

Document Code	Classification	Protocol	Version
ENH-PFG-SAMPLE-ZMB-ILL USTRATIVE	Public Sample — For service demonstration only	PathFinder™ v1.0 / SLS Engine	v1.0

This public sample is for illustrative demonstration only. It was not commissioned, endorsed, validated, or approved by the Government of Zambia, its NDA, or any GCF-related authority. Some numerical fields have been redacted to protect ENHANCE's proprietary methodology. Full outputs are provided to verified clients only.

## [1] STRUCTURAL POSITION

<b>Moderately positioned</b> Adj Z = [—]	SLS Score	[—]	
	Raw Z-Score	[—]	
	Policy Context Adj.	[—]	
	Adjusted Z-Score	[—]	
	Portfolio Percentile	Upper-mid range	

**Structural Position:** Moderately positioned — strengthenable with targeted structural improvements

Reference Interpretation: Positioned above the weak-structure range, but below the higher-confidence approval zone.

Policy Context Adjustments Applied	
+ Trusted implementer	
+ LDC designation	
+ GCF accredited partner	
<b>Total adjustment applied: [—]</b>	

## [2] SLS COMPONENT BREAKDOWN

Indicator	Score	Visual	Signal
<b>Performance Block</b>			
CO2 Mitigation Efficiency	N/A		Not applicable — Adaptation theme
Project Beneficiary Scale	[—]		—
Project Impact Scope	[—]		—
Grant Ratio Alignment	[—]		Comparative Strength
Project Financial Preparedness	[—]		—
Project Execution Preparedness	[—]		Comparative Strength
<b>Country Risk Context</b>			
State Fragility (FSI)	[—]		Context Signal
Security Environment (GTI)	[—]		Context Signal
Institutional Quality (CPIA)	[—]		Context Signal

Indicator	Score	Visual	Signal
Economic Development (GNI)	[–]		Context Signal
<b>Climate Vulnerability Context</b>			
Climate Vulnerability (GAIN)	[–]		Context Signal
Adaptation Readiness	[–]		Context Signal

### [3] COUNTRY INDEX CONTEXT

Index	Raw Value	Norm. (0–1)	Visual
FSI — State Fragility	76.40	[–]	
GPI — Security Environment	1.20	[–]	
CPIA — Institutional Quality	3.00	[–]	
GNI — Economic Development	1180	[–]	
GAIN — Climate Vulnerability	31.50	[–]	
READINESS — Adaptation	0.27	[–]	

Data basis: Embedded reference baseline (approx. 2023–2024). Official country dataset may be applied when available.

### [4] POLICY DIRECTION NOTE

Current positioning appears broadly workable, but further strengthening is advisable before entering a higher-confidence approval range. Any co-financing assumptions should be formalized and kept ancillary to the grant-heavy structure indicated by the national risk profile.

#### Priority areas for structural strengthening:

<b>W1</b>	<b>Project Beneficiary Scale</b> Increase direct beneficiary coverage and/or improve disaggregation methodology across gender, age, and vulnerability categories.
<b>W2</b>	<b>Project Impact Scope</b> Expand documentation of indirect impacts, including secondary economic and ecosystem beneficiaries.
<b>W3</b>	<b>Project Financial Preparedness</b> Strengthen the financial sustainability analysis — O&M; cost coverage and a post-project exit strategy should be clearly documented.

### [5] PEER PORTFOLIO PATTERN

GCF approved project patterns for countries with a comparable fragility, income, and priority designation profile.

#### Peer Group (42 projects): LDC · AFR · FSI MID

Theme	Share	Visual
Adaptation	65%	
Cross-cutting	28%	
Mitigation	7%	

Avg. GCF Financing	USD 31.6M
Avg. Project Duration	7.1 years
Avg. Grant Ratio	83%
Top AEs	UNDP · AfDB · WB · FAO
Result Area #1	Health/Food/Water (31%)
Result Area #2	Ecosystems (29%)
Result Area #3	Infrastructure (20%)

Adaptation is the dominant pattern in this peer group (65%). Secondary themes partly reflect AE-driven design preferences rather than national priority. Your adaptation-primary design is well-founded.

## [6] PRE-STRUCTURAL RISK FLAGS

Country-level structural risk signals — generated from national indices only. Not a substitute for project-level T-C-V evaluation.

**Risk Summary — Critical: 0 High: 0 Moderate: 7 Adequate: 0 Asset: 0**

### — Structural Risk Flags

Dimension	Level	Score	Guidance
<input type="checkbox"/> Execution Environment Risk	MODERATE	—	Capacity is workable but requires a dedicated PMU. Capacity-building components embedded in the project design will strengthen the proposal.
<input type="checkbox"/> Country Financial Viability Risk	MODERATE	—	Financial viability is feasible but requires careful O&M; cost coverage planning and a documented post-project exit strategy.
<input type="checkbox"/> Beneficiary Targeting Risk	MODERATE	—	Standard beneficiary targeting with gender and vulnerability disaggregation is recommended.
<input type="checkbox"/> State Fragility (FSI)	MODERATE	—	Moderate fragility. Governance risk components should be addressed explicitly in Section E (Investment Criteria).
<input type="checkbox"/> Security Environment (GTI/GPI)	MODERATE	—	Security context should be acknowledged with standard risk mitigation documentation.
<input type="checkbox"/> Institutional Quality (CPIA)	MODERATE	—	Institutional capacity is workable. Standard governance documentation applies.
<input type="checkbox"/> Budget Integrity Risk (Adaptation Context)	MODERATE	—	Adaptation projects in LDC/SIDS contexts structurally embed capacity building components with discretionary budget execution. Independent PMU structure, direct payment to verified service providers, and phased disbursement triggers tied to verifiable output milestones are recommended. Governance of training budgets and per diem structures should be made explicit in the project design document. A VERA™ structural authenticity evaluation is advised before submission to identify misalignment between stated outcomes and fund flow design.

### — Vulnerability Profile (GCF Access Rationale)

The dimensions below reflect country-level climate conditions. These are not structural weaknesses — they are the basis for GCF access and adaptation project justification.

Dimension	Exposure	Score	Guidance
<input type="checkbox"/> Climate Vulnerability (ND-GAIN)	MODERATE EXPOSURE	—	Moderate vulnerability. Standard vulnerability documentation applies.
<input type="checkbox"/> Adaptation Readiness	MODERATE EXPOSURE	—	Readiness is developing. Embed capacity-building components in the project design.

<b>Policy Context Note</b>	LDC designation: GCF policy allocates ≥50% of adaptation finance to LDCs. Grant financing is the structurally appropriate default. This designation is a structural asset in the proposal narrative.
----------------------------	--

## [7] SCENARIO-CONTEXT STRUCTURAL SIGNALS

Country Risk Index (CRI)	[Redacted]
Structural Grant Grade	<b>D</b>
Indicated Grant Range	80–100%
(Scenario-context adjusted — may differ from public RFRC baseline classification.)	

### Recommendation:

- Grant-heavy architecture is required.
- Any blended component should remain ancillary and must not replace the dominant grant structure.
- Dedicated coordination mechanisms are required in project design.

Flag	Level	Guidance
Structural Context: Fragmented Delivery Environment	<b>[MODERATE]</b>	Fragmented institutional coordination capacity identified. Project delivery architecture must explicitly address coordination gaps. Grant-dominant architecture is recommended; refer to national risk-based grant recommendation below for the applicable grant range. Dedicated coordination mechanism required in project design.

### Recommended Next Step

If the project direction is confirmed, prepare a Concept Note outline and request project-level structural review before GCF submission. ENHANCE offers SQS™ (Structural Quick Screen) and SBA™ (Structural Beta Assessment) for project document evaluation.

Product	Tier / Type	Description
<b>PathFinder-GOV™</b>	Mission Access	Pre-submission structural navigation for LDC/SIDS Focal Points and NDAs.
<b>PathFinder-INST™</b>	Institutional	Institutional pre-submission alignment for MDBs, DFIs, AEs, UN agencies, and donor organisations.
<b>PathFinder-ENT™</b>	Enterprise	Enterprise structural alignment and capital/claim navigation for corporates, investors, and consulting firms.
<b>SQS™</b>	Structural Quick Screen	Rapid project-level structural review — direction, risk flags, and early submission readiness signal before Concept Note submission.
<b>SBA™</b>	Structural Beta Assessment	Deeper project-level structural assessment using the full ENHANCE model stack — VERA™, ToC:f(x)™, C-FAIR™, and VORTA™ — prior to GCF submission.

[contact@enhance-institute.org](mailto:contact@enhance-institute.org) · [enhance-institute.org](https://enhance-institute.org)

Structural navigation output. Not a substitute for GCF Board decision.