
Annual Performance Report

Project/Programme title: Climate change adaptation solutions for Local Authorities in the Federated States of Micronesia (FP169)

Accredited Entity: Pacific Community (SPC)

Date of Report submission: 14 April 2026

Version number V1.0



Contents

Section A	<u>PROJECT DATA</u>
Section B	<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>
Section C	<u>RESULTS AND IMPACTS</u>
Section D	<u>RISKS ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT</u>
Section E	<u>FINANCIAL INFORMATION</u>
Section F	<u>ENVIRONMENTAL SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS & GENDER & INDIGENOUS PEOPLE</u>
Section G	<u>ANNEXES</u>

RATIONALE

This report layout is designed to support the drafting of a structured report that assesses, evaluates, documents, and communicates the progress on Funding Proposal (FP) implementation and on its associated Funded Activity Agreement (FAA). The layout aims to provide a clear and comprehensive understanding of key objectives, progress, and risks, drawing on project implementation related data provided by Accredited Entities (AEs). Considering the Green Climate Fund's (GCF) evolving strategic direction toward a Risk-Based Approach, the report is intended to:

- Track quantitative and qualitative progress of the project implementation.
- Highlight critical findings and emerging trends.
- Identify risks and propose actionable mitigation strategies.
- Support evidence-based decision-making.
- Promote transparency and accountability.
- Align with strategic and regulatory frameworks.
- Serve as a foundation for AE engagement on project performance

METHODOLOGY

The report's layout mirrors, to the extent possible, the structure of the Funding Proposal (FP) to maintain coherence with the presented information. However, the FP and the Report differ in scope and strategic intent; thus, while the FP serves a functional role in informing the Report, it does not dictate a strictly parallel structure.

A. PROJECT DATA (Prefilled where possible)														
Should any information/data prefilled from Section A.1 to Section A.12 be incorrect or require updating, please inform GCF's Project Lead of appropriate corrective action.														
A.1. Date of report submission		14 April 2026												
A.2. Project or programme	Project	A.3. Sector	Public											
A.4. Total Financing (GCF + Cofinance)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>GCF Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 16.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>Mill. USD 16.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Co-Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 3.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>InKind</td> <td>Mill. USD 3.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 19.7</td> </tr> </table>				GCF Financing	Mill. USD 16.6	Grants	Mill. USD 16.6	Co-Financing	Mill. USD 3.1	InKind	Mill. USD 3.1	Total Financing	Mill. USD 19.7
	GCF Financing	Mill. USD 16.6												
	Grants	Mill. USD 16.6												
	Co-Financing	Mill. USD 3.1												
	InKind	Mill. USD 3.1												
Total Financing	Mill. USD 19.7													
A.5. Total GCF funding disbursed to this date	NA (draft)													
A.6. Implementation period	From NA to NA													
A.7. ESS Category (Refers to GCF revised <u>Environmental and Social Policy</u> and GCF ESS Standards to assess your FP category.)			Category B											
A.8. Executing Entity Information														
Full legal name	Country of registration (or, for intl orgs, country of HQ)	Entity type	Role in project	Focal Point(s) and email(s)										
The Pacific Community	New Caledonia	Direct Access Entity	Executing Entity and Accredited Entity	floydr@spc.int; seank@spc.int										

A.9. Co-Financier information				
Full legal name	Country of registration (or, for intl orgs, country of HQ)	Focal Point(s) and email(s)	Ownership Type	Beneficial Owner(s)
Government of FSM	Micronesia (Federated States of)	kattinowgisog@gmail.com; sligohr@gmail.com; nowellpetrus@gmail.com; ODA@kosrae.gov.fm	government	Not applicable
SPC	New Caledonia	Sherlynr@spc.int	Intergovernmental organization	Not applicable

A.10. Alignment with country NDCs & NAP <i>(NB Only populate if applicable, e.g., if your project/programme specifically contributes to a country's NDC or NAP target/s)</i>				
Country	Date of NDC/ NAP submission	NDC/ NAP objective	Brief description of project's alignment with NDC/ NAP objectives	Percentage of target met with proposed project.Beneficial owner(s)
Micronesia (Federated States of)	16 September 2025	FP169 is well aligned with FSM's NDC 3.0 adaptation objectives, particularly on strengthening water and food security, enhancing ecosystem resilience, reducing climate risks, and building local institutional capacity. By financing community-driven adaptation through local authorities, the project directly supports the NDC's emphasis on locally led, inclusive, and practical climate action.	FP169 project is strongly aligned with the Federated States of Micronesia's NDC 3.0 priorities, particularly on adaptation. The project focuses on enhancing local adaptive capacity, improving food and water security, strengthening disaster risk reduction, and building climate-resilient infrastructure and livelihoods at community level . These interventions directly support key NDC objectives, including ensuring resilient water systems, protecting ecosystems and biodiversity, and addressing climate impacts on food security and vulnerable communities . Moreover, by channeling finance and decision-making to local authorities through an Enhanced Direct Access model, the project reinforces country ownership and decentralized implementation—core principles underpinning FSM's NDC approach to translating national commitments into locally driven climate action.	0%

A.11. Estimated duration of impact	
A.12 Report to be shared with NDA	Yes ☐ No ☐

B. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Should any information/data prefilled in Section “B” be incorrect or require updating, please inform GCF’s Project Lead for appropriate corrective action.

B.1. Summary

This reporting period marked a major milestone for the FSM Enhancing Direct Access Programme, with the successful launch of the first Call for Proposals and the submission of 20 proposals. Building on earlier groundwork, the Programme Coordination Unit (PCU) advanced capacity building and operationalized the Resilient Communities Grants Facility. While logframe targets have not yet been achieved, this reflects the programme’s position in the pre-granting phase, with results expected to materialize following proposal approvals in 2026.

A total of 57 Expressions of Interest were received, with 21 applicants progressing to proposal formulation and 20 proposals developed. The 20 submitted proposals are collectively valued at approximately USD 12 million, corresponding to the full sub-grants allocation. The PCU continues to support refinement of proposals to ensure alignment with funding ceilings and quality standards. Capacity-building workshops and targeted technical assistance delivered across all four states significantly strengthened proposal quality, ownership, and understanding of climate risks and adaptation solutions.

Substantial progress was also made in environmental and social safeguards (ESS), including finalization of the ESMP framework, risk categorization of all proposals, and delivery of ESS and grievance mechanism training. Programme management was strengthened through recruitment of key staff, onboarding of Facilitating Agents, and enhanced coordination with national stakeholders and other GCF initiatives.

Implementation challenges were driven by the limited capacity of local authorities, requiring intensive, hands-on support through workshops, mentoring, and iterative reviews. This increased demands on the PCU but resulted in stronger proposals. Key lessons include the importance of close stakeholder accompaniment, flexible implementation approaches, and adequate resourcing during the pre-granting phase.

Looking ahead, priorities for 2026 include finalizing proposal approvals, strengthening implementation support, enhancing monitoring systems, and advancing gender-responsive delivery.

C. RESULTS AND IMPACTS

C.1. Overall Summary of the Project Progress

(This section provides a narrative report summarizing the overall progress of the implementation status of the funded activity progress during the reporting period. 1,500 words)

During the reporting period, the Programme made significant progress, with a focus on capacity building, proposal development, and the operationalization of the Resilient Communities Grants Facility (RCGF). While the Programme remains in a pre-granting phase and outcome-level results are not yet fully realized, key milestones were achieved across outcomes, outputs, and activities, establishing a strong foundation for implementation and delivery of adaptation results from 2026 onward.

Outcome 1: Local authorities are empowered to deliver climate change adaptation services to their populations

Progress under Outcome 1 focused on strengthening the capacity of Local Authorities to identify, prioritize, and design climate adaptation solutions. While outcome-level indicators remain pending due to the pre-granting phase, substantial progress was achieved through training, technical support, and proposal development. A total of 21 Local Authorities were supported, resulting in 20 full proposals submitted. Capacity building, field consultations, and iterative feedback improved understanding of climate risks, ESS requirements, and project design. These efforts established a strong foundation for implementation and delivery of adaptation results from 2026 onward.

Output 1.1: Build technical expertise to identify and prioritize adaptation solutions

Progress under Output 1.1 focused on strengthening technical expertise of Local Authorities and Facilitating Agents. Adaptation planning tools and training materials were applied through workshops across all four FSM states. Continuous engagement, mentoring, and refresher trainings enhanced stakeholders' ability to identify climate risks and prioritize adaptation interventions. Facilitating Agents played a key role in supporting Local Authorities and linking them with technical experts. These efforts contributed to improved proposal quality and stronger alignment with local needs and climate risks.

Activity 1.1.1. Develop climate adaptation decision support framework and training curriculum including interactive case studies targeting government officials

Adaptation planning tools and training materials were applied through workshops across the four FSM states, supporting Local Authorities in identifying and prioritizing climate risks and adaptation solutions. These tools guided structured discussions and informed proposal development, strengthening technical understanding and decision-making capacity.

Activity 1.1.2. Climate adaptation decision support training for local authorities

Proposal training workshops were conducted across all four states (Kosrae, Yap, Chuuk, and Pohnpei) for 21 Local Authorities invited to submit proposals. Refresher training in Q3 strengthened the capacity of Facilitating Agents and State Focal Points. Facilitating Agents connected Local Authorities with technical experts (ESS, water, food security, DRR), ensuring targeted support to improve proposal quality and technical robustness.

Activity 1.1.3. Develop train-the-trainer's module and conduct training for national consultants and/or local NGOs in each State to become Facilitating Agents

Refresher training on proposal development was conducted in Q3 for Facilitating Agents and State Focal Points. Following the recruitment of additional Facilitating Agents, onboarding support was provided during missions to Kosrae and Chuuk. Facilitating Agents maintained continuous coordination with technical experts, ensuring timely guidance and strengthening proposal development throughout the Call for Proposals stage.

Activity 1.1.4. Facilitating Agents to support LAs to prioritise adaptation actions for Grants Facility

Facilitating Agents supported Municipalities and State Governments throughout the Call for Proposals (September–October 2025). Where technical gaps arose, they engaged EDA consultants (water, food security, DRR, ESS, and gender) to clarify queries and strengthen proposal submissions.

Output 1.2: Technical support on project preparation

Progress under Output 1.2 focused on strengthening the capacity of Local Authorities to design viable adaptation projects. Workshops, mentoring, and field consultations enabled Local Authorities to translate priorities into structured proposals aligned with GCF requirements. An integrated approach ensured inclusion of climate rationale, gender, ESS considerations, and sustainability. As a result, 20 full proposals were submitted, demonstrating improved technical quality and readiness for financing.

Activity 1.2.1. Project Preparation Trainings and Mentoring

Four state-level workshops were conducted for 21 Local Authorities, combining group sessions and individual consultations. Field visits and community consultations ensured proposals reflected local needs. Training covered climate rationale, gender, ESS, and sustainability, with discussions conducted in both English and local languages. This integrated and iterative approach strengthened proposal development and improved overall quality.

Output 1.3: Knowledge sharing mechanisms to develop and foster a network of local government authorities

Initial progress was made in establishing knowledge-sharing mechanisms to support climate-informed decision-making. The Programme assessed options and identified the SPC-led Integrated Pasifika Platform as the most suitable solution. While not yet operational, key design decisions were completed, ensuring alignment with regional platforms and long-term sustainability. The platform is expected to support peer learning and knowledge exchange across Local Authorities from 2026.

Activity 1.3.1. Develop a knowledge platform and ensure the Programme is connected to regional platforms across the Pacific

The Programme assessed knowledge platform options and selected the SPC Integrated Pasifika Platform. Preparatory work was undertaken to ensure linkage with regional platforms and alignment with national needs. Full operationalization is planned for 2026.

Outcome 2: Grant Facility for Enhancing local community resilience through priority adaptation projects implementation

Progress under Outcome 2 focused on operationalizing the Resilient Communities Grants Facility (RCGF). The first Call for Proposals generated 57 Expressions of Interest, with 21 shortlisted and 20 full proposals submitted. While disbursement has not yet commenced, governance, safeguards, and review systems were significantly strengthened. These efforts ensure readiness for proposal approval and financing in 2026.

Output 2.1: Establishment of Resilient Communities Grant Facility (RCGF)

Significant progress was made in establishing the RCGF governance and operational framework. Systems for proposal review, safeguards screening, and due diligence were strengthened. Coordination with SPC corporate teams ensured alignment with institutional processes. Capacity assessments of Local Authorities were initiated, supporting readiness for implementation. These efforts position the Programme for effective grant disbursement in 2026.

Activity 2.1.1. Governance structure for Resilient Communities Grant Facility (RCGF)

The Terms of Reference for the Technical Evaluation Committee were finalized, followed by recruitment and onboarding of members and initial briefings. Coordination with the SPC Corporate Grants Team ensured sub-grant proposals were integrated into the 2026 workplan. The SPC Social Environmental Responsibility (SER) team confirmed its role in supporting environmental and social impact assessments and proposal reviews, strengthening due diligence and compliance processes.

Activity 2.1.2. RCGF guidelines and procedures developed and finalized

Progress included refinement of gender review criteria for sub-grant selection, strengthening the integration of gender considerations into the RCGF processes and improving the inclusiveness of proposal assessment.

Output 2.2. Grant award selection

The first Call for EOIs was completed in 2024, followed by a Call for Proposals that resulted in 20 submissions valued at approximately USD 12 million. As a result, no further Calls for EOIs are planned under the EDA Programme.

Activity 2.2.1. Initial call for expressions of interest

The First Call for EOI was completed in 2024. Following a Call for Proposal, 20 submissions were received and accumulative value reaching USD 12 Million. Therefore the EDA Programme will not have any further calls for EOIs.

C.2. Performance against the Funding Proposal Logical Framework Indicators

For each of the indicators please report only the 'annual value' for the reporting year; this means reporting solely the values achieved from January 1st, 2025, to December 31st, 2025. The "cumulative value" will automatically be updated by the system by aggregating reported annual values since project FAA effectiveness.

Please ensure that targets are clearly defined and reported using the following categories:

- *Midterm Target: The results to be achieved by the midpoint of implementation.*
- *Final Target: The results to be achieved by the conclusion of project or programme implementation.*
- *Lifetime Target: The total results expected over the entire operational period of the project or programme.*

Note that the baseline, midterm, final and lifetime targets will be prefilled based on your previous Annual Performance Report and/or Funding Proposal. It is imperative that you carefully review, verify and update where relevant.



Should any prefilled information/data in the Logical Framework be incorrect or require updating, please inform GCF's Project Lead for appropriate corrective action.

GCF Outcome Level: Standardized Indicators

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by result area.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Result Areas (Adaptation)	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Health and well-being, and food and water security	0	27,150	54,301	0	0	0

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by Gender.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Male	0	13,792	27,585	0	0	0
Female	0	13,358	26,716	0	0	0

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by Country.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Micronesia (Federated States of)	0	27,150	54,301	0	0	0

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (RMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached
Provide the total number of indirect beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by result area.

Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Result Areas (Adaptation)	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Livelihoods of people and communities	0	46,008	92,016	0	0	0

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of indirect beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by Gender.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Male	0	0	45,272	0	0	0
Female	0	0	46,744	0	0	0

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of indirect beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by Country.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Micronesia (Federated States of)	0	46,008	92,016	0	0	0

Livelihoods of people and communities

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) A1.1 Change in expected losses of lives and economic assets due to the impact of extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic area of the GCF intervention (IRMF) Supplementary 2.7 Change in expected losses of lives due to the impact extreme climate-related disasters in the geographic area of the GCF intervention						
Provide the total reduction in expected loss of lives (female/male) due to climate-related disasters among targeted population, disaggregated by gender.						
Unit						No. of Persons
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Female	0	4	6	0	0	0
Male	0	4	6	0	0	0

(IRMF) Supplementary 2.5 Beneficiaries (female/male) adopting innovations that strengthen climate change resilience						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) using new or improved climate adaptation technologies or innovations, disaggregated by gender.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Male	1	4	6	0	0	0
Female	2	4	6	0	0	0

Health and well-being, and food & water security

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) A2.3 Number of males and females with year round access to reliable and safe water supply despite climate shocks and stresses (IRMF) Supplementary 2.3 Beneficiaries (female/male) with more climate-resilient water security						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) with improved access to and adoption of climate-resilient and reliable water supply in climate-stressed areas, disaggregated by gender.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Male	0	5,257	10,514	0	0	0
Female	0	5,083	10,165	0	0	0

(PMF) A2.3 Number of males and females with year round access to reliable and safe water supply despite climate shocks and stresses (IRMF) Supplementary 2.3 Beneficiaries (female/male) with more climate-resilient water security						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) with improved access to and adoption of climate-resilient and reliable water supply in climate-stressed areas, disaggregated by country.						
Unit						Enter unit
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Micronesia (Federated States of)	0	10,340	20,679	0	0	0

(PMF) A2.2 Number of food secure households (in areas/periods at risk of climate change impacts) (IRMF) Supplementary 2.2 Beneficiaries (female/male) with improved food security						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) with improved or sustained food security through enhanced physical, social, and economic access to, and utilization of, food and nutrition in areas at risk of climate change, disaggregated by gender.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Male	0	5,038	10,077	0	0	0
Female	0	4,871	9,742	0	0	0

Infrastructure and built environment

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) A3.1 Number and value of physical assets made more resilient to climate variability and change, considering human benefits (reported where applicable) (IRMF) Core 3 Value of physical assets made more resilient to the effects of climate change and/or more able to reduce GHG emissions					
Provide the total estimated value (USD) of physical assets made more resilient to climate change impacts in the targeted geographic areas.					
Unit					United States dollars
Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
	Mid-term	Final target			
0	445,100	735,500	0	0	0

(PMF) A3.1 Number and value of physical assets made more resilient to climate variability and change, considering human benefits (reported where applicable) (IRMF) Core 3 Value of physical assets made more resilient to the effects of climate change and/or more able to reduce GHG emissions						
Provide the total estimated value (USD) of physical assets made more resilient to climate change impacts in the targeted geographic areas, disaggregated by country.						
Unit						United States dollars
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Micronesia (Federated States of)		445,100	735,500	0	0	0

(PMF) A3.1 Number and value of physical assets made more resilient to climate variability and change, considering human benefits (reported where applicable) (IRMF) Core 3 Value of physical assets made more resilient to the effects of climate change and/or more able to reduce GHG emissions						
Provide the total estimated value (USD) of physical assets made more resilient to climate change impacts in the targeted geographic areas, disaggregated by asset type.						
Unit						United States dollars
Disaggregation by: Physical asset types (made more resilient)	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Other	0	445,100	735,500	0	0	0

Ecosystems and ecosystem services

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) A4.1 Coverage/scale of ecosystems protected and strengthened in response to climate variability and change					
Provide the total hectares of natural ecosystems protected, restored, conserved, or managed to reduce climate risks to ecosystem services and dependent people and communities.					
Unit					Hectares
Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
	Mid-term	Final target			
0	1,068	2,136	0	0	0

(PMF) A4.1 Coverage/scale of ecosystems protected and strengthened in response to climate variability and change						
Provide the total hectares of natural ecosystems protected, restored, conserved, or managed to reduce climate risks to ecosystem services and dependent people and communities, disaggregated by country.						
Unit						Hectares
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Micronesia (Federated States of)	0	1,068	2,136	0	0	0

(PMF) A4.1 Coverage/scale of ecosystems protected and strengthened in response to climate variability and change						
Provide the total hectares of natural ecosystems protected, restored, conserved, or managed to reduce climate risks to ecosystem services and dependent people and communities, disaggregated by ecosystem type.						
Unit						Hectares
Disaggregation by: Ecosystem types	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Coastal or marine	0	1,068	2,136	0	0	0

Project Specific Indicators							
Indicator	Unit	Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value <i>(automatically calculated)</i>
			Mid-term	Final target			
Number of adaptation planning support tools developed	Plans	0	1	4	0	4	4
Number of beneficiaries with enhanced knowledge and capacity to adapt to climate change, including vulnerable groups	No. of Persons	0	27,150	54,301	0	0	0
Number of climate information products developed in line with identified local needs and priorities	No. of Items	0	1	1	0	0	0
Number of Local Authorities who integrate the adaptation planning support tools in their decision-making processes	No. of Institutions	0	20	40	0	21	21
Number of municipalities and State authorities' officials who report increased knowledge and capacity to prioritize adaptation solutions and implement them	No. of Persons	0	70	140	0	291	291
Number of people who benefitted from food security sub-projects reporting increased food security	No. of Persons	0	7,927	11,891	0	0	0
Number of private sector actors with increased knowledge of challenges and opportunities in local adaptation planning	No. of Actors	0	10	20	0	1	1
Number of protected (climate-proofed) wells	No. of Items	0	1	2	0	0	0
Number of roadmaps / action plans developed for the recapitalization of the RCGF	Plans	0	0	1	0	0	0
Percentage of hectares of agricultural land with salinity levels >1g/l	Percentage	0	20	40	0	0	0
Recapitalized funding volume for the RCGF	United States dollars	0	0	12,000,000	0	0	0
A3.1 Number and value of physical assets made more resilient to climate variability and change, considering human	No. of Items	0	4	10	0	0	0

benefits (reported where applicable)							
--------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
Activity 1.1.1. Develop climate adaptation decision support framework and training curriculum including interactive case studies targeting government officials	100	188,500	188,500	100
Activity 1.1.2. Climate adaptation decision support training for local authorities	90	75,784.3	396,240	19
Activity 1.1.3. Develop train-the-trainer's module and conduct training for national consultants and/or local NGOs in each State to become Facilitating Agents	70	44,401.98	367,000	12
Activity 1.1.4. Facilitating Agents to support LAs to prioritise adaptation actions for Grants Facility	30	76,439.82	310,624	24
Activity 1.2.1. Project Preparation Trainings and Mentoring	30	54,290.39	183,208	29
Activity 1.3.1. Develop a knowledge platform and ensure the Programme is connected to regional platforms across the Pacific	10	1	85,840	0
Activity 1.3.2. Learning exchanges and site visit	0	0	98,000	0
Activity 1.3.3. Climate change adaptation local authorities conference	0	0	165,224	0
Activity 2.1.1. Governance structure for Resilient Communities Grant Facility (RCGF)	50	0	78,300	0
Activity 2.1.2. RCGF guidelines and procedures developed and finalized	100	8,400	52,208	16
Activity 2.2.2. Screening of Expressions of Interest	60	0	211,500	0
Activity 2.2.3. Organizational audit of sub-national entities/LAs undertaken	0	0	96,000	0
Activity 2.2.4. Invitations to submit full proposal	0	0	12,000	0

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
Activity 2.2.5. Sub-grant preparation support provided	0	0	372,500	0
Activity 2.2.6. Sub-grant screening and selection	0	8,075	425,750	1
Activity 2.2.7. Awarding of grants in the three thematic areas of food security, climate-induced disaster risk reduction and coastal protection, and water security	0	0	119,624	0
Activity 2.3.1. Training to improve sub-national entity service delivery of adaptation interventions	0	0	298,000	0
Activity 2.3.2. Sub-Grant agreements entered, implemented, monitored and reviewed	0	0	14,914.15	0
Activity 2.3.3. Sub-projects evaluated, and lessons gathered	0	0	128,380	0
Activity 2.3.4. Continued resource mobilization	0	0	115,624	0

C.2.1. Subprojects							
Where applicable, include information on sub-projects. For projects and programmes approved until B.31, the logical framework should focus on the mitigation and adaptation Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMF). For projects and programmes approved from B.32 onwards, the logical framework should reflect the Integrated Results Management Framework (IRMF).							
Title	Currency	GCF Funds	Co-Financing	Country	GHG Emissions Reduced	Direct Beneficiaries	Indirect Beneficiaries
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
C.3. Compliance with FAA covenants				Yes ☒ No ☐			

C.4. Funded Activity Implementation Arrangements in the Following Year	Yes ☐ No ☒
N/A	

D. RISKS ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT

D.1. Risk and mitigation measures

As stated in the Board-approved "Risk Appetite Statement," a cornerstone of the GCF's Risk Framework is proactive risk management. This includes risk identification, assessment, monitoring, reporting and appropriate mitigation to minimize and respond to risks, both directly and through partners implementing GCF's projects and programmes.

Risk Management Matrix

A risk is the probability of an event to adversely affect the achievement of the project Impact (its objectives, outcomes, and results). "Inherent risk" refers to the level of risk present before any of the mitigating measures are applied. "Residual risk" represents the level of risk after mitigating measures have been implemented.

Please update the project risk matrix by reviewing and revising information for all previously identified risks, and adding any new risks identified during implementation by selecting the adequate Risk Area in the drop-down menu. For each risk, ensure you provide a clear risk description, outline the potential negative consequences, specify the mitigating measures in place, and complete the severity scoring as required.

For the Integrity Risk Area, an annual reporting (and more frequent and prompt reporting if stated in the legal agreements with the GCF) is required for each of its 3 Risk Sub-areas, as GCF has zero tolerance for Prohibited Practices, for SEAH in Fund-related Activities, and for working with parties and engaging in activities subject to sanctions imposed by the United Nations Security Council. The AE reporting obligations under GCF's policies and in the legal agreement(s) with the GCF include but are not limited to requiring AEs to take action to identify, mitigate and promptly disclose to the GCF any real or perceived Conflict of Interest, any alleged or suspected Prohibited Practice, promptly notify the Fund of any material risks or other indications of money laundering and/or financing of terrorism in relation to the Project and promptly take remedial steps in consultation with the GCF.

The AE shall also provide updates on the risks and mitigating measures under the other Risk Areas when changes to already identified risks or new risks have been identified.

Risk scoring:

For likelihood, please rate on a scale from 1 to 5: 1. Unlikely, 2. Possible, 3. Likely, 4. Almost certain, 5. Certain

For impact, please rate on a scale from 1 to 5: 1. Close to none, 2. Low, 3. Medium, 4. High, 5. Catastrophic

The severity of each risk is automatically computed based on the likelihood and impact of the risk.

Risk 1	Low capacity of Municipalities and State Governments		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Design and Implementation		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Effective engagement with Municipalities and State Governments has required considerable time and sustained technical support, reflecting their limited prior experience in project formulation and climate finance processes. For many local authorities, this programme represents their first direct involvement in developing comprehensive adaptation proposals, marking a significant shift from previous approaches to accessing grant funding. As a result, the level and duration of technical assistance and coordination required during implementation were underestimated at the formulation stage. This has created a risk of placing strain on the Programme Coordination Unit (PCU), particularly in terms of available human resources and budget capacity.		
Consequences	If not adequately mitigated, this risk may overstretch the PCU's capacity to effectively support sub-grant implementation, potentially compromising the quality of oversight, causing delays, and placing additional pressure on programme resources. Inadequate support may also limit local authorities' ability to comply with GCF requirements, thereby affecting the overall effectiveness and sustainability of adaptation interventions.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	To mitigate this risk, the PCU implemented a range of measures to manage workload while maintaining effective support. Close collaboration with technical consultants and State Facilitating Agents was sustained to distribute responsibilities and provide targeted technical assistance. During the Call for Proposals, weekly coordination meetings were held to monitor progress, while Facilitating Agents engaged regularly with technical experts for guidance. The PCU also conducted ongoing reviews of budget		

	allocations to identify potential savings and reallocate resources toward implementation-related needs, in full compliance with GCF financial management policies and procedures. In parallel, structured and regular communication was maintained with Facilitating Agents and Local Authorities through virtual engagements. This included remote review of draft proposals and the provision of detailed feedback by the PCU and technical consultants, helping to maintain proposal quality while reducing the need for resource-intensive in-person support.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 2	Changing leadership		
Risk Origin	External Factors		
Risk Area	Political		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Changes in leadership following municipal elections have resulted in new administrations with incoming officers who often have limited knowledge or understanding of the EDA Programme and the progress achieved under previous administrations. In Chuuk State, elections held in 2025 were further affected by a delay of two to three weeks in the official announcement of results.		
Consequences	Potential delays in activity implementation and proposal development may arise due to newly appointed focal points requiring time to familiarize themselves with progress achieved under previous administrations. In Chuuk State, proposal workshops for the four municipalities invited to submit proposals were consequently delayed.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The PCU responded proactively by organizing briefing sessions on the EDA Programme for new municipal administrations, including dedicated Q&A sessions and follow-up discussions upon request. A flexible approach was adopted, with virtual proposal awareness workshops conducted initially, followed by in-person discussions in Chuuk once election results were formally announced.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 3	Technical aspects of EDA such as gender and environmental social safeguards inclusion viewed as new/separate topic by local authorities		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Design and Implementation		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	While there is strong interest among municipalities and state governments in developing proposals, there is a perception that topics such as environmental and social safeguards and gender are separate requirements, which may increase workload in facilitating discussions and integrating them into proposals.		
Consequences	This had the potential to discourage applicants from completing and submitting their proposals within the deadlines of the Call for Proposals		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	EDA awareness-raising workshops adopted a flexible approach, integrating sessions on gender and environmental and social safeguards into the agenda. This helped participants better understand the broader context and how these elements contribute to the sustainability and achievement of project results.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium

Comments	N/A		
Risk 4	Conflict of interest		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Conflict of interest		
Description	Conflicts of interest may arise among individuals involved in proposal evaluation, decision-making, or implementation processes.		
Consequences	This could undermine the fairness, transparency, and credibility of the selection process and lead to suboptimal allocation of resources.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 6 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	SPC applies its procurement and governance procedures, which require structured contracting processes, documentation of partner information, and adherence to established standards. Strengthened procurement policies (since 2022) include enhanced due diligence checks and clearer procedures for engaging vendors and consultants, reducing the risk of undue influence.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 5	Fraud, bribery, collusion, prohibited practices		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Fraud / Bribery & Corruption / Collusion and any other prohibited practice		
Description	There is a risk of fraudulent practices, bribery, or collusion during the selection and implementation of subprojects, particularly in decentralized contexts involving multiple stakeholders.		
Consequences	This could lead to misallocation or misuse of funds, reduced effectiveness of project interventions, and reputational damage to SPC and the programme.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 4 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	SPC includes anti-corruption clauses in all supplier agreements aligned with the United Nations Convention against Corruption and applies its Managing Fraud and Corruption Policy across all stages of project implementation. Donor agreements (e.g. EU and DFAT-funded programmes) also include specific provisions on fraud, anti-corruption, and irregularities. SPC has internal mechanisms to trace financial transactions, investigate irregular receipts, and relies on contractual controls and documented partner information to ensure accountability.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 6	Sanctions		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Sanctions		
Description	While FSM is not subject to international sanctions, there remains a low risk of inadvertently engaging with sanctioned individuals or entities through third-party contractors or suppliers.		
Consequences	This could lead to non-compliance with donor requirements, potential funding disruptions, and reputational risks.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 4 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	SPC conducts screening of all external partners using tools such as Sanction Scanner, which checks against multiple international sanctions lists. This is complemented by due		

	diligence procedures embedded in procurement processes and vendor onboarding requirements, ensuring alignment with donor compliance obligations.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 7	Money laundering and terrorism financing		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Money Laundering (ML) & Terrorist Financing (TF)		
Description	There is a risk that project funds could be misused for money laundering or inadvertently linked to terrorism financing through third-party partners or weak controls.		
Consequences	This could result in non-compliance with donor requirements, financial losses, and reputational risks.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	SPC complies with donor AML/CFT requirements and has adopted an AML/CFT Policy, supported by due diligence procedures applied to all vendors and partners. These include mandatory vendor forms, due diligence questionnaires, and background checks prior to contracting. Financial flows are monitored through banking systems, with the ability to trace transactions and investigate anomalies. SPC also conducts monthly bank reconciliations and applies procurement-level AML/CFT checks in partner selection.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Comments	N/A		

D.2. Report risk incidents

If any risk (previously identified or not) has materialized, please capture it here as a risk incident.

(this section is confidential)

E. FINANCIAL INFORMATION

E.1. GCF financing

In addition to the financial report in the annex, update the table with relevant GCF financial data for each country and instrument, including amounts and allocation percentages.

Country	Instrument	Currency (as per FAA)	Committed Amount	Disbursed Amount	Expenditure (reporting year)	Cumulative Expenditure	Mitigation	Adaptation
Micronesia (Federated States of)	Grants	USD	16,591,554	3,018,319	857,765.39	1,939,596.18	0%	100%
Total		USD	16,591,554	3,018,319	857,765.39	1,939,596.18	N/A	N/A

E.2. Co-financing

Please populate the table with relevant Co-financing data for each Co-financier and instrument, including amounts and allocation percentages.

Co-financier	Instrument	Currency (as per FAA)	Committed Amount	Disbursed Amount	Expenditure (reporting year)	Cumulative Expenditure	Mitigation	Adaptation
FSM Government	In-kind	USD	2,916,571	93,474	55,814	93,474	0%	100%
The Pacific Community	In-kind	USD	202,510	112,440.74	83,182.74	112,440.74	0%	100%
Total		USD	3,119,081	205,914.74	138,996.74	205,914.74	N/A	N/A

E.3. Additional Finance Mobilised Beyond Approved Co-financing

Report the realised (cumulative value) and/or expected volume (Final Target) of private/public finance leveraged as a result of GCF involvement in the investment, in addition to and beyond any co-financing originally committed at approval. This datapoint shall be reported separately from official co-financing figures and is intended to capture the catalytic effect of GCF investments and support institutional learning.

GCF Policy: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/policy-cofinancing.pdf>

No additional finance mobilized information provided.

File Name: FP169 FSM EDA_APR Financial Report_FY2025 (2).pdf

F. ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS, GENDER, and INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

This section provides an update against the ESS standards agreed as part of the Environmental and Social Action Plan (ESAP) and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), as well as Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS), Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP), Indigenous Peoples Plan Framework (IPPF), Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) when applicable.

F.1. progress on key challenges and updates regarding Environmental and Social Safeguards

Key Environmental and Social Changes

Have there been any changes in the key environmental and social risks and impacts? If you tick 'Yes,' please provide further information.

Yes ☐ No ☒

Environmental and Social Safeguarding Updates

Have there been any change/update on environmental and social safeguarding? you tick 'Yes,' please provide further information.

Yes ☐ No ☒

F.2. Compliance with laws and regulations applicable to ESS. Gender and Indigenous Peoples.

Have there been any changes or updates regarding compliance with applicable laws and regulations of the country, as well as the relevant conditions or covenants under the FAA?

Yes ☐ No ☒

F.3. ESS standards implementation progress

Does this reporting period include any ESS standards-related activities or updates?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If you tick 'Yes', please provide further information to report on the progress made in complying with the requirements of the relevant ESS standards that were triggered during the approval of the funding proposal and during the reporting period, if any; and the GCF Indigenous Peoples Policy, if relevant, describing achievement and specifying details outlined in the tables below.

Activities implemented during the reporting period, including monitoring

The Programme made significant progress in operationalizing the Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) framework, including the finalization and rollout of a revised Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) aligned with GCF requirements and IFC Performance Standards. As sub-projects progressed from Expressions of Interest to full proposal development, activities shifted from capacity building to implementation readiness, with emphasis on risk assessment, procedural consistency, and regulatory alignment. ESS training and awareness sessions were delivered across Pohnpei, Chuuk, Kosrae, and Yap, targeting Local Authorities (LAs), Facilitating Agents (FAs), and State stakeholders. Trainings were tailored to State contexts and covered ESS risk categorization, GCF safeguards, and national EPA requirements. Additional field visits and one-on-one coaching were conducted in lower-capacity contexts, particularly in Chuuk. Monitoring was ensured through continuous engagement, including follow-up sessions, proposal review cycles, and coordination with the national ESS consultant. ESS consultants screened all proposals, conducted bilateral sessions to refine risk identification and mitigation measures, and facilitated sessions to communicate final risk categorizations. Preparatory work for ESIA and ESMP development, including drafting Terms of Reference, was also initiated.

Outputs during the reporting period

A fully revised ESMS aligned with GCF policies and IFC Performance Standards (PS1–PS8) was finalized and operationalized as the central safeguards framework. Institutional roles across the Accredited Entity (AE), Programme Coordination Unit (PCU), Facilitating Agents (FAs), and Local Authorities (LAs) were clarified, and updated screening tools, templates, and monitoring forms were disseminated. Capacity building results were significant: 61 participants (42 men and 19 women) improved their understanding of ESS, and all 20 submitted proposals included ESS risk assessments and mitigation measures. Facilitating Agents and the PCU strengthened their understanding of safeguards requirements and risk categorization. Additional outputs include the development of an ESS compliance checklist, improved consistency in proposal screening and documentation, and enhanced stakeholder engagement practices. Initial steps for ESIA and ESMP processes were undertaken, including drafting Terms of Reference and initiating procurement of consultants. The Programme has also transitioned toward implementation readiness, with strengthened systems and tools in place to support safeguards compliance during the next phase.

Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during implementation

Key issues addressed included gaps in stakeholder engagement and documentation, unclear land tenure and consent processes, limited integration of gender and vulnerable groups, and inconsistencies in ESS risk screening and categorization. Challenges also arose from varying institutional capacities across States, requiring adaptation of safeguard procedures to different contexts. The restructuring of the ESMS helped address these issues by clarifying roles, improving sequencing of safeguards processes, and standardizing screening and categorization approaches. It also strengthened the integration of gender equality, stakeholder engagement, and grievance mechanisms into project design and implementation. The screening and proposal review process further addressed risks related to biodiversity, land access, cultural heritage, occupational health and safety, and compliance with State EPA requirements. Targeted technical support significantly improved the quality of risk identification and mitigation measures in proposals, ensuring alignment with GCF Environmental and Social Policy and national regulatory frameworks.

Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention

No major environmental, social, or gender issues requiring immediate action from the Accredited Entity or GCF were identified during this reporting period. The Programme has established robust safeguards systems and processes, including a revised ESMS, strengthened screening procedures, and enhanced capacity among Local Authorities and Facilitating Agents. Remaining activities relate primarily to the next phase of implementation, including the development of Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs). Additional refresher trainings and continued technical support may be required to ensure sustained compliance during implementation, particularly in lower-capacity contexts. Minor refinements to tools and processes may also be undertaken as lessons emerge from ESIA implementation. However, these are considered part of normal programme evolution and do not require specific intervention or escalation at this stage.

Remarks/Notes

The Programme has successfully transitioned from capacity building to implementation readiness, with strengthened institutional capacity, improved safeguards systems, and enhanced alignment with GCF and national requirements.

F.4. Sub-projects information

Have any subprojects been implemented?

Yes ☐ No ☒

N/A

N/A

F.5. Implementation of the stakeholder engagement plan	
Were any actions undertaken to increase engagement of relevant stakeholders in the project, particularly regarding environmental, social, and gender elements?	Yes ☒ No ☐
Activities implemented during the reporting period	
During the reporting period, extensive stakeholder engagement activities were conducted across all FSM states to support the implementation of the Enhancing Direct Access (EDA) Programme. These included information-sharing sessions, capacity assessments, technical working group meetings, proposal development and Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) workshops, bilateral consultations with municipalities, and coordination meetings with national and state stakeholders. Engagements involved a wide range of stakeholders, including national and state government entities (e.g. Department of Resources and Development), local authorities and municipalities, facilitating agents, sectoral initiatives such as the Small Islands Food and Water Project, and technical experts, including gender specialists. Engagements were tailored to different stages of the proposal cycle, ranging from early awareness raising and EOI feedback to detailed proposal formulation, reworking sessions, and lessons learned workshops. Additional targeted discussions were held with facilitating agents and sectoral partners to strengthen alignment, coordination, and proposal quality. While participation from NGOs and CSOs was strong in several consultations, efforts are ongoing to further enhance engagement with line ministries to ensure balanced institutional representation and ownership.	
Dates and venues of engagement activities	
Engagement activities were carried out between February and November 2025 across multiple locations, including Pohnpei, Chuuk, Yap, and Kosrae. Venues included government offices, municipal sites, conference rooms (e.g. SPC Conference Room, Kaselehlie Conference Room, DHS Conference Room), hotels, and community locations such as island field sites. Virtual sessions were also conducted to ensure continued engagement, particularly for technical discussions and gender consultations.	
Sex-disaggregated data on stakeholder engagement participants (male + female = total)	
A total of 655 participants were engaged during the reporting period, comprising 441 men and 214 women, reflecting broad stakeholder participation across national, state, and community levels.	
Information shared with stakeholders	
Information shared during the engagement process included guidance on the EDA programme, proposal development requirements, ESS standards (including IFC Performance Standards and GCF ESMS), gender considerations, budgeting processes, and GCF compliance requirements. Stakeholders were also informed of proposal timelines, evaluation criteria, and feedback on EOIs and draft proposals. Practical tools and training materials were provided to support stakeholders in developing high-quality proposals aligned with programme objectives.	
Outputs including issues raised and addressed during the reporting period	
Key outputs included strengthened stakeholder capacity to develop and refine climate finance proposals, improved quality of EOIs and full proposals, and enhanced coordination among stakeholders. Issues raised by stakeholders included the complexity of proposal templates, challenges in meeting ESS requirements, and the need for clearer guidance on budgeting and project structuring. These concerns were addressed through simplified guidance, targeted workshops, iterative review processes, and direct technical support. Lessons learned workshops further enabled stakeholders to reflect on challenges and improve subsequent proposal submissions.	
Remarks/Notes	
N/A	

F.6. ESS forward planning and lessons learned
--

Are there any planned ESS activities for the next reporting period or lessons learned to share from this period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
Provide planned activities on environmental and social safeguards for the next reporting period	
During the next reporting period, the Programme will focus on operationalizing and strengthening the implementation and monitoring of Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) for sub-grant projects. Key activities include the finalization of Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) and management plans for Category B sub-grants, as well as the finalization of management plans for Category C sub-grants. In the post-granting phase, emphasis will be placed on awareness raising and capacity building for sub-grantees and Facilitating Agents, including inception workshops covering environmental and social monitoring requirements, and refresher sessions on the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM). A standardized reporting template will be developed to support consistent tracking and reporting of ESMP implementation progress. Monitoring and reporting will be strengthened through regular tracking of ESMP implementation, including progress reporting against mitigation measures and risk management actions. Disclosure of Category B sub-grant packages will be prioritized in line with FAA requirements. In parallel, an ESS staffing needs assessment will be conducted, followed by targeted training and potential recruitment of additional Facilitating Agents to support implementation and oversight at the State level. At the subproject level, activities will include the implementation of ESMPs for Category B and C projects, continuous monitoring and reporting on progress, and documentation of lessons learned and best practices. Monitoring will be conducted on an ongoing basis throughout implementation, with particular attention to vulnerable groups and local communities, ensuring that ESS requirements are effectively integrated and applied.	
Provide any success stories, good practices, or challenges, including those related to the engagement of Indigenous peoples and local communities, promoting Indigenous knowledge and benefits to Indigenous peoples and local communities	
A key good practice emerging from the Programme is the progressive integration of environmental and social safeguards into local-level planning and project design. Through targeted awareness-raising and hands-on support during proposal development, Local Authorities and Facilitating Agents have increasingly recognized the importance of environmental and social considerations in ensuring the sustainability of investments. The use of tailored trainings, one-on-one coaching, and iterative proposal review processes has helped demystify safeguards requirements and support their practical application. This has contributed to improved quality of proposals, including more robust identification of risks and mitigation measures. However, challenges remain, particularly in shifting perceptions that safeguards—such as gender and environmental and social requirements—are separate or additional burdens, rather than integral components of project design. This has at times affected the pace of proposal development and required additional support to build understanding. Another challenge relates to varying levels of capacity across States and Local Authorities, especially during transitions in local leadership. Continued capacity building, simplified tools, and sustained engagement will be critical to ensure effective ESS implementation, including meaningful inclusion of local communities in project activities.	
F.7. Grievance Redress Mechanism - confirmation & grievances	
<i>Please indicate whether the project can confirm the following statement:</i>	
Fully functional and operational Grievance Redress Mechanisms are in place, have been communicated to and are accessible by all stakeholders applicable to this project	
☒ The accredited entity confirms the statement above at project-level, AE-level, and GCF-level grievance mechanisms. ☐ The accredited entity does not confirm the statement above	
Have there been any grievances received during the reporting period?	Yes ☐ No ☒
N/A	

F.8. Implementation of activities and actions agreed in the Gender Action Plan

Gender integration in the Programme was strengthened through targeted capacity building, technical support, and continuous engagement with Local Authorities and Facilitating Agents. Building on gender-responsive grant development workshops conducted in 2024, support in 2025 enabled 20 Local Authorities to develop full proposals with improved gender considerations. A gender assessment of Expressions of Interest informed tailored guidance and discussions, supported by a coordinated approach involving multiple technical experts to ensure the inclusion of women, men, and vulnerable groups.

Facilitating Agents played a key role in supporting Local Authorities, although the process required sustained engagement to build understanding and consensus. Practical tools, including Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) handouts and tailored guidance, were widely used. A gender refresher session in December 2025 further strengthened capacity, particularly for newly recruited Facilitating Agents, and highlighted the need for earlier and longer training to enhance integration.

Gender was systematically embedded across technical workshops rather than treated as a standalone topic, reinforcing its linkages with sustainability and overall project outcomes. Additional efforts included reviewing programme documentation and conducting proposal-level gender assessments. Progress is also reflected in participation, with strong female representation among trainees, programme staff, and within the Programme Board.

Are there GAP implementation activities or progress to report for this period?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Summary on Activities and Actions agreed in the Gender Action Plan (max. 200 words)

Provide a progress report on the gender action plan developed during project preparation stage for the reporting period. This will primarily be a report on activities undertaken and results achieved because of completion of an activity. Further, it should also indicate if the project is on track to achieving the intended outcome(s). The reporting should be done for activities, targets and indicators already set in the action plan including on vulnerable groups (youth, poor, female heads of households, etc.) as would have been identified in the gender analysis and action plan. If activities or targets are not achieved as per plan, reasons should be provided, and recourse action should be proposed. Please include reporting on any changes or deviations. Include a Report on implementation challenges and lessons learnt and how these will inform on-going actions and what action will be taken by when to address the challenges faced. Incorporate both quantitative data and qualitative reports on the performance of such actions, and on progress on actions identified.

GAP Activity

Activity 1.1.1. Develop climate adaptation decision support framework and training curriculum including interactive case studies targeting government officials: Gender-responsive design incorporated into sub-grant development training, localized strategies for gender mainstreaming, gender criteria, and implementation are developed.

Indicator

Number of men and women attending workshops and participating in workshops, training and mentoring activities in each participating State and Municipality - Number of trainings/modules specifically for gender considerations

Rating of Indicator

GREEN (on track to be met)

Baseline

0

Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable

1

Annual progress update (Reporting Period)

Targets: - At least 1 representative from each participating municipality/stakeholder is trained on gender-responsive sub-grant design/implementation and the sub-grant specific gender criteria
- 50% of workshop/training participants are women
- At least 1 module for gender-responsive sub-grant design and localised strategies for gender mainstreaming, gender criteria, and implementation incorporated into sub-grant development training

Cumulative progress update (Entire period)

- 63 Local Authority (LA) staff (16 women, 47 men) attended workshops, and training/mentoring activities in each participating State and Municipality; 34% of workshop/training participants were women - Two (2) representatives from each participating State were trained on gender-responsive sub-grant design/implementation and the sub-grant specific gender criteria (for each State, the representatives are 1 FA and 1 GCF State Focal Point); 67% of workshop/training participants were women - Two (2) modules for gender-responsive sub-grant design and localised strategies for gender mainstreaming, gender criteria, and implementation were incorporated into sub-grant development trainings - 100% of the budget under this sub-activity was fully spent in Year 2, for the design of gender modules and engagement of the Gender Consultant to complete the activity	
Budget	12,000
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	3 April 2024
Responsibility	
PMU, Gender Specialist	
Remarks/Notes	
The target indicators for this activity were achieved in Year 2.	
GAP Activity	
Activity 1.1.2. Climate adaptation decision support training for local authorities (2 trainings per State): Resilience training, includes training on gender-mainstreaming for climate resilience, for local authorities' staff and elected and appointed officials.	
Indicator	
Number of men and women trained on climate resilience planning in each municipality - Number of workshop participants with increased knowledge of gender mainstreaming for climate resiliency - Number of women hired as Facilitating Agents	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	50
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
Targets: - 50% of workshop/training participants are women - At least 80% of workshop participants demonstrate understanding of gender mainstreaming for climate resilience post-training - At least 25% of the Facilitating Agents will be comprised of women / members of women's groups	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
- 63 Local Authority (LA) staff (16 women, 47 men) were trained on climate resilience planning in each municipality; 34% of workshop/training participants were women - 50% of the Facilitating Agents (2 of 4 Facilitating Agents) recruited and engaged in Year 2 were women (1 for Yap State, 1 for Chuuk State)	

- 67% of the budget under this activity was spent in Year 2, for the integration of GEDSI into training materials and engagement of the Gender Consultant to complete the activity; with the remaining balance anticipated to be spent in Year 3	
Budget	6,000
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	10 April 2024
Responsibility	
PMU, Facilitating Agents, Gender Specialist	
Remarks/Notes	
The target indicators for this activity were achieved in Year 2.	
GAP Activity	
Activity 1.1.3. Develop train-the-trainer's module and conduct training for national consultants and/or local NGOs in each State to become Facilitating Agents: Develop train-the-trainer's module for gender-mainstreaming support to be provided by FAs.	
Indicator	
Number of men and women trained on climate resilience planning in each municipality - Number of workshop participants with increased knowledge of gender mainstreaming for climate resiliency	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	50
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
Targets: - 50% of workshop/training participants are women - At least 80% of workshop participants demonstrate understanding of gender mainstreaming for climate resilience post-training	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
- 50% FAs that are workshop/training participants are women (2 out of 4 FAs in total; women are from Yap State and Chuuk State) - 86% of workshop participants (inclusive of Facilitating Agents and GCF State Focal Points, 8 persons in total) after the workshop indicated that it was "Very Important" to ensure community and gender inclusiveness in a project design, demonstrating an understanding of gender mainstreaming for climate resilience post-training - 50% of the budget under this activity was spent in Year 2, for the integration of GEDSI into training materials and engagement of the Gender Consultant to complete the activity; with the remaining balance anticipated to be spent in Year 3	
Budget	6,000
Currency	USD

Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	10 April 2024
Responsibility	
PMU, Facilitating Agents, Gender Specialist	
Remarks/Notes	
The target indicators for this activity were achieved in Year 2.	
GAP Activity	
Activity 1.3.1. Develop a knowledge platform and ensure the Programme is connected to regional platforms across the Pacific: The programme web portal and database include sex-disaggregated data at the municipal and sub-project level on the three thematic areas and on key socioeconomic indicators to inform the design of future adaptation interventions.	
Indicator	
Inclusion of sex-disaggregated data collected at the municipal and sub-project levels in the web portal	
Rating of Indicator	AMBER (needs attention to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	1
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
PMU commenced discussions with focal points for the Integrate Pasifika, an online regional platform developed and hosted by SPC to support collaboration, data sharing, and peer learning across Pacific Island countries. Initial discussions are positive and EDA Programme will continue this moment in 2026. It is anticipated that activity will be completed by 2026.	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
Targets: Sex-disaggregated data is compiled on the web portal	
Budget	0
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	18 November 2026
Responsibility	
PMU	
Remarks/Notes	
PMU commenced discussions with focal points for the Integrate Pasifika, an online regional platform developed and hosted by SPC to support collaboration, data sharing, and peer learning across Pacific Island countries. Initial discussions are positive and EDA Programme will continue this moment in 2026. It is anticipated that activity will be completed by 2026.	

GAP Activity	
Activity 2.1.1. Governance structure for Resilient Communities Grant Facility (RCGF) established and formalized: Establishment of inclusive and representative EDA Programme Board (EPB) and Grants Technical Evaluation sub-committee.	
Indicator	
Number of men and women serving in the EDA Programme Board - Existence of gender provisions within bylaws/goals of the EDA Board and the Grants Technical Evaluation sub-committee	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	50
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
Targets: - At least 50% representation, and no less than 30%, from women across the different stakeholders - Bylaws or other operating frameworks includes provisions for awareness and review of gender considerations in final sub-grant decisions.	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
Of the 8 members (5 women, 3 men) serving in the EDA Programme Board (EPB), 62% are women - Operating frameworks (EDA Programme Operations Manual and related tools) include provisions for awareness and review of gender considerations in final sub-grant decisions	
Budget	0
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	9 April 2024
Responsibility	
PMU, National Designated Authority (NDA), EDA Programme Board (EPB)	
Remarks/Notes	
The target indicators for this activity were achieved in Year 2.	
GAP Activity	
Activity 2.1.2. RCGF guidelines and procedures endorsed and adopted by EDA Programme Board: Refinement of gender review criteria for sub-grant selection.	
Indicator	
Sub-grant review criteria include specific gender considerations	

Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	1
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
Targets: Sub-grant review criteria for gender are refined and approved by ECU, EPB and the Grants Technical Evaluation sub-committee and included into training	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
Sub-grant review criteria for gender were refined and approved by ECU, EPB, and the Grants Technical Evaluation Sub-Committee and included into training	
Budget	0
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	9 April 2024
Responsibility	
PMU, EDA Programme Board (EPB), Grants Technical Evaluation Sub-Committee	
Remarks/Notes	
The target indicators for this activity were achieved in Year 2.	

GAP Activity	
Activity 2.2.1. Initial call for expression of interest: Inclusive sub-grant design process.	
Indicator	
Sub-grant review criteria include specific gender considerations	
Rating of Indicator	AMBER (needs attention to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	100
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
The 57 Expressions of Interest (EOIs) were reviewed by the Programme Coordination Unit, resulting in 21 applicants progressing to the proposal formulation stage. All applicants were individually informed of the outcomes and briefed on next steps prior to the official launch of the Call for Proposals. The Programme Coordination Unit also engaged with unsuccessful applicants, providing feedback on the strengths of their submissions as well as areas for improvement, to enhance their chances of success in future calls.	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	

Targets: - 100% of sub-grants include stakeholder consultation process with active participation of women and other vulnerable groups - 50% of participants in the sub-grant design process are women, including 25% from most vulnerable groups	
Budget	0
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	8 August 2026
Responsibility	
PMU, EDA Programme Board (EPB), Grants Technical Evaluation Sub-Committee	
Remarks/Notes	
The target indicators for this activity will be achieved in the next reporting period.	
GAP Activity	
Activity 2.2.2. Screening of Expression of Interest: EOI of sub-grants reviewed and directed technical assistance provided for sub-grants, to ensure appropriate gender mainstreaming as needed.	
Indicator	
Sub-grant review criteria include specific gender considerations	
Rating of Indicator	AMBER (needs attention to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	100
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
A gender assessment was conducted on the 21 Expressions of Interest that progressed to the proposal stage, and the findings informed gender discussions during proposal development workshops. A second GESI expert was recruited in the latter part of 2025 and carried out gender assessments of the 20 full proposals received. The results were shared individually with Local Authorities to support the integration of gender considerations into their proposals and/or implementation plans. Where the Technical Evaluation Committee requests revisions, Local Authorities will have a further opportunity to strengthen gender inclusion before proposals are submitted to the SPC Grants Committee for review.	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
Targets: All sub-grants will be reviewed for gender considerations, pending the final selection of the first cohort of EOIs in the next reporting period.	
Budget	0
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	16 April 2026

Responsibility	
PMU, EDA Programme Board (EPB), Grants Technical Evaluation Sub-Committee	
Remarks/Notes	
N/A	

GAP Activity	
Activity 2.2.3. Organizational audit of sub-national entities/LAs undertaken: Organizational audits of local authorities including gender data and policies and the capacity to integrate gender into sub-grant design.	
Indicator	
Sub-grant review criteria include specific gender considerations	
Rating of Indicator	AMBER (needs attention to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	100
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
Although the initial design envisaged integrating gender considerations into organisational audits, this was not implemented, as the SPC Grants Policy focuses primarily on operational and financial compliance. As a result, organisational audits and gender assessments were conducted as separate but complementary processes under the oversight of the Programme Coordination Unit. Gender considerations are, however, being systematically integrated into awareness-raising and capacity-building activities during both the pre-granting and post-grant phases of the EDA Programme, in line with GCF Gender Policy commitments. By December 2025, a gender consultant had completed a review of all 20 proposals received.	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
N/A	
Budget	6,000
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	10 April 2026
Responsibility	
PMU, SPC Procurement Committee	
Remarks/Notes	
The indicator remains pending, as initial Programme implementation focused on outreach, awareness, and capacity building for Local Authorities (LAs). Capacity assessments were scheduled for Years 3 and 4, aligned with the launch of Calls for EOIs and Full Proposals, allowing resources to be prioritized toward committed proponents. The EOI process attracted 57 applicants, with 21 shortlisted based on eligibility criteria. Capacity assessments for these proponents are required as part of full proposal submissions. The SPC Grants and Programme Coordination	

Unit is coordinating this process to ensure robust capacity evaluation, with findings informing proposal appraisal and potential conditions for grant approval.	
F.9. Gender Action Plan implementation review	
Is the gender expert for the project/programme engaged to support the implementation of the gender action plan? If engaged previously, please advise if the gender expert has been retained by the project/programme, including plans to engage another expert if a previously engaged expert has left the project/programme.	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>During 2025, two separate gender experts were engaged. The first consultant did not reapply when the second consultancy was advertised, and a new gender consultant was subsequently recruited. Her support is expected to continue into 2026.</i>	
Has the implementation of gender action plan/s being implemented according to Funding Activity Agreements and GCF's Updated Gender Policy? Please ensure that the budget is included in the reporting above if it was indicated in the approved or updated gender action plan.	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>The Gender Action Plan (GAP) budget has been implemented in line with the Funding Activity Agreement and GCF Gender Policy. Gender considerations have been systematically integrated into capacity building, proposal development, and governance processes. Budgeted activities, including gender training modules, engagement of gender experts, and integration of GESI into programme tools and processes, have been implemented as planned.</i>	
Are the planned activities, targets, indicators, timelines, etc. on track during the reporting period?	Yes ☐ No ☒
<i>Overall, the Programme has made steady progress in implementing gender-related activities, particularly in capacity building, proposal support, and governance. Gender-responsive training modules were developed and delivered, and gender considerations were integrated into proposal development processes through workshops, technical guidance, and one-on-one support. Gender assessments were conducted for all shortlisted EOIs and full proposals, with findings shared with Local Authorities to strengthen gender inclusion. Targets related to governance and institutional frameworks have been achieved, including gender representation in the Programme Board (62% women) and the integration of gender criteria into sub-grant review processes. Capacity building indicators have also progressed, with training delivered across all States and participation of both men and women. However, some targets—particularly those related to participation rates (e.g. 50% women in trainings) and early-stage integration of gender into proposal design—are slightly delayed. This is largely due to the Programme's focus on foundational outreach and the time required for Local Authorities to engage with new concepts. Progress is expected to continue and strengthen during the post-granting phase in 2026.</i>	
Were there any revisions of the approved GAP during the reporting period? Please submit the updated GAP in Annex section of this APR and ensure that the updated GAP has details on each change.	Yes ☐ No ☒
<i>No revisions in the GAP have occurred during the reporting period.</i>	
Are the reported results on track to contribute to meeting the sex-disaggregated targets for the direct beneficiaries in the funding proposal, if applicable?	Yes ☒ No ☐

The Programme is on track to contribute to achieving sex-disaggregated targets, although some indicators are still progressing. Participation data shows that women accounted for approximately 34% of participants in training and capacity-building activities, indicating progress but remaining below the 50% target. At the institutional level, gender balance has been achieved within governance structures, with women representing 62% of the Programme Board. Additionally, 50% of Facilitating Agents recruited in earlier phases were women, increasing to five out of eight across the Programme. Importantly, qualitative progress is strong. Approximately 50% of proposal development teams were led or heavily supported by women, demonstrating increasing engagement and influence of women in decision-making processes. Gender assessments of EOIs and full proposals have further strengthened the integration of gender considerations into project design. As sub-grants move into implementation, the Programme expects improved tracking of sex-disaggregated beneficiary data, which will allow for more comprehensive reporting against targets.

Has the project/programme experienced any implementation challenges that affect gender-related activities? If yes, please include lessons learnt and how they are informing ongoing actions.

Yes ☒ No ☐

A key challenge relates to sociocultural norms in FSM, where men traditionally lead community decision-making processes. This can limit women's participation and influence in project design and discussions. In addition, proposal development was a new and complex process for many Local Authorities, requiring time to understand technical concepts, which at times led to gender considerations being deprioritized. Changes in municipal leadership and varying levels of capacity across Local Authorities also required additional effort to maintain engagement and promote gender inclusion. However, important lessons have emerged. Dedicated facilitation approaches, including separate consultations for men and women, have proven effective in enabling women to express their views more freely. Continuous engagement, practical guidance, and iterative feedback have helped strengthen understanding of gender integration. The Programme is building on these lessons by promoting inclusive consultation models, encouraging women's leadership in proposal development, and continuing targeted capacity building throughout the post-granting phase.

Were there any best practices identified, or case studies prepared on benefits/activities undertaken as agents of action by women and the female heads of households during the reporting period? Please share any case studies in the text boxes or in the Annex section of the APR.

Yes ☒ No ☐

An emerging good practice is the increasing role of women as active contributors in proposal development. Approximately 50% of Local Authority proposal teams were led or strongly supported by women, who played key roles in drafting and refining proposals. This has contributed to more inclusive project design, with greater consideration of benefits for different community groups. A notable example is the two-step consultation model implemented in Yap, where Facilitating Agents conducted separate consultations with men and with women, youth, and vulnerable groups, followed by joint validation discussions. This approach enabled women to share perspectives in a culturally appropriate setting and ensured that their inputs were incorporated into final project designs. In addition, women Facilitating Agents have played a critical role in community outreach and proposal support, particularly in geographically remote and culturally complex contexts such as Chuuk. These approaches demonstrate how culturally adapted engagement methods can enhance women's participation and strengthen overall project outcomes.

Provide planned activities on gender elements for the next reporting period

In the next reporting period, the Programme will focus on strengthening gender integration during the post-granting phase. Key activities include continued capacity building for Facilitating Agents and Local Authorities on gender-responsive implementation, including refresher trainings and targeted technical support. Gender considerations will be further embedded in sub-grant implementation, monitoring, and reporting processes, including tracking of sex-disaggregated data and progress against gender-related indicators. Additional support will be provided to proponents to operationalize gender elements identified in their proposals and management plans. The Programme will also promote inclusive consultation approaches, building on successful practices such as separate engagement sessions for women and vulnerable groups. Follow-up workshops, including potential in-person trainings with GESI and other technical experts, will support deeper understanding and application of gender principles. Ongoing engagement of the gender expert will ensure continued technical guidance, including review of implementation progress and identification of opportunities to strengthen gender outcomes across sub-grants.

G. ANNEXES (UPLOADED)
Annex 1: GHG emission reduction calculation methodology (for projects reporting GHG emission reductions) and details on the calculations of the annual and cumulative value.
No annexes provided.
Annex 2: Communication and visibility material
No annexes provided.
Annex 3: List of grievances received
No annexes provided.
Annex 4: Procurement information
File Name: Procurement 2025_ (1).pdf
Annex 5: Updated implementation timetable for the Funded Activity for the following year
File Name: Updated Implementation Timetable for FP169 Funded Activity.xlsx
Annex 6: Updated Gender Assessment and/or Action Plan
No annexes provided.
Additional Annexes (if applicable)
No annexes provided.

