on intervention type.

Given these constraints, the beneficiary estimates for Output 2.1 (the EDA grant facility) are based on a modelled portfolio of six representative intervention types — climate-resilient agriculture (A1), cold storage for artisanal fishers (A2), community-managed MPAs (A3), community-based early warning systems (B1), mobile mental health support units (B2), and hurricane-proofing of community buildings (B3) — calibrated to the investment allocations specified in the Economic and Financial Analysis (EFA). Beneficiary counts are derived from intervention-specific assumptions grounded in country-level data and peer-reviewed literature, rather than a flat population percentage. This approach produces more defensible, targeted estimates with transparent causal links between investment and benefit, while acknowledging that the actual portfolio will be shaped by community demand.

ARA distribution: CABRIC will aim to approve a balanced portfolio across the four GCF Adaptation Results Areas. The modelled scenario reflects the programme's design intent to address the full spectrum of coastal adaptation needs, from supporting vulnerable populations and improving food security to strengthening infrastructure and protecting ecosystems.

3.1.1 Adaptive management and validation

The programme recognises that these estimates are necessarily provisional and will require validation and refinement as the actual portfolio takes shape. The following adaptive management measures are built into the programme design:

- **Mid-term evaluation:** At mid-term, the portfolio composition will be assessed against the target ARA distribution, and beneficiary estimates will be updated based on actual proposals received and approved. Course corrections will be made if the portfolio is significantly skewed toward or away from particular ARAs or intervention types.
- **Subproject-level tracking:** The M&E framework will capture beneficiary data from each funded subproject, enabling aggregation of verified beneficiary numbers at the programme level. Standardised data collection templates will ensure consistent reporting across the diverse subproject portfolio.
- **Annual reporting:** Programme annual reports will include updated beneficiary figures based on cumulative subproject data, providing transparency on progress toward targets and enabling adaptive management where needed.
- **Final evaluation:** The terminal evaluation will provide a comprehensive assessment of actual beneficiaries reached, validated against subproject reports and independent verification where feasible.

3.2 Explanation of indicator mapping

The project identifies beneficiaries across four GCF Adaptation Results Areas (ARAs). The rationale applied in the estimation of beneficiaries per ARA is as follows.

ARA 1: Most vulnerable people and communities

Core indicator 2 (Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached):

- **Direct beneficiaries:** Includes government officials and technical staff receiving capacity building on climate-resilient coastal policy development (Output 1.2: **175 individuals**), CSO and NGO staff trained in project development and implementation (Outputs 1.1 and 2.2: **900 individuals** in total, of which 600 under Output 1.1 are a subset of the 900 and not double-counted), and vulnerable coastal community members receiving direct support through A1 CRA package and B1 EWS subprojects under Output 2.1 (**2,890 and 200 individuals respectively**). Total ARA1 direct beneficiaries: **4,765 individuals** (2,432 male, 2,333 female).
- **Indirect beneficiaries:** Includes two distinct populations. First, the poverty-affected coastal populations of the five CABRIC countries (**approximately 609,231 individuals**), who benefit indirectly from the strengthened national coastal policy frameworks developed under Output 1.2. The indirect beneficiary population is estimated as national population × coastal population share × national poverty rate, using poverty rates from World Bank PIP country profiles. Second, the rural populations within the EWS coverage zones of B1 investments (**approximately 247,861 individuals**), who benefit from improved early warning and coordinated disaster response without being directly trained. Total ARA1 indirect beneficiaries: **approximately 856,093 individuals** (423,079 male, 433,014 female).

Supplementary indicator 2.1 (Beneficiaries adopting climate resilient livelihood options):

Estimated at **2,890 individuals** — the A1 CRA package direct beneficiaries, comprising smallholder farming households that directly adopt climate-resilient agricultural practices through the programme. These represent the sub-population of ARA1 direct beneficiaries under Output 2.1 receiving targeted livelihood adaptation support.

Supplementary indicator 2.4 (Beneficiaries covered by early warning systems):

248,062 individuals — comprising B1 direct beneficiaries (200 trained community responders) and B1 indirect beneficiaries (approximately 247,862 rural residents within EWS coverage zones), all of whom benefit from the improved climate hazard early warning capacity created by B1 investments.

ARA 2: Health, well-being, food and water security

Core indicator 2 (Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached):

- *Direct beneficiaries:* Community members receiving post-disaster mental health support through B2 mobile mental health units under Output 2.1. Total ARA2 direct beneficiaries: **23,600 individuals** (9,440 male, 14,160 female).
- *Indirect beneficiaries:* The food-insecure sub-populations that benefit from improved food availability and reduced post-harvest losses generated by A1 (CRA peer learning spillover) and A2 (cold storage) investments, without directly receiving those interventions. Total ARA2 indirect beneficiaries: **63,230 individuals** (31,356 male, 31,874 female).

Supplementary indicator 2.2 (Beneficiaries with improved food security):

Estimated at **63,230 individuals** — the ARA2 indirect beneficiaries comprising food-insecure neighbouring farming households (A1 indirect) and food-insecure coastal communities near landing sites (A2 indirect). Country-level FIES food insecurity rates (FAO, 2022–2024) are applied to estimate the food-insecure sub-population in each case.

ARA 3: Infrastructure and built environment

Core indicator 2 (Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached):

Direct beneficiaries: Artisanal fishing households gaining access to cold storage at landing sites (A2) and residents within the catchment areas of hurricane-proofed community buildings (B3). Total ARA3 direct beneficiaries: **23,644 individuals** (12,318 male, 11,326 female).

Core indicator 3 (Value of physical assets made more resilient):

USD 1,500,000 across the programme portfolio. This figure reflects anticipated investments in climate-proofing community buildings (model B3) and coastal infrastructure through subproject interventions. Given the demand-driven nature of the EDA facility, the actual value will depend on the types of proposals received and approved. The estimate will be validated and refined at mid-term.

Supplementary indicator 3.1 (Change in expected losses):

The programme estimates a **10% reduction¹** in expected losses of economic assets due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic areas of CABRIC interventions. This conservative estimate reflects the combined impact of early warning systems, climate-proofed community infrastructure, and improved preparedness enabled by subproject interventions.

ARA 4: Ecosystems and ecosystem services

Core indicator 2 (Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached):

- *Direct beneficiaries:* Community members trained in co-management, monitoring, and enforcement of community-managed MPAs (A3). Total ARA4 direct beneficiaries: 150 individuals (105 male, 45 female) across three MPAs in Bahamas, Belize, and Jamaica.

¹ This estimate is based on expert judgment of the project formulation team based on similar projects. The actual reduction will be assessed through the programme's M&E framework and validated at mid-term and final evaluation.

- *Indirect beneficiaries:* The broader coastal fishing communities within each MPA catchment area, who benefit from fish stock replenishment, storm protection, and ecosystem services without directly participating in MPA management. Total ARA4 indirect beneficiaries: 12,000 individuals (5,904 male, 6,096 female), estimated at 4,000 people per MPA catchment based on comparable Caribbean CMMPAs.

Core indicator 4 (Hectares under improved management):

Estimated at **3,938 hectares** across the programme portfolio, comprising 937.5 hectares of climate-resilient agricultural land under improved management through A1 CRA package investments, and 3,000 hectares of community-managed marine protected areas established through A3 investments across three countries. This estimate will be validated and refined at mid-term evaluation based on the actual subproject portfolio.

3.2.1 Approach to avoid double counting

To estimate the total and avoid double counting across ARAs:

- For direct beneficiaries under Output 2.1, beneficiaries are estimated from a modelled portfolio of six representative intervention types. Each intervention targets a distinct beneficiary population (smallholder farming households, artisanal fishing households, MPA community managers, EWS trained responders, mental health patients, and shelter catchment residents), and the modelled interventions do not overlap geographically or in beneficiary definition. The total Output 2.1 direct count is therefore the sum of the six modelled intervention totals without further deduction.
- For direct beneficiaries under Outputs 1.1, 1.2, and 2.2: CSO/NGO/ staff (900 individuals under Outputs 1.1 and 2.2) and government officials/technical staff (175 individuals under Output 1.2) are counted separately as they are distinct from the community beneficiaries under Output 2.1. The 600 individuals trained under Output 1.1 are a subset of the 900 under Output 2.2 and are not double counted.
- For indirect beneficiaries: Output 1.2 poverty-affected coastal populations (~609,231), B1 EWS coverage zone populations (~247,861), ARA2 food-insecure indirect populations (~63,230), and ARA4 MPA coastal communities (~12,000) represent distinct populations with different causal pathways to benefit and are counted separately without overlap. ARA1 indirect (combining Output 1.2 and B1 indirect) is the largest category and is not duplicated in the ARA2 or ARA4 indirect counts.

Therefore, the **total beneficiaries** of the programme are approximately **982,882 individuals**. **51,559** are direct beneficiaries and **931,323** are indirect beneficiaries.

The output-wise breakdown, rationale, and assumptions is provided in the table below.

Output	Methodology and assumptions per beneficiary type and benefits	Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
		Male individual	Female individual	Results area	Male individual	Female individual	Results area
Outcome 1 Strengthened institutional and operational capacity for GEDSI integrated climate responsive planning							
Output 1.1 Community-led coastal climate adaptation priorities and project pipelines developed	Beneficiary: CSO, NGO and LA staff participating in capacity building workshops and write-shops for climate adaptation project development. Local authorities, civil society organisations and NGOs in CABRIC countries have limited institutional capacity to access climate finance and develop bankable project proposals. Staff members lack technical skills in climate data interpretation, GEDSI integration, and project design aligned with international climate finance requirements. Without targeted capacity building, these organisations cannot effectively channel adaptation funding to vulnerable coastal communities. Participants receive direct adaptation benefits through: - Enhanced technical capacity to develop climate adaptation project concepts and full proposals - Training on climate and climate change data interpretation for project design - Skills in GEDSI mainstreaming for inclusive project development - Understanding of fiduciary and operational requirements for climate finance - Ongoing technical assistance throughout the programme Assumptions: - 15 CSOs/NGOs/LAs engaged per target country. The actual number will vary by country context. Larger countries such as Jamaica and Belize with more established civil society sectors may engage more organisations, while smaller island states such as Grenada may engage fewer. The programme's inclusive outreach approach will ensure all interested organisations can participate regardless of size or current capacity. - 8 staff per organisation attending training. Average across participating organisations. CSO, NGO and LA sizes vary considerably across the region - from small community-based organisations with only a few staff members to larger established NGOs. Using an average accounts for this variation while ensuring sufficient institutional capacity is built within each organisation for sustainable project development. - Assuming 50-50% male/female split.	300	300	ARA1			

Output	Methodology and assumptions per beneficiary type and benefits	Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
		Male individual	Female individual	Results area	Male individual	Female individual	Results area
Output 1.2 Climate resilience and GEDSI mainstreamed national climate resilient coastal policy frameworks	Beneficiary: Government officials, policymakers, and technical staff receiving training and capacity building on climate data interpretation, GEDSI analysis, coastal vulnerability assessment, and climate-resilient policy development. Policymakers and technical staff in CABRIC countries currently lack the technical capacity to interpret climate data, assess coastal vulnerabilities through a gender and social inclusion lens, and translate this analysis into effective policy frameworks. Participants receive direct adaptation benefits through: - Training on climate data interpretation and coastal vulnerability assessment - Skills in GEDSI analysis for inclusive policy development - Technical assistance in developing integrated coastal resilience policy frameworks - Participation in Community of Practice network for peer-to-peer learning - Access to regional guidance documents and best practice toolkits Assumptions: - 10 government officials/policymakers trained per country. Senior officials from relevant ministries (Environment, Planning, Coastal Zone Management, Fisheries, Tourism) involved in policy formulation and approval. - 25 technical staff trained per country. Technical personnel from line ministries and agencies responsible for coastal management, climate adaptation, spatial planning, and related functions who require capacity to interpret climate data and implement policy frameworks - Assuming 40-60% female/male split.	105	70	ARA1			

Output	Methodology and assumptions per beneficiary type and benefits	Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
		Male individual	Female individual	Results area	Male individual	Female individual	Results area
	Indirect beneficiaries are the populations living in poverty within the coastal zones of CABRIC countries. These communities do not directly participate in the training, co-design processes, or institutional capacity building activities under Output 1.2, but they are the populations whose access to climate adaptation support is most directly determined by the quality of the national policy environment those activities produce. Poverty is applied as the defining criterion for this population under ARA1 because it is the most reliable observable proxy for reduced adaptive capacity in the Caribbean coastal context: low-income households are disproportionately concentrated in the most hazard-exposed coastal areas where land values are lowest and flood, storm surge, and erosion risk is highest; they lack the savings buffers, insurance access, and credit availability needed to recover independently from climate shocks; and they have no realistic capacity to self-relocate or invest in private structural protection measures. Higher-income coastal residents, by contrast, retain meaningful options for independent adaptation and are therefore excluded from the indirect beneficiary count. The adaptation benefit to this population flows through the policy frameworks and institutional systems that Output 1.2 produces. National Coastal Resilience Frameworks that are co-designed with community input, validated against local vulnerability realities, and integrated with GEDSI principles, directly determine how national adaptation budgets and climate finance are prioritised and geographically targeted. Where such frameworks are absent or fail to identify poverty-affected coastal communities as priority zones, public investment defaults toward more politically visible or economically productive coastal areas, and the most vulnerable populations are structurally bypassed. Where frameworks explicitly mandate inclusive targeting, as the LLCA and GEDSI integration requirements of this output demand, they create a durable institutional basis for directing adaptation resources toward the communities that cannot otherwise access them. The institutional capacity built under Activity 1.2.2 — through trained technical staff, embedded curricula, and a functioning Community of Practice — ensures that this targeting logic is not confined to a single planning cycle but is reproduced in successive rounds of policy design and budget allocation, extending the benefit horizon for vulnerable coastal communities beyond the programme period. These indirect beneficiaries also benefit from the regulatory protections that well-designed coastal resilience frameworks establish: climate-responsive coastal zoning, hazard setback provisions, and managed retreat mechanisms that reduce the physical exposure of low-income coastal dwellers who have no private means of reducing their own risk. For a household with no capacity to relocate or retrofit, a national coastal zoning policy is not a background condition but a primary determinant of whether its members survive a major storm event. Indirect beneficiaries benefit through: - Improved targeting of national coastal adaptation investment and public climate finance toward poverty-affected coastal communities, as GEDSI-integrated Coastal Resilience Frameworks create an explicit, validated basis for prioritising the most vulnerable populations in resource allocation - Stronger legal and regulatory protections from climate hazards through climate-responsive coastal zoning, setback regulations, and managed retreat provisions that reduce physical exposure without requiring private resources to act on - Greater formal accountability of national governments to coastal communities through the institutional coordination mechanisms and policy-to-community validation processes embedded in co-designed frameworks, giving marginalised groups standing to access adaptation support and challenge policy failures - Sustained improvement in the inclusiveness of future policy cycles as institutionalised training curricula and knowledge management systems ensure that successive cohorts of technical staff are equipped to assess and respond to the specific vulnerabilities of low-income coastal populations Assumptions: - The indirect beneficiary population is estimated as national population × coastal population share × national poverty rate, using poverty rates from World Bank PIP country profiles and coastal population shares from UNOCHA country profiles and national census data.						
	Bahamas				22,706	24,896	ARA1
	Belize				49,285	48,309	ARA1
	Grenada				14,680	14,622	ARA1
	Jamaica				192,066	196,731	ARA1
	Saint Lucia				22,198	22,738	ARA1
Outcome 2 Improved social and livelihood climate resilience through addressing multidimensional vulnerability to climate risks in coastal communities							

Output	Methodology and assumptions per beneficiary type and benefits	Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
		Male individual	Female individual	Results area	Male individual	Female individual	Results area
Output 2.1 Grants are provided to priority climate resilient livelihood and socially inclusive health & climate information projects	A1: CRA package model beneficiaries Beneficiary: Smallholder farming households in rural and peri-coastal communities across CABRIC countries whose livelihoods and food security are directly threatened by climate variability and extreme weather events. Smallholder agriculture across the Caribbean is highly exposed to climate change impacts: prolonged drought reduces crop yields, intensified rainfall causes soil erosion and flooding, salt spray intrusion degrades coastal farmland, and tropical storm events can destroy a season's harvest in a single event. Farmers operating on plots typically under two hectares, often without formal insurance, credit, or extension support, and face acute livelihood risk with limited adaptive capacity. Direct beneficiaries receive targeted technical and material support through the Climate-Resilient Agriculture (CRA) package, which addresses these risks at the farm level. Indirect beneficiaries are neighbouring farming households not directly enrolled in the programme, who benefit through peer learning, local knowledge spillover, and improved community-level food availability as adoption of CRA practices spreads. Direct beneficiaries receive adaptation benefits through: - Access to climate-resilient planting materials, inputs, and farm-level infrastructure (e.g. shade houses, drip irrigation, water harvesting systems) - Training in climate-adaptive agronomic practices tailored to island-specific conditions, including drought-tolerant varieties and soil and water conservation techniques - Technical assistance and farmer field school support throughout the growing season - Improved post-harvest handling capacity to reduce spoilage losses - Enhanced livelihood resilience and food security at the household level Indirect beneficiaries benefit through: - Exposure to CRA practices through peer learning and informal knowledge exchange with enrolled neighbouring farming households - Improved local food availability and downward price pressure on food staples as CRA adoption increases community-level agricultural productivity Assumptions - Average smallholder farm size is used to convert total investment hectares per country into the number of beneficiary farming households. Farm sizes are derived from national agricultural census data where available - Household size is drawn from national census data and applied to convert farming household counts into individual beneficiaries - Gender split for direct beneficiaries reflects national male/female population ratios. No differential is applied at this stage as the programme's inclusive outreach design aims to enrol farming households regardless of household head gender; the GAP includes specific targets to ensure female farmers are not systematically excluded. - An indirect beneficiary multiplier of 3 is applied to direct farming households to estimate the number of neighbouring households who adopt CRA practices through peer learning. This is anchored in Ben Yishay & Mobarak (2019), AEJ: Applied Economics and Kondylis et al. (2017), World Bank Economic Review, which document 26–65% technology adoption spillover among neighbouring farming households in analogous smallholder contexts. See also IADB Bolivia RCT (2025) and GCF FP299 (ADAPT Jamaica). - Indirect beneficiaries are counted under ARA2 (food and water security) rather than ARA1, as they do not directly receive the CRA package but benefit from improved food security through adoption spillover and increased local food production. Only the food-insecure sub-population of indirect neighbouring households is counted, using country-level FIES food insecurity rates (FAO, 2022–2024).						
		1,437	1,453	ARA1	1,334	1,345	ARA2

Output	Methodology and assumptions per beneficiary type and benefits	Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
		Male individual	Female individual	Results area	Male individual	Female individual	Results area
	A2: Cold storage for artisanal fishermen model beneficiaries Beneficiary: Artisanal fishing households whose primary landing sites receive climate-resilient cold storage infrastructure, and the broader food-insecure coastal communities whose access to locally caught fish depends on reduced post-harvest losses at those sites. Artisanal fishing is a critical livelihood and food security pillar across CABRIC countries, employing a significant share of coastal labour and supplying protein to some of the most climate-exposed communities in each country. However, the sector faces acute post-harvest losses due to the near-complete absence of cold chain infrastructure at landing sites: without refrigeration, fish spoil within hours of landing, forcing fishers to sell at distressed prices, waste significant portions of their catch, or reduce time at sea to match what can be sold fresh. Climate change compounds these pressures — increasing sea surface temperatures accelerate spoilage, more frequent and intense tropical storms disrupt fishing seasons, and shifting fish distributions reduce catch predictability. These compounding stressors reduce fishing household incomes and simultaneously restrict local fish supply to coastal populations that depend on it as their primary source of protein. Direct beneficiaries are artisanal fishing households whose landings pass through sites receiving cold storage packages. Indirect beneficiaries are the food-insecure portion of coastal communities surrounding those landing sites, who benefit from improved fish availability, price stabilisation, and reduced food insecurity as post-harvest losses decline. Direct beneficiaries receive adaptation benefits through: - Access to cold storage facilities at their principal landing site, enabling fish to be held safely for sale over multiple days - Reduced post-harvest losses, directly increasing the income value of each fishing trip - Reduced pressure to accept distressed sale prices from intermediaries, strengthening bargaining position in local supply chains - Improved resilience to climate-driven disruptions, as cold storage provides a buffer against short-term fishing downtime caused by storms or rough seas - Increased ability to participate in higher-value markets (e.g. hotels, restaurants, export processors) that require consistent cold chain compliance Indirect beneficiaries benefit through: - Greater and more consistent availability of locally caught fish in coastal community markets as spoilage losses are reduced - Downward pressure on local fish prices, improving dietary access to protein for food-insecure coastal households Assumptions: - The number of artisanal fishing households per investment is derived from country-level estimates of artisanal fishers per landing site, drawn from CRFM Statistics and Information Report (2020). Artisanal fishers are defined as those using non-industrial vessels operating within near-shore waters. - Household size is drawn from national census data and applied to convert fishing household counts into individual beneficiaries. - Gender distribution for direct beneficiaries is adjusted to reflect the male-dominated composition of the Caribbean fishing sector. An 85% male assumption is applied to the household head (the fisher), with national male/female population ratios applied to remaining household members. This is consistent with documented patterns across the region; CRFM and the Grenada National Trust note that fishing is "a traditionally male dominated livelihood" across Caribbean coastal communities. - For indirect beneficiaries, the population living near each landing site is estimated from national coastal population data (population × coastal population share, sourced from national census and UNOCHA country profiles) divided by the number of landing sites per country. Only the food-insecure sub-population of this coastal community is counted as indirect beneficiaries, using country-level FIES food insecurity rates (FAO, 2022–2024), consistent with the ARA2 classification (food and water security). National male/female population ratios are applied to the indirect beneficiary population. - Direct beneficiaries are counted under ARA3 (infrastructure and built environment), reflecting the infrastructure investment in cold storage facilities. Indirect beneficiaries are counted under ARA2 (food and water security), reflecting the food security benefit to the broader coastal community.	3,657	2,304	ARA3	30,022	30,529	ARA2

Output	Methodology and assumptions per beneficiary type and benefits	Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
		Male individual	Female individual	Results area	Male individual	Female individual	Results area
	A3: Community-managed MPA model beneficiaries Beneficiary: Community members trained in the co-management, monitoring, and enforcement of community-managed marine protected areas (CMMPAs), and the broader coastal fishing communities whose livelihoods, food security, and climate resilience depend on the health of the marine ecosystems those MPAs protect. Caribbean coastal and marine ecosystems are under compounding climate stress: rising sea surface temperatures are driving mass coral bleaching events of increasing frequency and severity, ocean acidification is degrading reef structural integrity, intensified tropical storms cause acute physical damage to reef systems and seagrass beds, and sea level rise is accelerating coastal erosion and saltwater intrusion into nearshore habitats. These impacts directly undermine the ecosystem services on which artisanal fishing communities depend — fish stock abundance, nursery habitat for juvenile species, coastal storm buffering, and shoreline protection. Community-managed MPAs are among the most cost-effective and locally sustainable mechanisms for building climate resilience into marine ecosystems, provided they are supported by trained community stewards with the skills to monitor, enforce, and adaptively manage MPA boundaries and rules. Direct beneficiaries are community members who receive hands-on training in MPA co-management and participatory monitoring and evaluation, and who take on active stewardship roles within the MPA governance structure. Indirect beneficiaries are the broader coastal community within the MPA catchment area, who benefit from the ecosystem service improvements generated by the MPA without directly participating in its management. Direct beneficiaries receive adaptation benefits through: - Training in MPA co-management principles, governance, and adaptive management, building the technical and institutional capacity needed for sustainable, community-led stewardship - Skills in participatory marine monitoring and evaluation, including reef health assessment, fish stock estimation, and boundary enforcement - Involvement in the design and implementation of MPA management plans that reflect local ecological knowledge and community priorities - Strengthened community agency in negotiating fishing rights, seasonal closures, and no-take zone boundaries with national fisheries authorities - Enhanced capacity to respond adaptively to climate-driven changes in marine ecosystem condition over time Indirect beneficiaries benefit through: - Increased fish stock abundance and species diversity within and adjacent to the MPA as a result of spillover from protected zones, directly improving artisanal fishing yields for the surrounding community - Improved ecosystem services Assumptions - Each investment is modelled as one community-managed MPA of 1,000 ha, consistent with the representative scale used in the EFA model. Three MPAs are modelled across Bahamas, Belize, and Jamaica; Grenada and Saint Lucia have zero investments under this sub-theme in the modelled scenario. - 50 community members are assumed to receive direct training in MPA management and M&E per investment. This is a conservative estimate consistent with the governance structures of comparable Caribbean CMMPAs, which typically involve a core group of community monitors, enforcement officers, fisher representatives, and local authority liaison members. - A minimum 30% female participation target is applied to direct trainees in line with CABRIC's Gender Action Plan. This yields a 70% male / 30% female split for direct beneficiaries (35 male and 15 female per MPA). - The indirect beneficiary population is estimated at 4,000 people per MPA catchment area. This is a conservative assumption based on documented population figures for comparable Caribbean CMMPAs, specifically the Soufrière Marine Management Area (SMMA, Saint Lucia, ~1,500 ha) and the Canaries and Anse La Raye Marine Management Area (CAMMA, Saint Lucia). The precise catchment population cannot be modelled at appraisal stage as the geographic location of each MPA will be determined through the EDA grant facility process. National male/female population ratios are applied to indirect beneficiaries.	105	45	ARA4	5,904	6,096	ARA4

Output	Methodology and assumptions per beneficiary type and benefits	Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
		Male individual	Female individual	Results area	Male individual	Female individual	Results area
	- Both direct and indirect beneficiaries are counted under ARA4 (ecosystems and ecosystem services), reflecting the ecosystem-centred nature of the intervention and its benefits. 						

Output	Methodology and assumptions per beneficiary type and benefits	Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
		Male individual	Female individual	Results area	Male individual	Female individual	Results area
	B1: Community-based EWS model beneficiaries Beneficiary: Community members trained to operate, monitor, and disseminate climate-related early warnings as part of community-based early warning systems (CBEWS), and the rural populations within each system's coverage area who benefit from timely, locally delivered climate hazard alerts and coordinated first response. The Caribbean is one of the world's most hurricane-exposed regions, and climate change is increasing the frequency of rapidly intensifying storms, extending the Atlantic hurricane season, and heightening the risk of extreme rainfall, storm surge, and coastal flooding events. The populations most exposed to these hazards are frequently those with the least adaptive capacity: rural and coastal communities that are geographically isolated, insufficiently connected to national early warning infrastructure, and dependent on informal local communication networks that break down precisely when hazard conditions are most severe. Without trained community-level responders and locally anchored warning dissemination systems, the gap between national-level weather forecasting and household-level preparedness action leaves vulnerable populations exposed to preventable loss of life, injury, and asset destruction. Direct beneficiaries are community members who receive formal training as CBEWS focal points, community monitors, emergency response committee members, and first responders, and who take on active roles in hazard monitoring, alert dissemination, and community evacuation coordination. Indirect beneficiaries are the rural population living within the geographic coverage zone of each CBEWS, who benefit from the improved early warning and coordinated response capacity that trained community members provide. Direct beneficiaries receive adaptation benefits through: - Training in community-level hazard monitoring, early warning protocols, and alert dissemination procedures linked to national meteorological services and civil protection systems - Skills in community emergency response coordination, including evacuation route planning, shelter management, and vulnerable person registries - Capacity to operate and maintain locally installed monitoring equipment (rain gauges, water level sensors, community alert systems) - Integration into national and regional disaster risk management networks, strengthening two-way information flows between communities and national civil protection authorities - Improved personal and household preparedness and the institutional standing to advocate for community-level disaster risk reduction investment Indirect beneficiaries receive adaptation benefits through: - Access to timely, locally trusted early warnings communicated through community networks, significantly reducing the gap between hazard onset and household preparedness action - Improved evacuation rates and reduced loss of life during tropical storms, floods, and storm surge events as trained community responders coordinate response - Reduced post-disaster asset and livelihood losses as households act earlier and more effectively in response to warnings Assumptions - 50 community members are trained per CBEWS investment as focal points, emergency response committee members, monitors, and first responders. This is a conservative estimate consistent with Caribbean Comprehensive Disaster Management (CDM) framework training norms documented by CDEMA, which typically involve community block captains, neighbourhood focal points, emergency committee members, and volunteer monitors. - A minimum 30% female participation target is applied to direct trainees in line with CABRIC's Gender Action Plan, yielding a 70% male / 30% female split (35 male and 15 female per investment). - Each CBEWS investment is assumed to cover 10% of the national rural population, consistent with the coverage assumption used in the EFA model. The indirect beneficiary population is calculated as the total coverage zone population minus the 50 directly trained individuals, with national male/female population ratios applied.	140	60	ARA1	122,143	125,718	ARA1

Output	Methodology and assumptions per beneficiary type and benefits	Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
		Male individual	Female individual	Results area	Male individual	Female individual	Results area
	- Both direct and indirect beneficiaries are counted under ARA1 (most vulnerable people and communities), reflecting the disaster risk reduction focus of the intervention and the acute exposure of rural Caribbean communities to climate-related hazard events. 						

Output	Methodology and assumptions per beneficiary type and benefits	Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
		Male individual	Female individual	Results area	Male individual	Female individual	Results area
	B2: Post-disaster mobile mental health support model beneficiaries Beneficiary: Individuals in climate-affected communities who receive direct mental health assessment, treatment, and psychosocial support through mobile mental health units deployed in the aftermath of climate-related disaster events. Climate change is intensifying the frequency and severity of hurricanes, floods, and storm surge events across the Caribbean, exposing populations to repeated cycles of acute trauma, prolonged displacement, asset loss, and livelihood disruption. The mental health consequences of this exposure are well-documented and severe: post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), major depression, acute anxiety, and complicated grief are consistently elevated in populations following extreme weather events, and the Caribbean's small island geography — characterised by high population density, limited land area, and inescapable exposure to successive disasters — means that communities rarely complete recovery before the next hazard event strikes. These impacts are compounded by the near-total absence of accessible mental health services across the region: Caribbean health systems are significantly under-resourced in mental health provision, mental health professionals are concentrated in capital cities, and the stigma attached to mental illness in many Caribbean communities creates substantial barriers to care-seeking even where services nominally exist. Mobile mental health units directly address this treatment gap by bringing trained community mental health workers and telehealth-enabled support to affected communities in the critical post-disaster window, when the risk of acute mental health deterioration is highest and when early intervention most significantly reduces long-term morbidity. Direct beneficiaries receive adaptation benefits through: - Mental health assessment, diagnosis, and evidence-based treatment for post-disaster PTSD, depression, anxiety, and acute stress reactions, delivered in or near affected communities by trained community mental health workers - Psychosocial first aid and peer support group facilitation in the immediate aftermath of climate disaster events, reducing acute distress and preventing crisis escalation - Access to telehealth-enabled specialist consultation and supervision, connecting community mental health workers to clinical supervisors and enabling case referral to higher-level care where required - Reduced long-term mental health morbidity and associated losses in economic productivity, educational attainment, and household functioning through timely early intervention - Reduced barriers to care by delivering services within communities, removing the need for travel to urban health facilities and minimising the deterrent effect of institutional mental health settings Assumptions: - Each mobile unit is staffed by 10 community mental health workers. Community mental health workers are trained, supervised paraprofessionals able to deliver psychosocial first aid, structured psychological interventions, and case triage under clinical supervision, consistent with WHO and PAHO task-sharing frameworks for mental health in low-resource settings. - Each community mental health worker is assumed to serve 40 patients per deployment cycle, yielding 400 patients per unit. This estimate is anchored in Eustache et al. (2018, PLOS One), which evaluated a mobile mental health clinic in rural Haiti — a Caribbean-analogous context — and documented an average of 42 patients per session and 318 unduplicated patients over two years (approximately 159 per year). The 400-patient estimate per unit is conservative relative to the programme's planned deployment intensity. - 60% of direct beneficiaries are female. This reflects the consistent and well-evidenced pattern of greater mental health vulnerability among women following climate disaster events. Norris et al.'s meta-analysis of 160 disaster mental health studies found that 46 of 49 studies reporting gender differences identified women as more adversely affected. The Puerto Rico Hurricane Maria study (Abeldaño Zuñiga et al., 2019) found PTSD prevalence of 8.2% among girls compared to 6.1% among boys. The World Bank's Gender Dimensions of Disaster Risk (2021) identifies women as consistently showing higher propensity for PTSD, depression, and anxiety in post-disaster contexts across the global literature. - No indirect beneficiaries are modelled for this intervention. Benefits are direct and individual — mental health treatment is received by the patient — and attributing indirect household or community effects, while plausible, would not meet the GCF standard of demonstrated, targeted benefit delivery required for beneficiary counting.	9,440	14,160	ARA2			

Output	Methodology and assumptions per beneficiary type and benefits	Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
		Male individual	Female individual	Results area	Male individual	Female individual	Results area
	All direct beneficiaries are counted under ARA2 (health, well-being, food and water security), reflecting the health and well-being dimension of post-disaster mental health support. 						

Output	Methodology and assumptions per beneficiary type and benefits	Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
		Male individual	Female individual	Results area	Male individual	Female individual	Results area
	B3: Hurricane-proofing community buildings to act as shelters model beneficiaries Beneficiary: Residents living within the catchment area of community buildings retrofitted to certified hurricane shelter standard, who gain access to a structurally resilient shelter-in-place option during tropical storms, hurricanes, and associated flooding and storm surge events. Caribbean communities are acutely exposed to hurricane-force winds and storm surge, and the adequacy of available shelter infrastructure is a direct determinant of life safety outcomes during major events. Across the region, a large proportion of the existing building stock — including community centres, health facilities, and schools that nominally serve as emergency shelters — was constructed before modern hurricane-resistant building codes were adopted or enforced, and has not been retrofitted to meet current standards. During major hurricane events, these buildings can fail structurally precisely when they are most needed, leaving sheltering populations without protection and emergency responders without safe operating bases. At the same time, the cost and logistical complexity of constructing new purpose-built shelters is prohibitive for most CABRIC country governments at the scale required to cover dispersed coastal communities. Retrofitting existing public buildings that already function as community focal points is therefore the most cost-effective and rapidly deployable mechanism for closing the shelter infrastructure gap in priority communities. Direct beneficiaries are residents within the geographic catchment area of each retrofitted building who gain access to a certified hurricane shelter during climate hazard events. As the benefit is the availability of safe shelter — an infrastructure service available to all catchment residents at the moment of need — the entire catchment population is counted as direct beneficiaries. Direct beneficiaries receive adaptation benefits through: - Access to a structurally certified hurricane shelter within their community during tropical storms, hurricanes, and associated extreme weather events, significantly reducing the risk of death or serious injury from structural building failure - Reduced need to travel to distant urban shelter facilities during hazard events, which is a critical advantage for elderly, disabled, and other mobility-limited residents, and reduces road congestion during mass evacuation - A shelter facility that also serves as a base for emergency response operations, community communications, and post-disaster relief distribution, providing resilience benefits beyond the immediate shelter function - Reduced household economic losses from storm events as residents who shelter safely are better positioned to protect moveable assets and return to productive activity more rapidly in the recovery phase - Long-term community confidence in disaster preparedness, encouraging earlier and higher rates of voluntary shelter-seeking behaviour in future hazard events Assumptions: - The population served per retrofitted building is estimated as the national population divided by the total number of health facilities in each country, which are used as a proxy for the community buildings most likely to be selected for retrofitting given their existing public function and geographic distribution. Sources: Bahamas — 96 facilities (Ministry of Health and Wellness facility registry); Jamaica — 342 facilities (Jamaica Information Service); Saint Lucia — 40 health centres (stats.gov.lc). National male/female population ratios are applied to estimate gender disaggregation. - Each investment unit corresponds to one retrofitted community building. The modelled investment level of approximately 1.04 buildings per country reflects the EFA budget allocation for this sub-theme across Bahamas, Jamaica, and Saint Lucia. - No indirect beneficiaries are modelled for this intervention. The benefit — access to a structurally certified shelter — is experienced directly by the catchment population at the point of use and does not generate a defined category of secondary beneficiaries analogous to the peer learning or food security spillover effects modelled under other sub-themes. - Belize and Grenada have zero investments under this sub-theme in the modelled scenario. - All direct beneficiaries are counted under ARA3 (infrastructure and built environment), reflecting the physical infrastructure nature of the intervention and its primary benefit of improved climate-resilient shelter provision.	8,661	9,021	ARA3			

Output	Methodology and assumptions per beneficiary type and benefits	Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
		Male individual	Female individual	Results area	Male individual	Female individual	Results area
Output 2.2 Institutional capacity to implement and adaptively manage gender transformative climate resilient livelihood and social projects increased	Beneficiary: CSO, NGO, and LA staff receiving capacity building support for project implementation, monitoring and evaluation, GEDSI integration, and environmental and social safeguards compliance. CSOs, NGOs and LAs that receive funding through the CABRIC EDA facility require institutional capacity to effectively implement and manage climate adaptation projects. While proposal development (Output 1.1) involves a core team, project implementation requires broader organisational capacity including field staff, M&E officers, finance personnel, and community mobilisers. Without adequate implementation capacity, funded projects risk underperformance, poor monitoring, and failure to meet safeguards requirements. Participants receive direct capacity building benefits through: - Data literacy and M&E training for tracking project results and impacts - Specialised training on GEDSI integration in project implementation - Environmental and Social Safeguards compliance training - Access to standardised data collection templates and monitoring tools - Ongoing support through the CABRIC helpdesk - Participation in cross-project peer learning exchanges and site visits Assumptions: - 15 CSOs/NGOs/LAs receiving implementation support per country. Consistent with Output 1.1 - organisations trained in proposal development will also receive implementation support. The actual number receiving implementation training will depend on successful funding applications, but capacity building will be offered to all engaged organisations to strengthen the pipeline for future calls. - 12 staff per organisation receiving implementation training. Implementation requires broader organisational capacity than proposal development. In addition to the core proposal team, implementation involves field coordinators, M&E officers, finance staff, community mobilisers, and other personnel who require training on project management, safeguards, and reporting requirements. This represents an average across organisations of varying sizes. - Assuming 50-50 male/female split Note: These beneficiaries include the individuals trained under Output 1.1 in proposal development, plus an additional 300 implementation staff (field coordinators, M&E officers, finance personnel, etc.) who require capacity building for project delivery. To avoid double-counting, the 600 beneficiaries from Output 1.1 are not counted separately in the programme total.	450	450	ARA1			
ARA1 beneficiaries		2,432	2,333	ARA1	423,079	433,014	ARA1
ARA2 beneficiaries		9,440	14,160	ARA2	31,356	31,874	ARA2
ARA3 beneficiaries		12,318	11,325	ARA3	-	-	ARA3
ARA4 beneficiaries		105	45	ARA4	5,904	6,096	ARA4

Output	Methodology and assumptions per beneficiary type and benefits	Direct beneficiaries			Indirect beneficiaries		
		Male individual	Female individual	Results area	Male individual	Female individual	Results area
Total beneficiaries		23,995	27,563	All	460,339	470,984	All

