
Annual Performance Report

Project/Programme title:	De-Risking and Scaling-up Investment in Energy Efficient Building Retrofits (FP010)
Accredited Entity:	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Date of Report submission:	23 July 2026
Version number	V2.0



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		23 July 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 20.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>Mill. USD 20.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Co-Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 82.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>Mill. USD 54.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senior Loans</td> <td>Mill. USD 27.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 102.7</td> </tr> </table>				GCF Financing	Mill. USD 20.0	Grants	Mill. USD 20.0	Co-Financing	Mill. USD 82.7	Grants	Mill. USD 54.8	Senior Loans	Mill. USD 27.9	Total Financing	Mill. USD 102.7
	GCF Financing	Mill. USD 20.0														
	Grants	Mill. USD 20.0														
	Co-Financing	Mill. USD 82.7														
	Grants	Mill. USD 54.8														
	Senior Loans	Mill. USD 27.9														
	Total Financing	Mill. USD 102.7														
A.5. Total GCF funding disbursed to this date	NA (draft)															
A.6. Implementation period	From 30 June 2017 to 30 June 2026															
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)												
Ministry of Nature Protection	Armenia	Public sector – Government (which may be acting through a ministry or department)	Executing Entity	Mr. Hambardzum Matevosyan, minenv@env.am												

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)
Yerevan Municipality	Armenia	Mr. Tigran Avinyan, Mayor, info@yerevan.am	Local Self-Government Body	n/a
Armenian Territorial Development Fund	Armenia	Mr. Sargis Baghinyan, Director, atdf@atdf.am	Fund	n/a
"Center of Education Project" Projects Implementation Unit of the Ministry of Education,	Armenia	Mr. Grisha Hovhannisyan, Director, info@cfep.am	Government	n/a

Full legal name	Country of registration (or, for intl orgs, country of HQ)	Focal Point(s) and email(s)	Ownership Type	Beneficial Owner(s)
Science, Culture and Sports of the Republic of Armenia				
Renewable Resources and Energy Efficiency (R2E2) Fund	Armenia	Mr. Karen Asatryan, Director, info@r2e2.am	Fund	n/a
Ministry of Health of the Republic of Armenia	Armenia	Ms. Anahit Avanesyan, Minister, info@moh.am	Government	n/a
Communities	Armenia	Mr. Ashot Giloyan, Head of LSG Policy Department, a.giloyan@mta.gov.am. Ms. Narine Avetyan, Head of Regional Programs' Support Department, n.avetyan@mta.gov.am	Local Self-Government Bodies	n/a
Health and Labor Inspection Body under the Office of Prime Minister	Armenia	Mr. Arayik Harutyunyan, Chief of Staf, chiefofstaff@gov.am	Government	n/a
Ministry of Territorial Administration and Infrastructure (State Subsidy program for SFHs)	Armenia	Mr. Davit Khudatyan, Minister, mta@mta.gov.am	Government	n/a
UNDP	Armenia	Ms. Natia Natsvlishvili, UNDP Resident Representative, registry.am@undp.org	UN Agency	n/a
EIB	Luxembourg	Stephanie Guihard-Brand, s.guihard-brand@eib.org	Multilateral Organization	n/a
Ministry of Environment	Armenia	Ms. Ruzanna Grigoryan, Head of International Relations Department, ruzanna.grigoryan@env.am	Government	n/a
Armenian General Benevolent Union Representation in Armenia	Armenia	Mr. Vasken Yacoubian, Authorized Representative, agbuarm@agbu.am	Fund	AGBU global non-profit organization

A.10. Alignment with country NDCs & NAP (NB Only populate if applicable, e.g., if your project/programme specifically contributes to a country's NDC or NAP target/s)

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)
Armenia	22 April 2021	NDC.2.0: 40 per cent reduction from 1990 emission levels by 2030. NDC.3.0: Mitigation strategic priorities include energy efficiency in	The UNDP–GCF project “De-risking and Scaling up Investment in Energy-Efficient Building Retrofits in Armenia” is directly aligned with Armenia’s NDC 2.0 and NDC 3.0	0%



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)
		building sector (as untapped priority). Energy Sector mitigation unconditional target is set to improve national energy efficiency by prioritizing key investments, including retrofitting of residential and public buildings (159 multi-apartment buildings, 50 healthcare facilities, and 800 schools and kindergartens by 2035.) NDC 3.0 Investment plan under unconditional measures included 2 measures: #1 - Adoption of the Government of the Republic of Armenia decision "On approving the programme-schedule ensuring the implementation of the second phase (2026–2028) of the "Program on Energy Saving and Renewable Energy for 2022-2030". #6 - Energy efficiency retrofitting and construction of new buildings aimed at introducing innovative construction systems to reduce energy consumption in public, residential, and healthcare buildings.	commitments under the Paris Agreement and is explicitly referenced in Armenia's Biennial Transparency Report (BTR, pp. 71–72, 149) as a key mitigation action under the policy priority "Improving Energy Performance of Buildings." The BTR identifies the project as a government-supported energy efficiency programme implemented with national partners and international financial institutions to scale up investments in building retrofits, reduce energy consumption, and cut GHG emissions in the buildings sector. By retrofitting multi-apartment and public buildings, improving thermal envelopes, and upgrading heating/lighting/cooling systems, the project contributes to reduced energy intensity (kWh/m²) and supports Armenia's unconditional mitigation targets in the energy sector. Under NDC 3.0 (2026–2035, approved 31 December 2025), Armenia prioritizes large-scale retrofitting of residential and public buildings. The project operationalizes this commitment and contributes to the NDC Investment Plan, including: • Measure #1 (implementation of the Energy Saving and Renewable Energy Program 2022–2030); • Measure #6 (energy-efficient retrofitting in public, residential, and healthcare buildings). The project also advances objectives of Armenia's National Adaptation Plan (NAP) by enhancing climate resilience of public infrastructure. Through investment, policy reform, and financial de-risking mechanisms, the project provides a scalable model supporting Armenia's low-carbon, climate-resilient development pathway.	

A.11. Estimated duration of impact	
A.12 Report to be shared with NDA	Yes ☒ No ☐
18 June 2026	

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

The project made significant progress in 2025 towards accelerating energy-efficient (EE) building renovations and reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in Armenia.

During the reporting year, 157 buildings (129 public and 28 multi-apartment) were retrofitted, contributing to annual GHG emission reductions of 6,031 tCO₂eq. USD 4.2 million of GCF funding was leveraged, and approximately USD 21 million in co-financing for EE retrofits. The project strengthened the policy and institutional framework by developing a standardised Grid Emission Factor and supporting the integration of mandatory Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) provisions into the draft Law on Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency. Targeted trainings on Energy Management Information System (EMIS) expanded across Yerevan, Armavir, Ararat, Vayots Dzor, and Syunik regions. Surveys conducted in the reporting period showed that public awareness of EE retrofits increased to 56.2%, compared to a baseline of less than 10%, and 90.4% of respondents expressed willingness to undertake residential retrofits. Approximately 139,000 people (56% women) benefited from financial incentives. Over 400 individuals (123 women and 282 men) received capacity-building support at community and central government levels. Environmental and social safeguards were strengthened through asbestos screening of 162 buildings and regular monitoring visits across the country.

Implementation challenges included household affordability constraints, procurement delays and slower-than-expected materialisation of GCF co-financing by partners, as well as limited local institutional capacity. These were addressed through adaptive management, policy dialogue on targeted financial support, strengthened coordination with partners, pipeline diversification and capacity building of partners.

Key lessons confirmed the importance of complementary financing mechanisms, early safeguards implementation, and gender-responsive approaches in maximising project impact and supporting sustainable market transformation.

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)

In 2025, the project achieved significant progress in advancing energy efficiency (EE) in residential and public buildings across Armenia, reinforcing institutional capacity, and broadening knowledge on the opportunities that come with the EE among communities, professionals, and policymakers. During the reporting period, 157 buildings (129 public; 28 multi-apartment) were retrofitted, bringing the total number of buildings with introduced energy efficient measures to 398 since the project start. The emission reductions achieved in 2025 amounted to 30,400 tCO₂, with a lifetime of 608,000 tCO₂ reductions. Financially, 2025 was the strongest year of implementation. Investments in EE retrofits totalled USD 4.2 million (GCF grant), leveraging approximately 21 million USD in co-finance.

1.1.1. The project advanced Armenia's institutional and regulatory environment. A new standardised Grid Emission Factor was developed to replace the expired baseline, providing a robust methodological tool for calculating emission reductions across EE and renewable energy projects. This innovation ensures continuity and consistency in national reporting. The project also supported the integration of mandatory MRV provisions into the draft Law on Renewable Energy and EE, while contributing to the approval process of the comprehensive Climate Law. Together, these legislative milestones strengthened Armenia's climate governance and established systems for coordinated action, finance, and emissions reporting.

1.1.2. At the local level, the Energy Management Information System (EMIS) expanded its reach. Stepanavan and Alaverdi communities introduced EMIS, while 21 staff members across Yerevan, Armavir, Ararat, Vayots Dzor, and Syunik received targeted trainings. Agreements with GIZ and the EU-funded "Covenant of Mayors" initiative, reached at the end of 2025, aim to ensure that EMIS would be replicated in other projects, amplifying its impact in 2026. Technical enhancements were made, included migrating EMIS to cloud storage with physical backups to safeguard data integrity. Energy audits were conducted for 126 (67 public and 59 residential) EE retrofitted buildings, and energy passports were developed to guide their future energy management.

1.2.1. Capacity building remained a cornerstone of the project. In 2025, over 400 individuals (123 women, 282 men) were trained at community and central levels. These trainings were informed by a survey of local self-government (LSG) authorities, which revealed growing awareness but persistent capacity gaps (see the attached training database). 61% of surveyed specialists rated their technical knowledge as good or excellent. To consolidate knowledge, 77 materials, including guidelines, designs, and standard TORs, were published on the project website.

1.2.2-1.2.3. Public outreach expanded significantly. The project's website was fully operational throughout 2025, attracting nearly 5,000 visitors, and publishing 22 news articles. Social media became the dominant channel for awareness, as informed by public opinion survey. 77 Facebook posts reached over 315,000 views (12,489 engagements). A media tour in Syunik resulted in 10 articles and 3 television features, while human stories highlighted the transformative impact of retrofits, such as the modernisation of Yerevan Kindergarten No. 36. Three videos and one animation were produced, showcasing results and emphasising the role of women and engineers in EE, all made accessible with sign language translation.

1.2.4. Public opinion survey confirmed the growing awareness of EE among Armenians. By 2025, 56.2% of the population reported awareness of EE programs, a dramatic increase from the baseline of less than 10%. Nearly half of respondents recognised the benefits of EE retrofits in reducing costs and improving comfort. Importantly, 90.4% were willing to have retrofits in their own homes, and 87.9% considered such programs important or very important. The survey also revealed that financial constraints remain the main barrier, with 76% citing lack of resources as the key obstacle. 2025 Household Survey among project supported EE retrofitted households revealed that over 93% of residents are satisfied with the results of the project.

2.1.1. & 2.2.1. As part of the exit strategy, noting the project will be closing in 2026, a 2025 study identified remaining risks associated with EE investments, leading to comprehensive policy recommendations that were reviewed with national partners. Findings from a gap analysis of Armenia's regulatory framework were shared with the working group drafting the Law on Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency to incorporate major findings in the draft law.

As 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 were completed, no actions were undertaken in 2025.

2.3.1. At the community level, 10 trainings were conducted for 230 representatives from all marzes and Yerevan, strengthening knowledge on multi-apartment buildings (MAB) management and recent legislative updates in partnership with Ministry of Territorial Administration and Infrastructure (MoTAI), Urban Development Committee and Habitat for Humanity – Armenia.

Based on the Assessment of LSG's Capacities, comprehensive recommendations were developed to address knowledge gaps among LSG staff and presented to policymakers to reflect in mandatory training programmes.

2.4.1. Practical support for MAB management advanced. Alaverdi and Ijevan communities established new management bodies with clear obligations and financial mechanisms, supported by project-provided equipment (handover of computers and a printer) and data collection, undertaken together with the UNDP and a local NGO. Sample TORs for MABs energy audits, MABs management, and the resource centre were developed and handed over to communities.

2.4.2. Cooperation with R2E2 expanded. A formal agreement was made for MABs' EE retrofits in Tashir. This marked R2E2's first engagement in MAB retrofits. The project provided quality assurance, technical support and EE co-financing. The partnership extended to additional buildings and enabled R2E2 to expand revolving funds for EE retrofits.

2.5.1. The Exit Strategy implementation was on track. Progress will be evaluated during the final evaluation (FE). The FE team, selected in 2025, will ensure the timely completion of the evaluation report due in December 2026.

3.1.1. Financial mechanisms for single-family houses (SFH) also progressed. On June 9, 2025, the project formalised an agreement with the MoTAI to co-finance retrofits of SFHs. A study reviewing green financial products offered by local financial institutions was commissioned. Actionable recommendations and consultations planned in 2026 together with the Central Bank (3.4.1 as well).

3.2.1. The team published sample designs and updated Bills of Quantities for 10 MABs types online, providing financial institutions with practical tools to assess investment costs.

3.3.1 The project further strengthened local government capacity. The team developed and published templates for energy audits, 10 MABs sample designs, and technical supervision on the project's website (www.mershenq.am). In November 2025, the team developed and presented a new guidebook on insulation solutions as well as the third edition of the catalogue of insulation materials. The project team continued to provide technical assistance for the "Yerevan Energy Efficiency" project under the EIB loan, offering technical supervision and co-financing for EE retrofits of 47 public buildings.

3.4.1. By June 30, 2025, 25 active agreements covered both public and residential buildings, including 19 concluded with communities, under the State Subvention Programme.

3.4.2. Monitoring and oversight remained rigorous. In 2025, five audits and one spot-check found no major financial issues. The project team conducted 58 monitoring visits to 169 buildings across Marzes to check compliance with LOA and SES rules.

3.5.1 Around 2,400 marketing materials printed and disseminated for raising awareness on EE throughout Armenia.

4.1.1. Around 139,000 beneficiaries (56% women) benefitted from project financial incentives in 2025. Of these, 2,561 (53% women) are MABs' residents. Overall number of beneficiaries has exceeded final target.

Targeted support mechanisms helped the inclusion of lower-income beneficiaries. The affordability survey results confirmed that 76% of respondents consider financial constraints the main barrier to EE investment, underscoring the importance of maintaining incentive schemes beyond project closure.

Finally, the project continued data collection to verify its impact, including through commissioning surveys (LSG, Financial Institutions, Households, Affordability, and Public Opinion); the databases on EE-retrofitted buildings (including major indicators, beneficiaries, and households) and knowledge-building activities were systematically updated. Collected data were gender-disaggregated, and vulnerability data were also collected.

In this reporting period, the project has also initiated preparation for the final evaluation due in December 2026 and engaged with the GCF Secretariat when preparing the terms of reference.

The year 2025 demonstrated the project's ability to deliver tangible climate change mitigation results, strengthen institutional frameworks, and build lasting capacity across Armenia. While market challenges such as financial barriers for households remain, the strong demand, growing awareness, and institutional readiness signal that Armenia is well-positioned to continue its transition toward energy-efficient buildings after the project ends in 2026.

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 the project be Multicountry, please report the achievement by Country.

Lastly, avoid using commas or periods as thousand separators. Periods should only be used as decimal separators.

For REDD+ Results-Based Payment (RBP) projects, you are only required to report on the progress of activities.

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

PMF/IRMF Results Management Framework

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) M1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO ₂ eq) reduced as a result of GCF-funded projects/programmes (IRMF) Core 1 Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered						
Provide the total GHG emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered (tCO ₂ eq) as a result of GCF support.						
Unit						Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent
Baseline	Target			Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
	Mid-term	Final target	Lifetime			
0	13,900	100,000	1,118,000	98,928	6,031	104,959

(PMF) M1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO ₂ eq) reduced as a result of GCF-funded projects/programmes (IRMF) Core 1 Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered							
Provide the total GHG emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered (tCO ₂ eq) as a result of GCF support, disaggregated by result area.							
Unit							Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent
Disaggregation by: Result Areas (Mitigation)	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Lifetime	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Buildings, cities, industries and appliances	0	13,900	100,000	1,118,000	98,928	6,031	104,959

(PMF) M1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO ₂ eq) reduced as a result of GCF-funded projects/programmes (IRMF) Core 1 Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered							
Provide the total GHG emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered (tCO ₂ eq), disaggregated by Country.							
Unit							Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Lifetime	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Armenia	0	13,900	100,000	1,118,000	98,928	6,031	104,959

Buildings, cities, industries and appliances

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) M7.1 Energy intensity/improved efficiency of buildings, cities, industries and appliances as a result of Fund support (IRMF) Supplementary 1.1 Annual energy savings
Provide the total energy savings (MWh)

Baseline	Target		Unit		Megawatt-hour
	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
0	0	369,585	347,076	22,509	369,585

(PMF) M7.1 Energy intensity/improved efficiency of buildings, cities, industries and appliances as a result of Fund support (IRMF) Supplementary 1.1 Annual energy savings						
Provide the total energy savings (MWh) disaggregated by Country.						
Unit						Megawatt-hour
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Armenia	0	0	369,585	347,076	22,509	369,585

(PMF) M7.1 Energy intensity/improved efficiency of buildings, cities, industries and appliances as a result of Fund support (IRMF) Supplementary 1.1 Annual energy savings						
Provide the total energy savings (MWh) disaggregated by intervention type.						
Unit						Megawatt-hour
Disaggregation by: Intervention Type	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Building Efficiency	0	0	369,585	347,076	22,509	369,585

Project Specific Indicators							
Indicator	Unit	Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
			Mid-term	Final target			
Development and coverage of MRV system and database	No. of Items	0	1	1	1	0	1
Number of beneficiaries with access to knowledge about energy use in buildings, opportunities and financing for EE	No. of Persons	0	50,000	250,000	2,860,000	329,764	3,189,764
Additional exit strategy measures designed and implemented	No. of Strategic Frameworks	0	1	1	1	0	1
Adequate secondary legislation providing a clear and effective set of functional models and a standard set of rules for multi-owner building management	No. of Policy Instruments	0	6	7	6	0	6

bodies to undertake EE retrofits developed, introduced and enforced							
Binding legislation on building codes and adequate Secondary legislation adopted.	No. of Policy Instruments	3	4	5	4	0	4
Business models for repayment of EE investments implemented	Index/Score/Level	1	3	5	3	1	4
UNDP's framework to support policy-makers in selecting public instruments to promote energy efficiency investment in developing countries used, adapted as necessary	No. of Strategic Frameworks	0	3	3	3	0	3
Amount and number of loans for building renovation provided	United States dollars	0	20,000,000	80,000,000	131,900,000	0	131,900,000
Capacity of banks to develop and market products for energy efficiency retrofits in individual houses	Index/Score/Level	0	2	4	2	0	2
Capacity of banks to develop and market products for energy efficiency retrofits in multi-owner residential buildings	No. of Items	0	2	4	2	2	4
Marketing materials developed and platform created	No. of Knowledge Products/Resources	0	5,000	25,000	55,000	2,397	57,397
Percentage of local government employees in Armenia who believe they have the capacity to develop EE retrofit projects	Percentage	0	50	80	50	11	61

for publicly-owned buildings							
Financial mechanism to provide targeted financial incentives in place and incentives provided	No. of Policy Instruments	0	15,000	50,000	390,038	139,804	529,842
Number of public buildings that receive a financial incentive for energy efficient retrofits, including area (m2)	No. of Items	0	0	103	42	22	64
Number of public buildings that receive a financial incentive for energy efficient retrofits, including area (m2)	No. of Items	0	0	202	42	107	149
Number of residential buildings that receive a financial incentive for energy efficient retrofits, including area (m2)	No. of Items	0	0	10	0	0	0
Number of residential buildings that receive a financial incentive for energy efficient retrofits, including area (m2)	No. of Items	0	0	188	157	28	185
Number of single-family houses that receive a financial incentive for energy efficient retrofits, including area (m2)	No. of Items	0	0	200	0	0	0
Establishment of a web-based, publicly-accessible MRV database	No. of Items	0	1	1	1	0	1
Number of vulnerable beneficiaries (lowest quintile of	No. of Households	0	15,000	50,000	87,156	30,337	117,493

household income) with improved building EE							
Value of loans for building renovation provided	United States dollars	0	22,000,000	100,000,000	131,900,000	0	131,900,000
M5.1 Institutional and regulatory systems that improve incentives for lowemission planning and development and their effective implementation	No. of Policy Instruments	34	64	91	71	62	133
M7.1 Energy intensity/improved efficiency of buildings, cities, industries and appliances as a result of Fund support	Percentage	0	0	50	45	43	88

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
1. Establishment of Building Sector MRV	98	800,997.32	890,000	90
2. Policy De-risking	94	711,948.01	890,000	79
3. Financial De-risking	93	3,265,910.76	3,420,000	95
4. Financial Incentives	70	9,782,682.66	14,000,000	69

C.2.1. Subprojects
<i>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).</i>

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 ☐			
The Amended and Restated Funded Activity Agreement set new disbursement timelines, with tranches 6 and 7 due in January and May 2025. While implementation progressed well, conditions for disbursement 7 were not met. The main obstacle was co-financing materialisation under tranche 6, as required by FAA clause 9.01(d)(ii). UNDP received USD 11.81 million in firm commitments, supported by agreements and letters, meeting conditions for tranche 6. By end-May 2025, USD 5.02 million was spent, a 42.5% materialisation rate. Co-financing from Yerevan Municipality lagged, with slower-than-expected progress despite consultations and meetings. Procurement delays further hindered co-finance materialisation, preventing request of tranche 7 by the FAA closing date. UNDP informed the GCF Secretariat of its decision not to extend timelines. Consequently, disbursement 7 (USD 2,567,000) was not requested, leaving total GCF contribution at USD 17,433,000 (see annex clarification file).							
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	The project may experience of under-delivery by proportional percentage of non-materialized commitments by national partners		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Financial		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	The project's investment component depends on substantial co-financing from national partners. Under the financing model, the project contributes approximately 20% of eligible EE costs, while partners mobilise approximately 80% of EE costs, plus additional construction-related expenditures. In practice, the project's contribution often represents less than 10% of total CAPEX (except in fully retrofitted buildings). Root causes of the risk include fiscal constraints at the community level, administrative delays in approvals for the State Subvention Programme, procurement bottlenecks, and shifting local political or budgetary priorities. Any failure to materialise co-financing directly affects eligibility for GCF disbursement and implementation timelines.		
Consequences	If under-delivery persists, the project may not fully achieve investment targets or associated GHG emission reductions by June 2026. Secondary consequences include reputational risk vis-à-vis national counterparts and the donor, reduced confidence in EE financing mechanisms, and weakened momentum for scaling energy-efficiency investments. The overall impact is assessed as moderate to high in the absence of mitigation, primarily affecting timing and output delivery rather than institutional reform achievements		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The mitigation strategy addresses both likelihood and impact. 1. High-level coordination and oversight. Regular engagement with MoTAI, communities, and the Ministry of Environment; two Project Board meetings in 2025;		

	structured monitoring visits; and targeted escalation for underperforming partners. This strengthens accountability and accelerates corrective actions. 2. Pipeline diversification. The project signed LOAs before June 30, 2026, that are sufficient to use all available funds. These measures significantly reduce the likelihood of aggregate under-delivery and mitigate impact through substitution flexibility. Residual risk rating: 1.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	As of mid-2025, all required LOAs have been signed in advance. No escalation to the Deputy Prime Minister's Office has been required to date, as coordination at the ministerial level has proven sufficient. Given the strong monitoring framework and demonstrated partner responsiveness, the probability of systemic under-delivery is low. Residual exposure remains limited to isolated partner-level delays, which can be absorbed within the expanded pipeline. (This rating already considers the fact that the last disbursement will not be accessed/requested for the project due to previous procurement delays – see details under section C.3.)		
Risk 2	In case of military hostilities are escalated with Azerbaijan, the project may experience under-delivery by 50 % for all its components		
Risk Origin	External Factors		
Risk Area	Political		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	In 2020-2023, the 2020 war followed by several military escalations between Armenia and Azerbaijan, has impacted the project in many ways.		
Consequences	The most direct impact was the mobilization of construction workers for military service, causing significant delays in the ongoing works. The military escalation also affected the activity and priorities of government agencies, with national security and humanitarian priorities fully dominating the political agenda. Demand among some local communities for State Subvention Programme funding for EE retrofits has slowed as these communities sought to use their limited subvention allotments for more urgent infrastructure repair made necessary by the military conflict.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	The project applies adaptive management and contingency planning to reduce both the likelihood and impact of escalation-related disruptions. Implementation schedules will be made flexible, with re-sequencing activities and extended construction windows to accommodate temporary labour shortages. Framework agreements with multiple contractors and suppliers will be used to diversify delivery capacity and reduce dependence on a single workforce pool. Close coordination with national and local authorities will ensure rapid adjustment of targets in line with shifting government priorities, while maintaining alignment with EE policy objectives. Community engagement will be intensified to promote phased or scaled EE retrofits that can be combined with urgent repair needs, increasing the attractiveness of participation even during crises. These measures are expected to lower the impact of the risk, though the likelihood remains partially outside of project control. Residual risk score: 3 (moderate).		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	3 - Medium	3 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	3 - Medium	3 - Low
Comments	Since 2020, two major incidents have occurred. Although they did not directly affect implementation in 2025, they should be mentioned considering their impact on overall implementation. After the 2020 and 2023 wars, national policy priorities shifted toward urgent refugee support, with financing redirected to social housing. As a result, retrofitting of other buildings and broader capital infrastructure investments were no longer immediate priorities. In addition, construction activities were suspended in		

	regions near the conflict zone due to safety and security concerns. Even in unaffected regions, work was halted as much of the workforce was recruited into the army. These developments delayed construction progress and limited co-financing materialisation, thereby influencing overall project implementation and disbursement planning.		
Risk 3	Potential misuse of funds through third-party transactions		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Money Laundering (ML) & Terrorist Financing (TF)		
Description	A potential risk that project funds could be indirectly misused through third-party transactions or contractual arrangements. This may arise in contexts involving multiple implementing partners or subcontractors. The risk is considered contextual and relates to standard financial integrity considerations applicable to externally funded projects.		
Consequences	If it were to occur, this could lead to non-compliance with UNDP and GCF financial integrity standards, disbursement suspension, financial losses, implementation delays, and reputational damage to UNDP and GCF. It may also affect stakeholder confidence and require a review of financial management procedures. The likelihood of significant disruption is limited due to existing budget controls, financial reviews and expenditure verification.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	3 - Medium	3 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	The risk is managed through full compliance with UNDP Anti-Money Laundering and Countering the Financing of Terrorism (AML/CFT) policies. All implementing partners, vendors, and contractors are systematically screened against the UN Security Council Consolidated Sanctions List and other applicable watchlists prior to engagement. Partners with annual budgeted expenditures ≥ USD 150,000 undergo mandatory micro-assessments (once in a programme cycle, i.e. every five years), which include controls related to fraud, corruption, and financial integrity. Legal instruments (LOAs and RPAs) include binding AML/CFT clauses. Given that all major procurements and contractual arrangements have been completed and no new partners are anticipated, the likelihood of exposure has further decreased. These measures collectively reduce both likelihood and impact to a low residual level.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Comments	No instances of money laundering or terrorism financing have been identified during the reporting period. All financial flows have been subject to UNDP control frameworks and due diligence procedures. Armenia continues to improve its standing under FATF-related assessments, supporting a generally strengthened national compliance environment. At the current implementation stage, with no new partnerships foreseen, the risk remains relevant but largely theoretical and well-controlled.		
Risk 4	Risk of engagement with sanctioned entities		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Sanctions		
Description	A potential risk of inadvertent engagement with entities subject to international sanctions, particularly in the context of cross-border supply chains and service provision. This risk reflects the broader operating environment rather than project-specific vulnerabilities.		
Consequences	Such an occurrence could result in compliance issues with applicable sanctions frameworks and require corrective actions, including contract review or termination. It may also have reputational damage to UNDP and GCF implications. Given existing controls, impacts are expected to be limited and manageable.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	3 - Medium	3 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	The risk is mitigated through UNDP's mandatory due diligence and vendor screening procedures. All contractors, and sub-recipients are vetted against the UN Security Council Consolidated Sanctions List and other relevant sanctions regimes prior to		

	contracting. Contractual agreements explicitly prohibit engagement with sanctioned entities, and compliance is monitored throughout implementation. The UNDP Country Office maintains AML/CFT oversight capacity, including a designated focal point responsible for initial checking and ongoing monitoring. These measures reduce the likelihood of accidental engagement with sanctioned entities. As all procurement processes have been finalised and no new counterparties are expected, exposure to this risk is theoretical.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Comments	No cases of engagement with sanctioned entities have occurred during project implementation. All due diligence procedures have been consistently applied. Given the completion of procurement and contracting processes, the risk remains relevant in theory but is not expected to materialise under current implementation conditions.		
Risk 5	Risk of fraud, bribery or collusion in procurement and implementation		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	The risk of fraud, bribery, or collusion among bidders, contractors, or project staff during procurement and implementation. Root causes include the high value of infrastructure contracts and perceived corruption in the national context. Armenia ranks 62nd out of 180 countries in the 2023 Corruption Perception Index, indicating a medium level of corruption risk that requires active management, especially in sectors such as construction.		
Consequences	If realised, this could affect value for money and implementation efficiency, and may require administrative or corrective actions. It could also have reputational implications. However, given the control environment, any potential impact is expected to be contained.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	3 - Medium	3 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	The project applies UNDP's Policy on Fraud and other Corrupt Practices through robust procurement and oversight mechanisms. These include competitive bidding processes, independent evaluation committees, segregation of duties, and third-party monitoring where applicable. All personnel are subject to UNDP's ethical standards, and reporting channels are ensured through the Whistleblower Protection Policy. Allegations, if any, are subject to independent investigation by the Office of Audit and Investigations (OAI). Additionally, partners with significant financial exposure undergo micro-assessments covering governance, financial controls, and anti-corruption safeguards. With procurement largely completed, opportunities for Fraud / Bribery & Corruption / Collusion have materially decreased, reducing the residual risk.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Comments	No cases of Fraud / Bribery & Corruption / Collusion have been reported or detected during the reporting period. While the risk remains structurally relevant for infrastructure-type interventions, the current phase of implementation substantially limits exposure. Existing controls remain adequate and effective.		
Risk 6	Risk of conflicts of interest in decision-making processes		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		

Description	A potential risk that individuals involved in project implementation or decision-making may have competing interests that are not fully disclosed. This is a standard consideration in procurement, recruitment, and partnership processes.		
Consequences	If not properly managed, this could affect the perceived fairness and transparency of decisions and may require corrective measures. Impacts would primarily relate to process integrity rather than project outcomes and are expected to be limited under existing controls		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 3 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	Conflict of interest risks are managed through UNDP's Policy on Ethics and Conduct, requiring disclosure of any actual or perceived conflicts by personnel and partners. All procurement evaluation committee members sign declarations of impartiality, and key decisions are subject to the "four-eyes" principle to ensure independent oversight. Micro-assessments of implementing partners include review of HR policies and governance structures to identify and mitigate conflict-of-interest risks. Given that major procurement contracts and LOAs/RPAs are signed, the likelihood of conflict-of-interest cases arising is reduced.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 2 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 2 - Low
Comments	No conflict-of-interest cases have been identified during implementation. All required declarations and compliance mechanisms have been applied. At the current stage, with no new procurement or recruitment processes anticipated, the risk remains relevant from a compliance perspective but is considered low and effectively managed.		

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
Armenia	Grants	USD	20,000,000	17,433,000	5,156,417.84	15,264,983.9	100%	0%
Total		USD	20,000,000	17,433,000	5,156,417.84	15,264,983.9	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
UNDP	Grants	USD	420,000	365,526.64	16,038.95	365,526.64	100%	0%
Ministry of Environment	Grants	USD	400,000	400,000	0	400,000	100%	0%
UNDP (Parallel funding)	Grants	USD	3,071,603.14	3,071,603.14	0	3,071,603.14	100%	0%
Yerevan Municipality	Grants	USD	17,096,000	17,096,000	0	17,096,000	100%	0%
European Investment Bank	Loans	USD	14,824,318	12,198,390.32	2,013,540.21	12,198,390.32	100%	0%
Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Territorial Administration, Ministry of Health, Office of Prime Minister	Grants	USD	29,862,746	22,513,952.13	9,483,938	22,513,952.13	100%	0%
EDB/R2E2	Grants	USD	3,122,479	3,122,479	1,906,027.49	3,122,479	100%	0%
ADB/Armenian Territorial	Grants	USD	9,037,777	3,721,006.68	2,961,006.68	3,721,006.68	100%	0%

Co-financier	Instrument	Currency (as per FAA)	Committed Amount	Disbursed Amount	Expenditure (reporting year)	Cumulative Expenditure	Mitigation	Adaptation
Development Fund								
WB/Ministry of Education PIU	Grants	USD	2,200,000	2,200,000	1,193,490.77	2,200,000	100%	0%
Armenian Representation of AGBU	Grants	USD	843,069	843,069	0	843,069	100%	0%
Local Banks	Loans	USD	1,820,000	0	0	0	100%	0%
Total		USD	82,697,992.14	65,532,026.91	17,574,042.1	65,532,026.91	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>

Institution Type (public/private)	Instrument	Currency	Cumulative Value	Final Target (estimation)
Public	Grants	USD	7,260,811.76	N/A
Total		USD	7,260,811.76	0

File Name: PIMS 5684_APR_2025_Grant-Financial Progress Detail_cleared by QM.xlsx

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

During the reporting period, the project implemented environmental and social risk mitigation measures in line with the approved ESMF/P and Asbestos Waste Management Guideline (AWMG), addressing Category B risks (asbestos handling, labour conditions, air emissions and community health and safety). Prior to co-financing, the project verified the availability of construction permits in accordance with Armenian legislation and checked the presence of any asbestos-containing materials in the buildings targeted for GCF prospective support. Asbestos screening was completed for 162 newly selected buildings. In addition, 142 “no-asbestos” confirmations were obtained from partners; thus, asbestos presence was verified for 304 buildings. Asbestos-containing materials (ACM) were identified in 65 buildings (15 under construction in Alaverdi, 14 completed, 36 pending works). Where asbestos was detected, AWMG procedures were triggered. In addition, in 2025, all new LOAs/RPAs that were signed using the updated contractual templates incorporated the project’s predefined environmental and social safeguard risk management measures applicable to GCF-financed construction activities, and the project required the respective IPs to comply with them. Capacity strengthening: Three targeted trainings (in May, July and October 2025) were delivered to community and partner staff on safeguards compliance, AWMG implementation and Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) procedures. Systematic monitoring and supervision: A structured monitoring approach was applied through 58 monitoring visits covering 169 construction sites in Yerevan and regions. The monitoring plan (approved by CO in May 2025 and updated in August 2025) operationalised routine safeguards supervision. BTORs and technical reports documented visit results. No material non-compliance or incidents triggering ESMF risk realisation were identified. Where minor issues were observed, corrective actions were communicated to the partners. Grievance management: No formal grievances were submitted during the reporting period. One concern regarding construction waste (identified through a focus group discussion in Stepanavan under the household survey) was promptly verified and resolved at community.

Outputs during the reporting period

- The set of pre-defined social and environmental safeguard risk management measures related to the relevant construction works or activities to be executed with the GCF, including AWMG, was incorporated in 18 new LOAs signed in 2025.
- 162 asbestos screening reports prepared by certified professionals
- 142 formal “no-asbestos” confirmation letters from partners obtained
- 65 buildings identified with asbestos
- 58 monitoring visits conducted across 169 sites (BTORs/technical reports issued)
- Monitoring plan developed, updated, and approved by CO
- 3 Social and Environmental Screening (SESP)/AWMG/GRM trainings delivered (25 participants: 9 women, 16 men)
- SESP training materials developed and disseminated
- Asbestos risk awareness banners installed at construction sites
- Verification of construction permits completed prior to co-financing

These outputs demonstrate operationalisation of the ESMF and AWMG, systematic safeguards supervision and strengthened compliance tracking.

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

No new environmental or social risks were identified during the reporting period. Implementation focused on mitigating the Moderate risks previously identified under the Category B classification:

- Asbestos exposure risk (Risk 3): Addressed through systematic screening, activation of AWMG protocols in 65 buildings, contractor oversight, and site monitoring.
- Air emissions and construction impacts (Risk 5): Managed through application of predefined construction-phase mitigation measures (dust suppression, waste handling, site safety controls), verified during monitoring visits.
- Labour and working conditions (Risk 6): Reviewed during site supervision to ensure compliance with national legislation and agreed safeguard requirements.
- Community health and safety: Managed through controlled construction practices, public information measures (including asbestos awareness banners), and permit verification. Systematic monitoring confirmed that mitigation measures are being implemented in line with ESMF/P requirements. No incidents requiring escalation to UNDP or GCF occurred.

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

No outstanding safeguards incidents or unresolved grievances require GCF action. However, the institutional capacity of national oversight bodies responsible for the enforcement of environmental and construction standards remains limited. While beyond the project mandate, sustained national capacity strengthening would enhance long-term compliance with safeguards in the building sector. The project will continue systematic monitoring and compliance tracking until completion of all retrofit activities.

Remarks/Notes

n/a

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	
In line with the approved Stakeholder Engagement Plan, the project implemented structured, multi-level engagement covering stakeholder households, local authorities, financial institutions, civil society, technical professionals, and the general public. A total of 4,731 individuals were directly engaged through consultations, surveys, trainings, workshops, and media outreach. Engagement included: • 17 technical and safeguards trainings (299 participants) on EMIS, institutionalisation of energy managers, asbestos handling, environmental and social risk management, EMIS use, NEX fiduciary procedures and MAB management. • 4 strategic workshops (153 participants) on policy reforms, SDG7 Roadmap, building codes, EE materials catalogue, and retrofitting barriers. • Media engagement (32 participants) to strengthen transparency and public accountability. • Targeted MAB consultations (15 participants) in Ijevan and Alaverdi on management reform and delivery challenges. • Household survey (1,079 households) assessing comfort, affordability, gender impacts, and co-financing barriers. • Public opinion survey (3,016 respondents) assessing awareness, trust, and willingness to participate in EE retrofits. • LSG capacity assessment (107 participants in 20 municipalities). • Financial institutions assessment (30 representatives from 14 FIs). Engagement was conducted through face-to-face meetings, Focus Group Discussions, interviews, and online tools. Venues were accessible municipal facilities. Gender balance targets were applied in surveys and institutional consultations. Vulnerable groups were intentionally included.	
Dates and venues of engagement activities	
• March-May, face-to-face: Household survey: 10 communities, 67 MABs • Countrywide, August-September, online, face-to-face: Public opinion survey. • March-June, online, face-to-face: LSG survey: 20 municipalities nationwide FI survey: Yerevan, regional branches. • SESP Trainings in communities: Alaverdi: 07.05.2025 Ashtarak: 22.07.2025 Online: 14.10.2025 • Meeting with Partners: 17.04.2025, MoTAI meeting hall • Project Boards: MoTAI meeting hall, 8.07.2025 Ani Grand Hotel, 24.12.2025 • Energy Management Training: 18.04.2025, 28.04.2025, 07.07.2025, Yerevan 30.04.2025, Sisian 24.09.2025, Stepanavan 07.10.2025, Alaverdi • Media Tour: Kapan, Kajaran, 18-19.07.2025	

• EE and MABs management training: 10 regions and Yerevan, Sep-Nov25
Sex-disaggregated data on stakeholder engagement participants (male + female = total) Please provide the list of CSOs, NGOs, or other platforms, initiatives, and opportunities the entity reached or consulted in line with the requirement according to the relevant framework (projects which IPPF-- satisfying the Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement Plan). Please include the list of other relevant stakeholders involved i.e., stakeholders Trainings: 75 women + 224 men = 299 Workshops: 54 women + 99 men = 153 Media: 22 women + 10 men = 32 LSG survey: 37 women + 70 men = 107 Financial institutions survey: 12 women + 18 men = 30 Public opinion survey: 1,822 women + 1,194 men = 3,016 Household survey: 1,079 (209 women-headed) households Women represented a significant share of engagement activities, particularly in public opinion research. Vulnerable groups were 23.2% of public opinion and 10% of household survey participants. This demonstrates inclusive outreach, particularly toward women and vulnerable populations disproportionately affected by energy poverty. Stakeholders • Ministry of Environment • MoTAI • Deputy Prime Minister's Office • Environmental Project Implementation Unit • Local Self-Governments (20 communities) • Homeowners Associations and condominium bodies • Financial institutions (14 FIs) • Construction and supervision companies • NGOs: Sustainable Development NGO (Syunik), HEBA NGO (Alaverdi), For Equal Rights NGO (Ijevan) • Habitat for Humanity Armenia • Journalists from Public Television, Public Radio, Ecolur, Mediamax, JAMnews, Armenpress, Syuniats Yerkir, AraratNews.am, Syunik TV, Free News • Residents of retrofitted buildings • General public
Information shared with stakeholders Stakeholders received information enabling informed participation, including: • Municipal Energy Management Systems framework • Asbestos management and SES safeguards procedures • National execution advance and fiduciary requirements • Building Climatology Code and EE materials catalogue • Advisory handbook on thermal insulation solutions • Results of the household satisfaction and impact survey • Public opinion findings on Energy Efficiency • LSG capacity assessment findings and recommendations • Financial institutions' capacity assessment findings • Risks on EE investments and recommendations addressing them • Policy and institutional reform proposals Information was disclosed through workshops, technical manuals, presentations, public reports, media dissemination, and social media channels.
Outputs including issues raised and addressed during the reporting period 1. Affordability and Social Equity 76% of public respondents identified a lack of financial resources as the main barrier. Many households reported difficulty meeting co-financing requirements; women-headed households face lower heating affordability. Response: Findings are informing dialogue on targeted subsidies, guarantee instruments, and revised co-financing approaches for vulnerable households. 2. Institutional Capacity Gaps (LSGs) Limited energy monitoring, absence of dedicated EE staff, and fragmented responsibility.

Response: Expanded EE and EMIS trainings; promotion of energy manager institutionalisation; development of practical guidance. 3. Financial Sector Barriers Banks reported lack of collective MAB financing models, high transaction costs, and regulatory limitations. Response: Continued consultation on pooled lending, risk-sharing mechanisms, and regulatory clarification. 4. Behavioural and Trust Constraints Despite high recognition of EE importance (87.9%), 68.4% expressed reluctance to co-finance due to mistrust and income insecurity. Response: Strengthened awareness messaging, improved transparency and dissemination of demonstrated comfort and health benefits. 5. Technical and Safeguard Risks Market capacity constraints and asbestos risks were raised. Response: Strengthened contractor training and safeguards compliance monitoring. Stakeholder inputs directly informed adjustments in communication strategy, capacity-building focus, and financing discussions.
Remarks/Notes
Stakeholder engagement during the reporting period was conducted in full alignment with the approved SES and supported compliance with environmental and social safeguards. All four surveys functioned as structured consultation mechanisms feeding into adaptive implementation and policy dialogue. No formal grievances were recorded during the reporting period. Engagement activities strengthened transparency, institutional ownership, and risk-informed decision-making.

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	
AWMG Implementation and Supervision (throughout construction phase): Monitoring safe removal, transport and disposal of ACM. Deliverables: monitoring reports; contractor compliance confirmations. Systematic Safeguards Monitoring: Continued structured monitoring visits across active construction sites. Grievance Redress Monitoring: Ongoing operation of GRM; documentation of any complaints and corrective actions. Deliverables: grievance log and review summaries. While the information on GRM is available on project website and social media, information will be published in administrative buildings of partners giving easy access to potential complainants. Country Office (CO) Level SRM monitoring : In addition to project level GRM, CO will use its Stakeholder Response Mechanism (which is not linked with the project operation) for collecting any potential grievances even after the project closure.	
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	
Systematic safeguards supervision (structured monitoring plan, documented site visits and permit verification prior to disbursement) has proven effective in preventing risk materialisation and ensuring contractor compliance. Early asbestos screening prior to construction launch significantly reduces implementation delays and liability exposure. Integrating AWMG and safeguard requirements contractually into LOAs/RPAs strengthens enforceability. Community-level information disclosure (including visible asbestos awareness materials) enhances transparency and contributes to proactive issue identification, as demonstrated by the timely resolution of the Stepanavan construction waste concern. No substantive safeguard incidents occurred during the reporting period.	
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 ☒
<i>This is a note for "The accredited entity confirms the statement above at project-level, AE-level and GCF-level grievance mechanisms": Project-level GRM, established on 25.12.2024, applies to complaints related to project activities implemented after signature of the Project Document and before project closure. Affected persons or their authorised representatives may submit complaints indicating actual /potential environmental /social harm. See: https://www.undp.org/armenia/contact-us, https://mershenq.am/en/contacts. Complaints may be submitted in writing, via email, mobile/WhatsApp (+374 95 993393), or a complaint box at UN House. GRM does not preclude access to other dispute resolution mechanisms. Information on GRM is available on the website of UNDP Armenia, project website and social media, also on partner communities' information walls at administrative buildings (see more details in annexed presentation).</i>	
F.8. Implementation of activities and actions agreed in the Gender Action Plan	
In 2025, the Project continued systematic implementation of the Gender Action Plan (GAP) across all four outputs. All planned gender-related actions were implemented within the reporting period, except for the presentation of the affordability study, which was postponed to February 2026 for coordination purposes. Gender considerations were integrated into all major analytical products and technical assistance activities. Five gender-responsive surveys were conducted (total 4,971 respondents; 49% women). Employment generated through project-supported activities remained gender balanced (53% women in 2025). Women-headed households constituted 32.4% of beneficiary households, exceeding the 30% target. Women represented 52.8% of total individual beneficiaries. Institutional strengthening included engagement of two women-led NGOs in piloting new MAB management models and development of gender-disaggregated municipal housing databases. With the exception of one structural indicator related to the share of income spent on heating (see below), all GAP indicators remain on track. The Project continues to align with the GCF Updated Gender Policy and Funding Activity Agreement.	
Are there GAP implementation activities or progress to report for this period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>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.</i>	
GAP Activity	
The Project ensured gender balance in employment generated through project implementation. Contractors were required to apply gender-sensitive recruitment practices. Gender expertise was retained to monitor compliance and support gender-responsive procurement. The household survey covered 1,079 households (3,774 individuals), including 1,930 women. Partner organisations in Ijevan and Alaverdi were women-led NGOs, and municipal focal points were women. Gender-sensitive clauses were integrated into TORs and procurement documentation. Small-scale service providers were selected with consideration of women-led enterprises, where qualifications met requirements.	
Indicator	
Number of women and men employed through jobs created from the project / Number of men and women small-scale service providers engaged.	

Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	1988
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
Indicator 1: Number of women and men employed through jobs created from the project. In 2025: 53% of project-related employment was female. 39% of the project's purchase orders were awarded to women or women-led organisations. - Project prioritised working with female-headed NGOs in Alaverdi and Ijevan. - The awareness-raising campaigns concentrated on the impact of the project on women. Indicator 2: Number of men and women small-scale service providers engaged. In 2025: 100 purchase orders were issued. 39% were awarded to women or women-led enterprises. - The minimum target of 2 women-led providers was exceeded. Gender-responsive procurement is systematically applied. Action 1 (Outputs 1, 2, 4) was fully implemented. Gender and social expertise were conducted for methodologies and reports related to five surveys: - Local Self-Governments survey - Financial institutions survey - Household impact survey - Affordability survey - Public opinion survey (EPIU technical support) Sampling structures were reviewed to ensure inclusion of women and vulnerable groups. Questionnaires were refined from a gender-sensitive perspective. Reports were reviewed to ensure sex-disaggregated analysis. Two women-led NGOs ("HEBA" in Alaverdi and "For Equality" in Ijevan) were contracted to support data collection for MAB management reform.	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
From 2017–2025: - Over 1,000 jobs created. - More than 200 companies and NGOs contracted. - Female employment exceeded 60% in research, consulting, PR, and NGO sectors. - More than the targeted 2 women-led service providers were hired every year, with 39 in 2025. Gender-responsive recruitment and procurement practices are institutionalised. Indicators are rated GREEN as female participation consistently exceeds the 40% target. Gender clauses in TORs and procurement ensure the sustainability of results.	
Budget	0
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	30 June 2026
Responsibility	
Contractor companies Alaverdi and Ijevan Municipalities "HEBA" NGO "For Equality" NGO	

Gender and Social Impact Expert International Project Manager	
Remarks/Notes	
n/a	
GAP Activity	
Output 1, Objective 2: Ensure outreach and communication include women All surveys required at least 30% women respondents. Knowledge-building and outreach activities were designed to ensure female participation in a traditionally male-dominated sector. Website and social media analytics were used to monitor the gender distribution of users. Media tours and human-interest stories intentionally highlighted women beneficiaries. Two women-led NGOs supported community mobilisation and dissemination activities in pilot communities.	
Indicator	
Number of women and men trained in MRV and EMIS / Number of outreach programs/fairs / Number of men and women website users / Number of women's groups involved	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	1491
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
Indicator 1: Number of women and men trained in MRV and EMIS In 2025: 6 trainings conducted on EMIS and MRV related topics. 78 participants. 50 women (52%) trained. Indicator 2: Number of outreach programs/fairs Target: At least 2 programs In 2025: 28 outreach activities. 608 participants. 224 women (37%). Total outreach since project start: 68 events. 3,719 participants (45% women). Indicator 3: Number of men and women website users The website remained fully operational, with 4.9 thousand unique visits recorded in 2025 In 2025, 40% of the project website users were women. The total number of Facebook followers is 10,400, out of which 65.3% is women. Indicator 4: Number of women's groups involved Target: At least 2 women's groups Action 2 was implemented through the development of the "Affordability Gap of Energy Efficient Retrofitting" report based on: 739 surveyed households, 6 focus groups, 3 roundtables.	

The report analyses affordability by:
 Women-headed households,
 Social benefit recipients,
 Households with persons with disabilities,
 Single pensioners.
 Through the affordability survey, 8 groups from 8 settlements were engaged in the project outreach activities. In 6 communities, 2 women's groups were targeted – residents of EE retrofitted buildings and homeowners' associations.

Cumulative progress update (Entire period)

Since 2017:

- 68 outreach events,
- 3,719 participants (45% women).

Two "Women in Climate Awards" (2022, 2024):

- 215 female applicants across seven nominations.

Women-led NGOs actively supported fieldwork, community mobilisation, and communication material refinement. Website and social media outreach were measured, and the targets were met.

Budget	0
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	30 June 2026

Responsibility

Contractor companies
 "HEBA" NGO
 "For Equality" NGO
 Gender and Social Impact Expert
 International Project Manager

Remarks/Notes

n/a

GAP Activity

Output 2, Objective 1: Active women's participation in EE governance
 Five surveys were conducted in 2025 with gender-sensitive methodologies.

Total respondents:

- 4,971 individuals.
- 2,416 women (49%).

Training on EE:

- 24 financial officers trained.
- 16 women (67%).

Two women-led NGOs facilitated discussions on MAB management reform and resource centre creation in pilot communities.

Indicator

Number of women and men who participated in town hall meetings, focused group meeting, etc. / Number of women and men HOAs head involved as facilitators / Number of men and women trained on appraising investments and developing EE projects

Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
----------------------------	----------------------------

Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	1491
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
Indicator 1: Number of women and men who participated in town hall meetings, focus group meetings, etc. Target: 1491 Total 2,416 women (49%) out of 4,971 surveyed during the preparation of 5 surveys HH Survey: 1079 respondents, 30% women Awareness survey: 3,016 respondents, 60.4% women Affordability Survey: 739 respondents, 30% women Financial Institutions Survey: 30 respondents, 40% women LSGs survey: 107 respondents, 35% women Indicator 2: Number of women and men HOA heads involved as facilitators Target: 0 In the framework of “Study of buildings’ energy efficient retrofitting issues in Armenia” the contractor company organised 2 roundtable discussions with 15 representatives of condominiums (HOAs) in Yerevan, comprising 4 women and 11 men, to discuss the issues of MABs management, maintenance and affordability of EE retrofitting measures. 4 female-employees of 2 MABs management former units supported the Project in the collection of gender and social vulnerability data on resident households of MABs and the facilitation of creating a new management body of MABs in Alaverdi. Women activists and NGO leaders facilitated focus groups and roundtables in Alaverdi and Ijevan. Indicator 3: Number of men and women trained on appraising investments and developing EE projects Target: 40% women trained - 1988	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
Women’s participation in sector governance (national level): 42% of technical commission members on energy standards. 60% of authors of new EE standards. 73% of Interagency Commission on Climate Change members are women. Women’s representation in sector institutions remains strong. https://armstat.am/en/?nid=82&id=2700	
Budget	0
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	30 June 2026
Responsibility	
Project’s Gender and Social Impact Expert International Project Manager Contractors EPIU	
Remarks/Notes	
n/a	

GAP Activity	
Output 4. Objective 1. Women-headed households have equal access to affordable capital	
Indicator	
Number of Women-headed households who received funding / Number of male/female beneficiaries in the Women-headed households	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	1491
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
Indicator 1: Number of Women-headed households that received funding Target: At least 30% - 1,491 In 2025 the project supported: 749 households benefited. 243 women-headed (32.4%). Indicator 2: Number of male/female beneficiaries in the Women-headed households. Target: At least 60% -2,983 According to the data of the household survey conducted by the contractor company among the residents of EE retrofitted MABs, the distribution of male/female beneficiaries in the women-headed households was 30.6% vs. 69.4%.	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
Since launch, the project supported: 5,644 households benefited. 1,843 women-headed (32.4%). The overall % of women in female-headed households exceeds 60%.	
Budget	0
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	30 June 2026
Responsibility	
Project's Gender and Social Impact Expert International Project Manager of the Project Contractors	
Remarks/Notes	
n/a	
GAP Activity	
Output 4. Objective 2. Improved quality of life of households that received financial support	

Indicator	
Reduction in electricity bills /	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	994
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
Indicator 1: Reduction in electricity bills Target: At least 20% - 994 Rating of indicator: RED According to HH survey: Average total energy cost reduction ≈23% while for women-headed households this data is 22.4%. Indicator 2: Percent of income spent on space heating Target: No more than 10% Approximately 62.5% of respondents of the households' survey reported that EE retrofitting led to lower energy expenditures and resulted to economy of family budgets. Thus, before energy efficiency improvements, the average monthly household expenditure on space heating amounted to 18.3% of the gross average monthly income, and after EE retrofits, it amounted to 16.3%. The women-headed households spent 29% of their income before and 25.8% after EE retrofits, while the male-headed households spent almost twice lower parts of their gross income either before or after EE retrofits – 14.6% and 13.2%, respectively. Explanation: Although reductions are measurable, structural energy poverty and low-income levels prevent reaching the 10% benchmark. Mitigation: Affordability gap study completed; policy dialogue ongoing. Indicator 3: Target: Total number of men and women beneficiaries of project Over 625,715 total direct and indirect beneficiaries out of which 366,045 (58.6%) are women and girls Target 20,000 – exceeded	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
N/A	
Budget	0
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	30 June 2026
Responsibility	
N/A	
Remarks/Notes	
N/A	
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	Yes ☒ No ☐

the project/programme, including plans to engage another expert if a previously engaged expert has left the project/programme.	
<i>The Gender and Social Impact Expert has been continuously engaged since 2021. She oversees GAP implementation, reviews methodologies, ensures sex-disaggregation, supports reporting, and advises on gender-responsive procurement.</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>Yes, the Gender Action Plan (GAP) has been implemented in line with the Funding Activity Agreement (FAA) and the Green Climate Fund's Updated Gender Policy. While no separate budget was allocated specifically for GAP activities under the FAA, gender considerations have been integrated into the overall project design and implementation. This means that relevant actions have been financed through the project's general budget and carried out as part of core activities. During the reporting period, the Project made consistent efforts to ensure that women and men benefit equally from its interventions. Particular attention was given to vulnerable groups, including women-headed households. Gender-disaggregated data has been regularly collected and used to better understand who benefits from the project and to guide decision-making. Training, awareness-raising activities, and community outreach were organised in a way that encourages participation from both women and men. Where needed, additional efforts were made to reach women and ensure their meaningful involvement. The Project also ensured that women's voices are included in consultations and discussions with stakeholders. This helped make activities more inclusive and responsive to different needs. Gender aspects were also considered in environmental and social risk management, including community safety and working conditions. Progress on gender-related actions has been regularly monitored and reflected in project reporting. Overall, even without a dedicated GAP budget, the Project has followed the requirements of the FAA and GCF Gender Policy by integrating gender equality into its day-to-day work and ensuring that activities are inclusive, data-informed, and responsive to the needs of both women and men.</i>	
Are the planned activities, targets, indicators, timelines, etc. on track during the reporting period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>Women-headed households exceed 30% threshold. Women constitute 52.8% of individual beneficiaries. Training participation consistently exceeds minimum thresholds.</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>n/a</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 ☐
<i>Women-headed households exceed 30% threshold. Women constitute 52.8% of individual beneficiaries. Training participation consistently exceeds minimum thresholds.</i>	
Has the project/programme experienced any implementation challenges that affect gender-related activities? If yes, please	Yes ☒ No ☐

include lessons learnt and how they are informing ongoing actions.	
<i>Structural energy poverty limits achievement of ≤10% heating expenditure benchmark. Lesson learned: affordability support mechanisms require complementary policy instruments beyond infrastructure retrofit.</i>	
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 ☐
<i>During the 2025 household survey, women-headed households (WHHs) were identified as key agents of action in adopting energy-efficient behaviours. WHHs (19.5% of households) have smaller family sizes and lower average incomes (≈123,000 AMD) than other households, making them more reliant on electricity for heating (42% vs. 22% in male-headed households). After EE retrofits, electricity use declined, and natural gas uptake increased, reflecting both savings and behavioural changes. Although achieving the desired indoor temperature remains challenging for 40–50% of WHHs and single pensioner households, their engagement in energy-saving practices demonstrates resilience and adaptability. Satisfaction with the Project is high across all households (93.1%), with 94.6–97.4% among families receiving social benefits and slightly lower (~90%) for WHHs. These outcomes illustrate best practices: actively engaging women and WHHs in energy-efficiency measures, supporting informed household decision-making, and tracking tangible benefits through surveys. Their participation has directly contributed to improved affordability, comfort, and energy behaviours, highlighting the importance of gender-responsive approaches.</i>	
Provide planned activities on gender elements for the next reporting period	
<i>Detail the gender-related activities planned for the next reporting period: • Presentation of HH and affordability reports (February 2026). • Final update of gender-disaggregated beneficiary database. • Documentation of gender-responsive best practices.</i>	

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.
File Name: Annex 1_GHG emissions_tCO2e year_20 years_2025_Ver.02.xlsx
Annex 2: Communication and visibility material
File Name: Annex 2_Communication Materials_APR 2025.docx
Annex 3: List of grievances received
No annexes provided.
Annex 4: Procurement information
No annexes provided.
Annex 5: Updated implementation timetable for the Funded Activity for the following year
File Name: Annex 5. Implementation timetable_AWP 2026_ENG_final_.docx
Annex 6: Updated Gender Assessment and/or Action Plan
No annexes provided.
Additional Annexes (if applicable)
File Name: Additional Clarifications on APR 2025_final.docx File Name: BTOR_3 July_2025_Gyumri Talin.docx File Name: ESMF implementatiuon Answer 1_V1[97].docx File Name: LoA_Kajaran_8 MABs__016-25_30 Jun_25.pdf

File Name: FW Corporate actions to address GCF SES concerns and prepare for OAI audit.pdf

File Name: Answer 1_V1 FW Corporate actions to address GCF SES concerns and prepare for OAI audit.docx