
Annual Performance Report

Project/Programme title: Enhancing climate resilience of India's coastal communities (FP084)

Accredited Entity: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Date of Report submission: 18 August 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		18 August 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 43.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>Mill. USD 43.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Co-Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 86.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>Mill. USD 80.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>InKind</td> <td>Mill. USD 6.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 130.3</td> </tr> </table>				GCF Financing	Mill. USD 43.4	Grants	Mill. USD 43.4	Co-Financing	Mill. USD 86.9	Grants	Mill. USD 80.5	InKind	Mill. USD 6.4	Total Financing	Mill. USD 130.3
	GCF Financing	Mill. USD 43.4														
	Grants	Mill. USD 43.4														
	Co-Financing	Mill. USD 86.9														
	Grants	Mill. USD 80.5														
	InKind	Mill. USD 6.4														
	Total Financing	Mill. USD 130.3														
A.5. Total GCF funding disbursed to this date	NA (draft)															
A.6. Implementation period	From 1 January 2019 to 28 June 2027															
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 Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India	India	Public sector – Government (which may be acting through a ministry or department)	Executing Entity	Ms Rajasree Ray, National Project Director, rajasree.r@nic.in												

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)
Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change of the Republic of India (MoEFCC)	India	Ms Rajasree Ray, National Project Director, rajasree.r@nic.in	National Government	N/A
Maharashtra SG	India	Mr. S. V. Ramarao State project Director, GCF ECRICC Project Maharashtra, ccfmmumbai@gmail.com	State 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)
Andhra Pradesh SG	India	Mr. Kantilal Dande Principal Secretary to AP Govt & State Project Director, splcs_efst@ap.gov.in	State Government	N/A
Odisha SG	India	Mr. Prem Kumar Jha, State Project Director, ecriccodisha@gmail.com	State Government	N/A

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)
India	26 August 2022	NDC 5: To create an additional carbon sink of 2.5 to 3 billion tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent through additional forest and tree cover by 2030	The project will generate substantial mitigation co-benefits through interventions that enhance long-term carbon sequestration. Restoration of degraded blue carbon ecosystems—such as mangroves and seagrass meadows—along with the creation of new vegetative systems through catchment revegetation and establishment of coastal shelter belts, will significantly expand carbon sinks along India's coastline. Over a 30-year period, these interventions are estimated to sequester more than 3.6 million tonnes of CO ₂ . By strengthening blue carbon stocks and enhancing ecosystem integrity, the project will make a measurable contribution to India's emission reduction commitments under its Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.	0%

A.11. Estimated duration of impact	
A.12 Report to be shared with NDA	Yes ☒ No ☐
7 May 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 on Enhancing Climate Resilience of India’s Coastal Communities, worth US\$43 million, runs from 2019 to 2028 and is led by India’s Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India alongside UNDP which is the Accredited Agency of GCF, with funding from the Green Climate Fund. It focuses on three coastal states particularly susceptible to climate risks e.g Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, and Odisha.

Overall Objectives

The core aim is to strengthen the ability of vulnerable coastal populations to withstand the effects of climate change. It seeks to transform how coastal areas are managed by embedding ecosystem-based and community-driven approaches into planning frameworks. Special attention is given to empowering women and other disadvantaged groups. The project also works to build natural defences against climate hazards, promote climate-resilient ways of earning a living, and improve how coastal zones are governed through better risk awareness.

Key Outcomes

The project focuses on three broad results

a) restoring and conserving critical coastal and marine ecosystems such as mangroves, seagrass, and coral reefs; b) building climate-adaptive livelihoods and sustainable value chains for at-risk communities; c) improving policy and governance structures at both national and state levels to better incorporate ecosystem-based adaptation into coastal planning.

Climate Impact

By restoring natural ecosystems, the project helps shield coastal populations from climate-driven threats like storm surges and flooding. It also aligns with India’s broader national commitments to climate action, including its National Action Plan on Climate Change and its Nationally Determined Contributions under the Paris Agreement.

C. RESULTS AND IMPACTS

C.1. Overall Summary of the Project Progress

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

During the reporting period, the ECRICC project continued to make steady progress toward achieving its intended outcomes across all three Outputs: (i) ecosystem-based adaptation through coastal ecosystem restoration, (ii) promotion of climate-resilient livelihoods, and (iii) strengthened institutional and community capacities for climate-resilient coastal management. Project interventions have contributed to enhanced resilience of vulnerable coastal ecosystems and improved livelihood opportunities and climate preparedness of coastal communities, with women accounting for more than 60%, a substantial proportion of direct beneficiaries. The project is currently in its seventh year of implementation and under a 24-month extension period. In view of progress achieved to date with only 30% of financial delivery- and implementation challenges previously reported, an additional 18-month extension has been requested to enable completion of both originally approved activities and activities proposed under the Restructuring Proposal which has been formally submitted to the GCF Secretariat for consideration and approval in January 2025. For 2022 and 2023, gender-disaggregated data could not be reported; only the cumulative count of direct beneficiaries was captured. From 2024 onwards, data collection and reporting have been streamlined, ensuring the availability of gender-disaggregated data. The total cumulative number of direct beneficiaries stands at 393,225. Of these, gender-disaggregated data accounts for 295,241 — comprising 131,036 reported in 2024 and 164,205 reported in 2025. The remaining 97,984 represents beneficiaries from 2022–2023, recorded as a cumulative aggregate only.

Output 1: Enhanced resilience of coastal and marine ecosystems and their services

During the reporting period National Center for Sustainable Coastal Management undertook a Socio-Economic Assessment using 2011 census data, with a Pulicat Lake pilot pending approval. Restoration guidelines are regularly updated, with seagrass, saltmarsh, and coral protocols due in 2026. A Decision Support System for integrated coastal management is also targeted for 2026. Across three states, 1,566.81 ha of mangroves and 792 ha of watersheds have been restored. Preparatory work for the restoration work on 200 ha of saltmarsh, 50 ha of seagrass, and 7.5 ha of coral reefs has been initiated across the three states and implementation work will initiate in the next reporting cycle. Over 26,000 beneficiaries participated, with women comprising 38%, supported by community-based organizations strengthening local governance and ecological sustainability.

Activity 1.1: Conducting vulnerability assessment of the coast to inform planning of ecosystem and community-based adaptation interventions

NCSCM prepared a physical and ecological Coastal Vulnerability Index using the InVEST model and field datasets. The Socio-Economic Vulnerability Assessment, delayed due to Census postponement, was initiated in 2025 using 2011 census data, with a Pulicat Lake pilot awaiting Project Board approval. Mangrove and Watershed restoration follows regularly updated government-approved guidelines (e.g PCCF Guidelines on Mangroves was revised this year), while Seagrass, Saltmarsh, and Coral protocols are due in 2026. A Decision Support System supporting Target Landscape Integrated Management Plans and gender-sensitive planning is also targeted for finalization in 2026 which is depended on the VA data for its development and testing

Activity 1.2: Community-based conservation and restoration of coastal ecosystems for increasing ecosystem resilience

Restoration across three states covered 1,566.81 ha of mangroves (AP 1118 ha, Maharashtra 198.81 ha and Odisha 250 ha), 792 ha of watersheds, with maintenance spanning 2,284 ha of Mangroves and 810 ha of watershed. Odisha initiated 50 ha of seagrass restoration and 200 ha of saltmarsh, and Maharashtra sanctioned 7.5 ha of coral artificial reefs. Over 26,000 beneficiaries engaged in restoration activities, with women comprising 38% of mangrove beneficiaries. Community-based organizations and co-management frameworks strengthened local governance, ensuring ecological sustainability. A key achievement this year was the strong participation of women from the community in who constitute 38% of the total beneficiaries (21,267) under output-1

Output 2: Climate-adaptive livelihoods for enhanced resilience of vulnerable coastal communities

The project has continued promoting adoption and scaling-up of climate-resilient livelihood options. In the reporting year, a total of 164,205 beneficiaries were reached under Output 2 (2.1 and 2.2), of which 105,282 were women, representing 64% of the total. This number, reflects the project's focus on gender-inclusive and transformative interventions. Through diverse climate-resilient livelihood approaches including sustainable agriculture, aquaculture, and alternative income-generating activities, communities are strengthening adaptive capacity and enhancing resilience against climate impacts. This is addressing the adaptation core indicator A1.0 where vulnerable communities are benefitting from adoption of diversified livelihood activities and indicator A7.0 strengthening adaptive capacity through climate adaptive livelihoods and value chains. These interventions not only improve livelihoods but also foster empowerment, equitable participation, and long-term sustainability for vulnerable coastal populations.

Activity 2.1 Building climate resilient livelihoods and enterprises through value chains and strengthened access to markets In the reporting year, 120,230 individuals (44,790 males; 75,440 females) benefited from climate-resilient livelihood activities, including System of Rice Intensification (78,085), fish value addition (32,640), crab fattening (2,480), ornamental fisheries (2,625), oyster (1935) and mussel farming (1290), seaweed cultivation (1,175). Women constitute 63% of beneficiaries. Targeted training and capacity-building enhanced skills and women's participation accounting for 63% of beneficiaries strengthening community resilience, adaptive capacity, and sustainable livelihoods in fisheries and agricultural sectors.

Activity 2.2: Improving capacities of local communities for community-based adaptation and climate-adaptive livelihoods Across three states, training and capacity-building in agriculture and fisheries covering System for Rice Intensification, crab farming, ornamental fisheries, seaweeds, mussels, oysters, and fish value addition benefited 43,975 individuals (14,133 male; 29,842 female) from Self Help Groups (SHGs), Community-Based Organisations (CBOs), Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), and local communities. Odisha recorded the highest outreach (33,548), followed by Maharashtra (8,630) and Andhra Pradesh (1,797). Women constituted 68% of total trainees, reflecting the programme's strong gender-inclusive approach.

Output 3: Strengthened governance and institutional framework for climate-resilient management of coastal areas

The project is strengthening governance for climate-resilient coastal management through the National Coastal Mission and National Adaptation Plan alignment, embedding climate risk screening into district planning and ecosystem-based adaptation into coastal zone management plans. In regions like the Bhitarkanika landscape, community-led initiatives enhance local stewardship, ensuring that restoration efforts are sustained and aligned with the needs of the people living closest to the land. The National Project Steering Committee met in July 2025, reinforcing multi-level coordination, evidence-based decision-making, and inclusive stakeholder engagement across coastal areas. Furthermore, the project is actively promoting community-led initiatives, such as beach cleaning drives and participatory restoration activities, to enhance local stewardship of coastal ecosystems.

Functionality of the National Coastal Mission. The National Coastal Mission, extended in May 2025 with a Rs. 767 Cr outlay (2025–2031), supports mangrove and coral conservation, marine research, sustainable beach development, and capacity-building, implemented through State and UT administrations with funds released based on Ministry-reviewed proposals.

Activity 3.1: Network of institutions for enhanced climate resilience and planning and governance in all coastal states. 8th National Project Steering Committee meeting and a national orientation workshop in Odisha guided strategic implementation of the project. 978 activities, events of District and landscape Level Coordination Committees, Mangrove and Eco-development Committees, reaching 44,282 beneficiaries (male 17,532; female 26,750). All DLCCs in AP are fully operational and guiding the project progress. The Pan-Indian Coastal Resilience Network strengthened knowledge sharing, multi-stakeholder dialogue, and evidence-based policy. Strategic partnerships with Indian Institute of Technology (Bhubaneswar, Mumbai), Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute, and National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management further bolster coordinated coastal resilience action nationwide.

Activity 3.2: Integrating ecosystem-centric approaches to climate change adaptation into public and private sector policies, plans and budgets, and scaling up finance for EbA

Under the National Coastal Mission, mangrove and coral conservation across 17 and 2 sites respectively, the Mangrove Zonation Atlas, and a National Coastal and Marine Spatial Plan framework were prepared. NAP consultations and climate finance workshops sensitized stakeholders to ecosystem-centric planning, with ECRICC project inputs incorporated into the NAP currently under submission. These efforts strengthened institutional capacities, mainstreamed climate adaptation into decision-making, and advanced sustainable financing and ecosystem-based approaches to address coastal climate vulnerabilities.

Activity 3.3: Knowledge management for coastal resilience The project participated in national events including the Swachh Sagar, Surakshit Sagar beach cleaning campaign across 75 beaches, alongside capacity-building activities celebrating Earth Day, World Wetland Day, World Ocean Day, and other events engaging communities, women, and youth in conservation and climate resilience. Across three states, 978 programs reached 44,282 beneficiaries (17,532 male; 26,750 female) Odisha recorded the highest outreach (33,548), followed by Andhra Pradesh (8,676) and Maharashtra (2,058), with with strong female participation at 60% of total beneficiaries under this output.

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 (tCO₂eq) 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 (tCO₂eq) as a result of GCF support.

Unit						Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent
Baseline	Target			Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value <i>(automatically calculated)</i>
	Mid-term	Final target	Lifetime			
0	28,751	122,766	3,682,980	40,257	19,341	59,598

(PMF) M1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂eq) 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 (tCO₂eq) 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
Forestry and land use	0	28,751	122,766	3,682,980	40,257	19,341		59,598

(PMF) M1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂eq) 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 (tCO₂eq), 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
India	0	28,751	122,766	3,682,980	40,257	19,341	59,598

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by result area.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Result Areas (Adaptation)	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Livelihoods of people and communities	0	500,000	1,744,970	229,020	164,205	393,225

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by Gender.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Male	0	250,000	872,485	114,510	58,923	173,433
Female	0	250,000	872,485	114,510	105,282	219,792

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by Country.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
India	0	500,000	1,744,970	229,020	164,205	393,225

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of indirect beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by result area.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Result Areas (Adaptation)	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Ecosystem and ecosystem services	0	3,000,000	10,000,000	1,145,100	821,025	1,966,125

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of indirect beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by Gender.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Male	0	1,500,000	5,000,000	572,550	294,615	867,165
Female	0	1,500,000	5,000,000	572,550	526,410	1,098,960

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of indirect beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by Country.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
India	0	3,000,000	10,000,000	1,145,100	821,025	1,966,125

Livelihoods of people and communities

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) A1.2 Number of males and females benefiting from the adoption of diversified, climate resilient livelihood options (including fisheries, agriculture, tourism, etc.) (IRMF) Supplementary 2.1 Beneficiaries (female/male) adopting improved and/or new climate-resilient livelihood options						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) adopting diversified or strengthened climate-resilient livelihood strategies (including agriculture, fisheries, natural resource-based, and informal livelihoods), disaggregated by gender.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Male	0	200,000	697,988	51,628	58,923	110,551
Female	0	300,000	1,046,982	58,972	105,282	164,254

(PMF) A1.2 Number of males and females benefiting from the adoption of diversified, climate resilient livelihood options (including fisheries, agriculture, tourism, etc.) (IRMF) Supplementary 2.1 Beneficiaries (female/male) adopting improved and/or new climate-resilient livelihood options						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) adopting diversified or strengthened climate-resilient livelihood strategies (including agriculture, fisheries, natural resource-based, and informal livelihoods), disaggregated by country.						
Unit						Enter unit
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
India	0	500,000	1,744,970	127,402	164,205	291,607

Ecosystems and ecosystem services

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) A4.1 Coverage/scale of ecosystems protected and strengthened in response to climate variability and change					
Provide the total hectares of natural ecosystems protected, restored, conserved, or managed to reduce climate risks to ecosystem services and dependent people and communities.					
Unit					Hectares
Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
	Mid-term	Final target			
0	3,500	14,945	4,910	2,359	7,269

(PMF) A4.1 Coverage/scale of ecosystems protected and strengthened in response to climate variability and change					
Provide the total hectares of natural ecosystems protected, restored, conserved, or managed to reduce climate risks to ecosystem services and dependent people and communities, disaggregated by country.					

Unit						Hectares
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
India	0	3,500	14,945	4,910	2,359	7,269

(PMF) A4.1 Coverage/scale of ecosystems protected and strengthened in response to climate variability and change

Provide the total hectares of natural ecosystems protected, restored, conserved, or managed to reduce climate risks to ecosystem services and dependent people and communities, disaggregated by ecosystem type.

Unit						Hectares
Disaggregation by: Ecosystem types	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Coastal or marine	0	3,500	14,945	4,910	2,359	7,269

Project Specific Indicators							
Indicator	Unit	Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
			Mid-term	Final target			
1.1 Numbers of hectares of coastal ecosystems – disaggregated by type – that are successfully restored to reduce the impact of climate-induced disasters and other climate change impacts	Hectares	0	4,345	14,945	4,910	2,359	7,269
2.1 Number of males and females engaging in diversified, climate resilient adaptive practices and alternative income generating activities	No. of Persons	0	100,000	348,994	25,480	32,841	58,321
2.2 % increase in income at the household level, linked to implementation of diversified climate adaptive practices	Percentage	0	25	50	0	0	0
3.1 Functionality of the National Coastal Mission	Index/Score/Level	1	2	3	1	3	4
3.2 Functionality of the Pan-Indian Coastal Resilience Network	Index/Score/Level	1	2	3	1	2	3
3.3 Degree of integration/ of climate change including EbA in 13 coastal states' Coastal Zone Management Plans	Plans	0	5	13	0	0	0
A5.2 Number and level of effective coordination mechanisms	No. of Coordination Mechanisms	1	2	3	2	3	5

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
1.1 Conducting vulnerability assessment of the coast to inform planning of ecosystem and community-based adaptation interventions – in 13 coastal states	65	701,818.78	2,209,190	31
1.2 Conservation and restoration of coastal ecosystem for increasing ecosystem resilience – in 3 target states	48	3,803,911.26	23,376,593	16
2.1 Building climate resilient livelihoods and enterprises through value chains and strengthened access to markets – in 24 target landscapes	26	1,116,516.65	3,585,403	31
2.2: Improving capacities of local communities for community-based adaptation and climate-adaptive livelihoods – in 24 target landscapes 0 0	60	707,074.37	9,195,345	7
3.1: Network of institutions for enhanced climate resilience and planning and governance in all coastal states	65	736,594.81	2,487,950	29
3.2: Integrating ecosystem-centric approaches to climate change adaptation into public and private sector policies, plans and budgets, and scaling up finance for EbA- in 13 coastal states	40	0	0	0
3.3: Knowledge management for coastal resilience	50	170,575.58	496,830	34

C.2.1. Subprojects

Where applicable, include information on sub-projects. For projects and programmes approved until B.31, the logical framework should focus on the mitigation and adaptation Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMF). For projects and programmes approved from B.32 onwards, the logical framework should reflect the Integrated Results Management Framework (IRMF).

Title	Currency	GCF Funds	Co-Financing	Country	GHG Emissions Reduced	Direct Beneficiaries	Indirect Beneficiaries
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

C.3. Compliance with FAA covenants	Yes ☒ No ☐
N/A	
C.4. Funded Activity Implementation Arrangements in the Following Year	Yes ☐ No ☒
The following changes have been included in the submitted Restructure Proposal: 1. Shifted existing positions to a new budget code: the National Project Management Unit (NPMU), which was initially under UNDP's contract modality, will now be under the Ministry's contract modality. Positions of National Project Coordinator, NRM specialist, Ecological and CCA Specialist, Knowledge management Specialist, Field Associates, Admin officer and finance officer were shifted to budget code "Contractual Services-Implementing Partners. 2. New position of Social and Environment Safeguards specialist added under Contractual Services-Implementing Partners	

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	1. Extreme and erratic weather events		
Risk Origin	External Factors		
Risk Area	Natural hazard		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	The Project intervention areas operate within coastal zones and are inherently exposed to a range of natural hazards including storm surges, flooding, sea-level rise, coastal erosion, saltwater intrusion, and intensifying tropical cyclones. These hazards pose significant threats to project outputs such as infrastructure, livelihoods and ecosystem-based interventions potentially reversing development goals.		
Consequences	Cyclones, storm surges, and increasingly erratic rainfall patterns pose a significant risk to coastal restoration activities and agriculture-based interventions, including the System of Rice Intensification (SRI), Crab Farming, Mussel and Oyster Farming. Extreme weather events can damage field and protective structures, wash away seedlings, reduce crop yields, and undermine ecosystem establishment, thereby affecting overall project performance. These impacts also influence farmers' confidence and willingness to adopt, sustain climate-resilient practices and increase their vulnerability if the project interventions didn't adequately consider the impacts of Climate Change, Natural Disasters and extreme weather events.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Under the project's risk management framework, restoration interventions are guided by site-specific implementation protocols developed during implementation. These protocols integrate local environmental conditions, including the frequency, severity, and type of climate-induced hazards, to ensure selection of the lowest-risk restoration options. Site identification, initiated during project design, is being refined based on updated assessments of exposure and sensitivity to climate-induced hazards (Activity 1.1). Identified risks are addressed through tailored, site-specific mitigation measures		

	incorporated into implementation planning. The protocols are periodically reviewed and updated to enable adaptive management and ensure continued effectiveness of risk mitigation measures.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Comments	The risk relates to potential failure or underperformance of restoration interventions due to exposure to climate-induced hazards, including cyclones, storm surges, coastal flooding, erosion, and extreme rainfall events. Given the project's focus on vulnerable coastal ecosystems, such hazards present a material implementation risk that could affect survival rates, infrastructure integrity, and long-term sustainability of restoration outcomes. The risk assessment is based on site-level analysis of hazard frequency, severity, and exposure, combined with sensitivity assessments of ecological and physical conditions (Activity 1.1). The likelihood is considered moderate in high-exposure zones, with potentially significant impact if mitigation measures are not integrated. Therefore, site-specific protocols and adaptive management measures have been incorporated to reduce residual risk to an acceptable level.		
Risk 2	2. Delays/disruptions in project planning and implementation as a result of periodic changes in designated government counterparts at national and sub-national levels.		
Risk Origin	Partner Related		
Risk Area	Partner capacity and suitability		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Periodic changes in designated Government counterparts at both National and Sub-National levels represent a significant institutional risk that can disrupt project planning and implementation. Staff turnovers, re-assignments, and bureaucratic reorganizations often result in new officials who may lack familiarity with project objectives, procedures and commitments previously established with predecessors. This discontinuity can cause delays in decision-making, approval processes, budget releases, and coordination mechanisms. At the sub-national level, where implementation is closest to communities such disruption can stall field activities, weaken local ownership and erode trust among beneficiaries		
Consequences	This discontinuity can cause delays in decision-making, approval processes, budget releases, loss of institutional memory, and coordination mechanisms. At the sub-national level, where implementation is closest to communities, such disruptions can stall field activities, weaken local ownership, and erode trust among beneficiaries.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	To mitigate the above risks, the project has established clear institutional arrangements with defined roles and responsibilities. Regular coordination meetings, joint planning workshops, and structured communication channels are used to align timelines and technical inputs. Standard operating procedures and agreed implementation protocols guide decision-making and reduce ambiguity. Designated nodal officers at national and state levels facilitate timely follow-up and issue resolution. These measures strengthen inter-agency coordination, improve information flow, and minimize delays, thereby ensuring smooth implementation and adherence to project schedules.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Comments	This is a recognized and recurring risk in Government-Partnered development projects. Frequent changes in designated counterparts can undermine institutional memory, slow decision making and weaken accountability structures. However, this risk is managed through proactive mitigation measures such as maintaining comprehensive documentation, formalizing agreements at the institutional level, conducting transition briefings and diversifying engagement across multiple government focal points.		
Risk 3	3. Limited involvement and participation of women and other marginalized groups in project implementation		

Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	Gender & SEAH		
Description	Women, as a marginalized and vulnerable group in many project areas, face a risk of exclusion from project activities due to prevailing social norms, gender roles, and decision-making structures within communities. These societal barriers can limit women's participation in consultations, training, and livelihood interventions, thereby reducing equitable access to project benefits. The risk assessment is informed by baseline gender analyses and field-level observations indicating differential access to resources and opportunities. The likelihood of exclusion is assessed as moderate, with a potentially significant impact on inclusiveness, effectiveness, and sustainability of project outcomes if not proactively addressed through targeted gender-responsive measures.		
Consequences	Lack of representation and voice of women and girls can reinforce existing gender disparities, limiting their access to project benefits, decision-making processes, and livelihood opportunities. This may result in interventions that do not adequately address women's needs, priorities, or constraints, reducing effectiveness and inclusiveness. Exclusion can weaken women's skills development, leadership potential, and economic empowerment, while perpetuating unequal power dynamics at the household and community levels. Over time, this can undermine social cohesion, reduce community ownership of project outcomes, and compromise the sustainability and long-term impact of climate resilience interventions.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 4 - High	Severity 12 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	To mitigate risks of gender exclusion and disparities, a detailed gender assessment was undertaken during project design to identify context-specific barriers, roles, and opportunities for women and vulnerable groups. Based on its findings, a comprehensive Gender Action Plan (GAP) has been developed and is being implemented throughout the project duration. The GAP outlines targeted measures, including gender-responsive outreach, capacity-building, leadership promotion, and monitoring of sex-disaggregated indicators to ensure equitable participation and benefit-sharing. Regular tracking, reporting, and adaptive management mechanisms are in place to address emerging gaps and strengthen women's meaningful engagement in project activities and decision-making processes.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Comments	The risk relates to potential exclusion of women and girls from project activities due to prevailing social norms, unequal power relations, and limited decision-making space within target communities. Such exclusion may result in unequal access to project benefits, reduced participation in capacity-building and livelihood interventions, and limited influence over project planning and implementation. The risk assessment draws on findings from the gender assessment conducted during project design, which identified structural and cultural barriers to women's participation. The likelihood of this risk is assessed as moderate, with a potentially significant impact on equity, inclusiveness, and sustainability of project outcomes if not adequately addressed through gender-responsive measures.		
Risk 4	4. Absence of a Formalized and structured project level Grievance Redressal Mechanism		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Design and Implementation		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Risk of unaddressed grievances stems from the absence of a formalized, standardized grievance redress mechanism across project levels. Reliance on informal channels, such as verbal reporting or ad-hoc communication with project staff, can result in inconsistent documentation, unclear accountability, and delays in response. Limited awareness among stakeholders about grievance procedures, coupled with uneven capacity at local levels to record and track complaints, further contributes to this risk. Inadequate integration of grievance into project management systems may lead to		

	grievance being overlooked or inadequately resolved, reducing transparency, trust, and effective stakeholder engagement.		
Consequences	Failure to formally register and address grievances may result in concerns of marginalized and vulnerable groups remaining unheard, thereby exacerbating existing inequalities. Unresolved complaints can lead to dissatisfaction, reduced participation, and withdrawal from project activities. Over time, this may erode trust between communities and implementing agencies, weaken stakeholder ownership, and increase the risk of conflict or reputational damage. Lack of transparent grievance resolution can also undermine accountability and compromise compliance with environmental and social safeguards. Collectively, these consequences may affect the effectiveness, inclusiveness, and long-term sustainability of project interventions and outcomes.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	To mitigate this risk, a project-specific Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) was established during the design phase, providing a structured and transparent framework for receiving, recording, and resolving complaints. The GRM ensures inclusive access for all stakeholders, particularly women and vulnerable groups, through clearly defined procedures and multiple reporting channels. Dedicated platforms at the Government level enable stakeholders to raise concerns freely and access rights-compatible redress processes. Project staff conduct regular sensitization and awareness sessions prior to on-ground interventions to inform communities about their rights and available grievance procedures. This approach strengthens accountability, transparency, and trust while promoting equitable stakeholder engagement.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 6 - Medium
Comments	The risk relates to the potential for grievances to remain unregistered or inadequately addressed in the absence of a formalized and accessible grievance redress mechanism. Without standardized procedures, complaints may be handled inconsistently, leading to gaps in documentation, accountability, and timely resolution. The assessment is informed by the reliance on informal channels at community level, which may not ensure equitable access, particularly for women and vulnerable groups. The likelihood is assessed as moderate in contexts with limited awareness and institutional capacity, with potentially significant impact on stakeholder trust, social inclusion, and compliance with environmental and social safeguard requirements.		
Risk 5	5. Lack of demarcation of project area and project area of influence in the intervention area		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	This risk is related to inadequate awareness of project scope and activities that may lead stakeholders to incorrectly attribute unrelated activities or impacts within the broader landscape to the project implementers. Such misperceptions often arise when the project's geographic boundaries and area of influence are not clearly defined or communicated. Lack of clear demarcation can create confusion regarding roles, responsibilities, and accountability, particularly in areas with multiple ongoing development initiatives. This risk assessment highlights the need for explicit identification and communication of the project's direct and indirect areas of influence to manage expectations, reduce misinformation, and prevent reputational and stakeholder engagement challenges.		
Consequences	Lack of clarity regarding the project's area of influence and scope of activities can result in misunderstandings among stakeholders, leading to misplaced expectations and incorrect attribution of impacts. Such confusion may generate dissatisfaction, grievances, and mistrust toward project implementers, even for activities beyond the project's mandate. Over time, this can weaken community engagement, reduce cooperation, and undermine stakeholder support for planned interventions. Mistrust may also affect participation in consultations and uptake of project activities, thereby diminishing effectiveness, social acceptance, and the overall achievement of project objectives within the intended project area.		

Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The identified environmental and social risks will be mitigated through a strengthened and clearly operationalized Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF). By demarcating the project's direct and indirect areas of influence, potential impacts will be systematically identified and mitigated. The physical and ecological vulnerability assessment has helped in demarcating the project landscapes and has brought deeper clarity among the project stakeholders in defining the scope of the project activities and its beneficiaries. The screening procedure embedded in the updated ESMF will assess site-specific environmental and social risks prior to activity implementation, enabling the design of targeted mitigation measures such as activity redesign, avoidance of sensitive habitats, livelihood safeguards, and culturally appropriate engagement strategies. The updated Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP), project-level Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), and Standard Operating Procedure for Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) will ensure meaningful participation of local communities, particularly women and Indigenous Peoples. xx		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Comments	The risk relates to potential misunderstanding and mistrust among stakeholders arising from limited awareness of the project's scope, roles, and defined area of influence. In contexts where multiple development initiatives operate simultaneously, stakeholders may incorrectly associate unrelated activities or impacts with the project. The assessment is informed by observed information gaps and the absence of clearly communicated geographic and operational boundaries at the community level. The likelihood of this risk is assessed as moderate, with a moderate impact on stakeholder trust, participation, and acceptance of project interventions, potentially undermining effective implementation if not addressed through proactive communication and outreach.		
Risk 6	6. Introduction of unsuitable livelihood options		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Design and Implementation		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	This is a new risk associated with new livelihood diversification interventions including Systematic Millet Intensification and climate-resilient agriculture, dwarf areca-nut and coconut cultivation, marine fish cage culture, marine finfish rearing units, and freshwater pisciculture carry implementation risks if monitoring systems and safeguard considerations are not adequately integrated into design and execution. Insufficient technical oversight or context-specific assessment may result in interventions that do not fully address environmental and social safeguard requirements. This could affect sustainability, productivity, and community acceptance. The risk assessment highlights the need for strengthened technical review, continuous monitoring, and integration of safeguard measures to ensure responsible and climate-resilient on-ground implementation.		
Consequences	Inadequate consideration of local ecological, social, and economic contexts in designing interventions may result in activities that are misaligned with community needs, environmental conditions, and market realities. If project designers lack sufficient experience or technical expertise, interventions may be poorly adapted, technically unsuitable, or unsustainable over time. This can lead to low adoption rates, reduced productivity, safeguard non-compliance, and inefficient use of resources. Ultimately, such gaps may undermine intended climate resilience outcomes, weaken stakeholder confidence, and compromise the long-term sustainability and scalability of project-supported livelihood and ecosystem restoration initiatives.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	The selection and design of new livelihood activities under the GCF Coastal Project involved a participatory approach combining community consultations ensuring that local knowledge, needs and preferences of coastal communities were central to decision-making with technical expertise from specialists in ecosystem restoration,		

	experts from the fishery, agriculture sectors and climate adaptation, thereby ensuring that proposed livelihoods were both contextually appropriate and scientifically sound. This dual approach of bottom-up community engagement and top-down technical validation significantly mitigated the risk of introducing unsuitable livelihood options by ensuring that selected activities were ecologically viable, culturally acceptable, economically feasible and resilient to projected xx		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Comments	The risk relates to potential non-compliance with recommended technical measures and good practices during implementation, which may arise if monitoring and oversight mechanisms are weak or inconsistently applied. Without systematic supervision, design gaps, safeguard issues, or deviations from approved protocols may go undetected, affecting quality and sustainability of interventions. The assessment is informed by the scale and geographic spread of activities, which increases the complexity of field-level supervision. The likelihood is assessed as moderate in decentralized implementation contexts, with a moderate to significant impact on effectiveness, safeguard compliance, and long-term resilience outcomes if not adequately monitored.		
Risk 7	7. Changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods leading to wild animal encroaching on human settlement, thus, leading to human animal conflict		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	In the Bhitarkanika landscape of Odisha, communities have raised concerns regarding increased risks of human–wildlife conflict, particularly due to the presence of crocodiles and wild boars near selected restoration sites. The risk arises as ecosystem restoration activities improve habitat conditions and water availability, which may attract wildlife closer to human settlements and areas of regular community use. Limited physical barriers, shared access points to creeks and wetlands, and dependence of local communities on natural resources for livelihoods further contribute to this risk. Without adequate planning, awareness, and site-specific mitigation measures, safety concerns for local communities may increase.		
Consequences	Especially post-cyclone habitat disturbances may displace wildlife, including crocodiles and wild boars, into rivers and creeks frequently used by local communities for fishing, bathing, and transport. This increases the likelihood of human–wildlife encounters, potentially resulting in injuries, fatalities, or damage to property and fishing equipment. Heightened safety concerns may restrict community access to natural resources, disrupt livelihoods, and reduce participation in restoration activities. Fear and uncertainty can also generate resistance to conservation interventions and weaken community support for ecosystem restoration efforts. Over time, unresolved conflicts may undermine project objectives related to resilience, co-management, and sustainable resource use.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	Continuous monitoring by the PMU, SPMU, and DPMU throughout the project cycle strengthens compliance with recommended measures and good practices, thereby reducing both the likelihood and impact of human–wildlife conflict risks. Regular field monitoring enables early detection of wildlife movement near restoration sites, timely implementation of preventive measures, and prompt community advisories. These actions significantly lower the probability of unsafe human–animal interactions. While residual risk remains due to natural habitat dynamics and post-cyclone disturbances, it is assessed as low to moderate. Ongoing surveillance, adaptive site management, and community engagement ensure that residual risks are managed within acceptable limits.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Comments	The risk relates to potential human–wildlife conflict arising from habitat changes at restoration sites, particularly in the Bhitarkanika landscape, where post-cyclone		

	disturbances may alter animal movement patterns. Such changes can increase the presence of crocodiles and wild boars in rivers and creeks commonly used by local communities, posing safety risks. The assessment is informed by community consultations and field observations indicating shared use of natural waterways and limited physical separation between habitats and human activity areas. The likelihood of occurrence is assessed as moderate, with potentially significant impacts on community safety, livelihoods, and acceptance of restoration interventions if not effectively managed.		
Risk 8	8. Occupational health and safety risks due to physical and biological hazards		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	The risk to worker health and safety arises primarily from inadequate planning and enforcement of occupational health and safety measures during project implementation. Root causes include limited availability or inconsistent use of personal protective equipment, insufficient safety training, and lack of clear site-specific safety protocols. Remote and environmentally challenging work conditions—such as coastal wetlands, waterlogged areas, and exposure to wildlife or extreme weather—further elevate risks. Inadequate supervision, limited emergency response arrangements, and weak contractor compliance with safety standards can compound these issues, increasing the likelihood of accidents, injuries, or health-related incidents during on-ground project activities.		
Consequences	Exposure of local community members to unsafe working conditions during activities such as mangrove restoration may result in occupational injuries, health complications, or fatalities. Risks including jellyfish stings, poisonous snake bites, cuts, infections, or heat stress can directly affect worker well-being and productivity. Such incidents may lead to work stoppages, increased medical costs, and loss of income for affected households. Repeated safety incidents can reduce community willingness to participate in project activities, generate grievances, and damage trust in project implementers. Over time, inadequate worker safety can undermine project timelines, effectiveness, and compliance with labor and social safeguard standards.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The project's ESMF includes an Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) Plan to guide mitigation of workplace risks. Preventive measures include the provision and mandator xx		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Comments	The risk relates to potential occupational health and safety hazards faced by community members and workers engaged in project interventions, particularly in environmentally sensitive areas such as mangrove restoration sites. Field conditions including waterlogged terrain, exposure to marine organisms, poisonous snakes, extreme weather, and difficult access create inherent safety risks. The assessment is informed by the nature of on-ground activities and local ecological conditions. The likelihood of minor to moderate incidents is assessed as moderate, with potentially significant impact on worker well-being and project continuity if adequate safety measures are not systematically implemented and monitored.		
Risk 9	9. Duty-bearers (e.g. government agencies) do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the project.		
Risk Origin	Partner Related		
Risk Area	Partner capacity and suitability		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	The risk relates to potential underperformance or suboptimal implementation of project activities if responsible agencies lack the requisite technical skills, sectoral expertise, or operational experience to deliver specialized interventions. This may affect quality of outputs, adherence to safeguards, and achievement of intended outcomes. Root causes may include limited prior experience in climate-resilient or ecosystem-based		

	interventions, inadequate technical staffing, high staff turnover, insufficient training, and weak institutional capacity at decentralized levels. Gaps in coordination, limited exposure to adaptive management approaches, and constrained access to expert guidance can further exacerbate implementation challenges and reduce effectiveness.		
Consequences	If duty bearers lack the requisite technical skills and operational capacity to implement recommended initiatives, project activities may be executed with delays, inconsistencies, or reduced quality. This can lead to suboptimal outcomes, lower productivity, and failure to meet intended climate resilience and livelihood targets. Inadequate implementation may also result in non-compliance with safeguard requirements and inefficient use of financial resources. Over time, delays and performance gaps can affect stakeholder confidence, reduce community participation, and compromise the sustainability and scalability of interventions. Collectively, these impacts may hinder timely achievement of project-specific outputs and intended long-term development impacts.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	With continuous PMU-led monitoring and regular capacity-building of SPMU and DPMU through trainings and workshops, the likelihood of skill gaps affecting implementation is significantly reduced. Ongoing review of onsite compliance enables early identification of capacity constraints and timely corrective actions. While some residual risk remains due to staff turnover and the complexity of interventions, it is assessed as low and manageable. Overall, strengthened institutional capacity and systematic oversight ensure that residual risks do not materially affect project timelines, quality, or achievement of intended outcomes. In addition, the NPSC and SPSC meetings provide a regular forum for assessing and addressing capacity gaps among duty-bearers such as government agencies, by facilitating targeted trainings, technical assistance and institutional support to ensure they can fulfil their obligations under the project.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Comments	The risk relates to potential delays or quality gaps in implementation if duty bearers at state and district levels lack adequate technical skills or experience to carry out specialized project activities. This assessment is informed by the complexity and diversity of interventions, as well as varying institutional capacities across locations. Without sufficient capacity, there is a possibility of inconsistent application of technical guidelines and safeguards. The likelihood of this risk is assessed as moderate, with a moderate impact on timelines and outcome quality. Continuous monitoring and capacity strengthening measures are therefore essential to manage and reduce this risk.		
Risk 10	10. Economic displacement of local communities due to access to resources being restricted by non-project activities in area of project interventions		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	The risk relates to potential livelihood disruptions arising from conservation measures introduced under the project, which may restrict community access to natural resources such as fisheries, forest produce, or grazing areas. If not carefully designed and communicated, such restrictions could limit income-generating activities of resource-dependent households. Root causes include changes in access regulations, zoning of restoration areas, enforcement of protection measures, and inadequate consultation during planning stages. Limited awareness of alternative livelihood options and insufficient integration of community needs into conservation planning may further exacerbate tensions, leading to resistance, reduced cooperation, and potential conflict with project objectives.		
Consequences	Restrictions on access to natural resources may adversely affect the livelihoods of local communities, particularly those directly dependent on land, water, or common property resources for income and subsistence. Reduced access can lead to loss of earnings, increased input costs, and diminished livelihood security, potentially resulting in economic displacement of affected households. Vulnerable groups, including marginal farmers and landless families, may be disproportionately impacted. Such economic		

	stress can trigger dissatisfaction, reduced cooperation, and resistance to project activities. Over time, livelihood disruption may undermine social stability, weaken community ownership, and affect the sustainability and acceptance of project interventions.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 4 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	Continuous monitoring by the PMU, SPMU, and DPMU throughout the project cycle lowers both the likelihood and potential impact of livelihood-related risks arising from access restrictions. Regular field monitoring and community feedback help identify emerging livelihood impacts early and enable timely corrective actions, such as adjusting restoration boundaries, phasing activities, or introducing alternative livelihood support and linking the communities with existing livelihood schemes and programmes of the Government. These measures reduce the probability of severe economic displacement and limit adverse effects on affected households. While some residual risk remains due to unavoidable conservation requirements, it is assessed as low risk and manageable through adaptive management, stakeholder engagement, and ongoing oversight.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 4 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 4 - Medium
Comments	The risk relates to potential livelihood impacts and economic displacement of local communities arising from access restrictions introduced through conservation and restoration interventions. Communities in project areas often depend on common natural resources for grazing, fishing, or collection of biomass, however the project design has been informed by		
Risk 11	11. Exclusion of Rights and interests of Marginalized groups		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Without a targeted approach to reach and engage project affected populations, particularly marginalized groups such as women, elderly persons with disabilities, indigenous communities and other vulnerable segments there is a significant risk that the rights and interests of these groups will be overlooked or inadequately addressed throughout the project cycle		
Consequences	Failure to meaningfully include marginalized groups in decision-making processes may result in project outcomes that do not reflect their specific needs and priorities, ultimately undermining the project's overall effectiveness and sustainability. Such exclusion can expose these groups to heightened risks, including loss of access to critical resources, increased economic hardships, and violation of their fundamental rights		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	To mitigate exclusion risks, the project adopts a targeted inclusion approach ensuring that women, elderly persons, persons with disabilities, Indigenous Peoples, and other vulnerable communities are meaningfully engaged across the project cycle. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) and Gender Action Plan (GAP) mandate disaggregated stakeholder mapping, targeted outreach, and inclusive consultations to reflect the needs of marginalized groups in project design and implementation. A Social Inclusion Plan (SIP) will be developed post-restructuring to further strengthen strategies for tribal and vulnerable groups. FPIC processes are applied in tribal areas, ensuring culturally appropriate consultations and documented consent prior to implementation. The project-level GRM provides accessible, rights-compatible channels for raising concerns. Site-level monitoring will track disaggregated participation, integration of stakeholder inputs, and emerging exclusion risks. Grievances will be systematically monitored with corrective actions where gaps arise. Project staff are sensitized to proactively identify and address barriers, ensuring interventions do not reinforce existing inequalities.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity

	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Comments	The exclusion of marginalized groups from project processes is not merely an oversight, it is a systemic risk that can undermine both the integrity and long-term impact of any intervention. Projects that fail to adopt inclusive, targeted approaches miss the opportunity to address the root causes of inequality and inadvertently perpetuate the very vulnerabilities they aim to reduce. Ensuring that the rights and interests of women, the elderly, persons with disabilities and other marginalized populations are explicitly integrated into project design, implementation and monitoring is not optional, it's a fundamental requirement for achieving equitable and sustainable development outcomes.		
Risk 12	12. Limited involvement and consultation with Scheduled Cast and Scheduled Tribe		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	Indigenous Peoples		
Description	The presence of Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes communities within the project intervention areas demands a particularly sensitive and culturally informed approach. Indigenous communities have distinct rights, traditions and governance systems that must be respected and upheld throughout the project cycle. Failure to engage these communities through culturally appropriate, inclusive and transparent consultation processes risks not only the exclusion of their voices and interests but also the violation of their internationally recognized rights, including the right to Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). Such exclusion can erode community trust, generate social conflict and result in project activities that are disconnected from the realities and aspirations of these communities. It is therefore essential that meaningful, good faith consultations are prioritized with these communities to ensure their rights are protected and their knowledge is valued and their participation in decision making is genuinely facilitated		
Consequences	Disregard for indigenous values and traditions erodes cultural identity and disrupts community cohesion. Failure to uphold FPIC violates internationally recognized indigenous rights, exposing the project to legal and reputational risks. Further inadequate consultations breed mistrust, community opposition and social unrest, leading to costly project delays. Without targeted engagement of indigenous communities, the interventions risks excluding them from project benefits deepening existing inequalities		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	To mitigate limited involvement of Scheduled Castes (SC) and Scheduled Tribes (ST), the project ensures systematic, early, and continuous engagement across all project stages. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) and Gender Action Plan (GAP) mandate targeted outreach, disaggregated stakeholder mapping, and dedicated consultation processes to ensure SC/ST voices are reflected in planning, design, and implementation. A Social Inclusion Plan (SIP) will be developed post-restructuring to strengthen tailored engagement strategies. In tribal areas, Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) processes are strictly applied through a defined SOP, ensuring consultations are conducted in local languages, culturally appropriate formats, and prior to activity initiation with documented consent. The operational GRM provides accessible grievance reporting channels actively promoted among SC/ST communities. Site-level monitoring will track disaggregated SC/ST participation, consultation quality, and incorporation of community inputs into decisions. Project staff are sensitized to identify participation barriers, ensuring consultations remain meaningful, inclusive, and rights-compatible throughout implementation.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Comments	N/A		
Risk 13	13. Limited coordination between key project stakeholders involved in implementation		

Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Design and Implementation		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Effective project implementation relies heavily on the seamless collaboration and coordination of all stakeholders including government, line departments, NPMU, SPMU, UNDP, communities, NGOs/CBOs, the private sector and other relevant actors. When coordination among these stakeholders is limited or fragmented, it creates significant gaps in communication, duplicates efforts and leads to misalignments of roles and responsibilities		
Consequences	Reduces the overall efficiency of the project delivery and compromises the quality and effectiveness of interventions on the ground. Furthermore, poor coordination can result in the misallocation of resources, missed opportunities for synergy and ultimately failure to achieve the project's intended outcomes.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The NPMU and SPMU serve as central coordination bodies at the national and state levels, acting as focal points in addressing risks associated with limited stakeholder coordination. By facilitating structured and continuous dialogue between project partners and stakeholders, they ensure all actors remain aligned, informed, and working cohesively toward shared project objectives. National and State Project Steering Committees provide structured platforms bringing together key stakeholders, including MoEFCC, State Nodal Departments, UNDP, and line ministries, to ensure coordinated decision-making and unified implementation. The project further strengthens institutional capacities through cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms at state and district levels, including District-level Coordination Committees. These mechanisms break down siloed approaches, ensuring that government agencies, line departments, accredited agencies, communities, NGOs, and CBOs are meaningfully engaged in an integrated and mutually reinforcing manner, thereby significantly reducing the likelihood and impact of coordination failures throughout project implementation.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Comments	N/A		
Risk 14	14. Critical Habitat Encroachment Risk		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	There is a risk that there might be project intervention activities within or adjacent to critical habitats and or/environmentally sensitive areas, including but not limited to legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national parks) proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and /or ST/Tribal people or local communities or frequented by migratory species.		
Consequences	Any disruptions to critical habitats and environmentally sensitive areas can be far-reaching and may lead to loss of bio-diversity loss. Degradation of critical habitat, and displacement of migratory species, undermining the ecological integrity of these areas. For legally protected areas such as nature reserves and national parks, any encroachment can constitute a direct violation of national environmental laws and international conservation commitments, exposing the project to significant legal and reputational risks		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	Project activities are being implemented by the Forest Departments and other line departments after adhering to National environmental laws and following government procedures at the State and District level. Site specific restoration protocols are being designed to ensure no impact on areas of ecological and cultural significance. The state nodal departments (e.g. Forest departments) are responsible for working alongside community organization and facilitators to monitor locally identified risks and verify that mitigation measures remain effectively in place throughout the project implementation. Accessible Grievance Redressal Mechanism of the Government further ensure that any		

	emerging environmental concerns are promptly identified and reported and addressed in a timely manner.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 15	15.Risk of money laundering and terrorist financing within the project's financial transactions and procurement processes.		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Money Laundering (ML) & Terrorist Financing (TF)		
Description	The Project operates across complex supply chains through a multi-layered funding structure and is particularly vulnerable to financial integrity risks when robust traceability mechanisms and counterparty screening processes are absent or inconsistently applied. Without comprehensive due diligence including background checks, sanctions screening, and ongoing monitoring of implementing partners, vendors, and financial intermediaries there is a heightened risk that project funds may be channeled to ineligible, fraudulent, or sanctioned entities.		
Consequences	Should ML/TF risks materialize, the consequences could be severe including significant harm to the reputations of both UNDP and the GCF, halt of fund disbursements, legal action under applicable national anti-money laundering regulations, and the freezing of project-related assets. If such an incident is confirmed, UNDP would be obligated to immediately inform the GCF Secretariat, initiate an investigation into the matter, and take necessary steps to recover any misused or diverted funds.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	To mitigate ML/TF risks, implementing partners, vendors, and contractors will undergo mandatory AML/CFT screening prior to engagement. HACT modalities, including micro-assessments, spot checks, audits, and assurance plans, will apply throughout implementation. Strong financial controls, including segregation of duties, traceable records, and audit trails, will govern all transactions to the community level. Funds will be processed through UNDP-approved banking channels, with cash transactions minimized. Regular audits, spot checks, and assurance visits will support ongoing monitoring and reconciliation of expenditures. As the project is directly implemented by the Governments of Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Odisha, and the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, key safeguards are embedded in government systems, including the Public Financial Management System (PFMS), GeM, General Financial Rules (GFR), Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) oversight, and the Prevention of Money Laundering Act of India.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Comments	No ML/TF-related incidents, suspicions, or reports were identified during the reporting period. During the reporting period, no incidents, suspicions, or reports related to money laundering (ML) or terrorist financing (TF) were identified. All project financial transactions and procurement processes were monitored in line with established safeguards, and no irregularities were observed.		
Risk 16	16. Sanctions exposure in project engagements		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Sanctions		
Description	There is a risk of inadvertently channeling financial resources, goods, or services to individuals, entities, or suppliers subject to sanctions imposed by international bodies such as the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC), the European Union, or by the Government of India / the State Governments, including designations under India's Unlawful Activities Prevention Act		

	(UAPA) and the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) proscribed list. This risk extends beyond direct engagement with listed parties to include indirect dealings through vendors, financial intermediaries, or sub-suppliers that are owned or controlled by sanctioned entities with opaque beneficial ownership structures, complex corporate arrangements, and multi-tiered supply chains prevalent in India's diverse vendor ecosystem making such links difficult to detect without thorough due diligence.		
Consequences	Any engagement with a sanctioned party even if unintentional would represent a direct violation of UN Security Council obligations and UNDP's internal compliance policy, triggering immediate remedial actions including termination of the relevant contract, mandatory reporting to both the GCF Secretariat and the UN Sanctions Committee, and the potential freezing of associated project assets. Beyond these operational and legal consequences, such an incident could inflict substantial and lasting reputational harm on both UNDP and the GCF, undermining stakeholder confidence and the broader credibility of the project.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	To mitigate engagement with sanctioned parties, all vendors, partners, and contractors will undergo mandatory sanctions screening before contracting, integrated into procurement workflows at vendor registration and contract issuance stages. Long-term partners will be periodically re-screened throughout implementation to capture updates under relevant sanctions regimes. Screening records will be maintained to ensure an auditable compliance trail. UNDP procurement policies, including mandatory sanctions screening, will apply to all procurement processes. As the project is directly implemented by the Governments of Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Odisha, and the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, additional safeguards are provided through India's institutional framework, including the Unlawful Activities Prevention Act, Prevention of Money Laundering Act, GeM and PFMS verification systems, RBI banking safeguards, and oversight by the Central Vigilance Commission and Comptroller and Auditor General.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Comments	No individual or entity currently subject to UN Security Council sanctions has been engaged under the project during the reporting period. The project country is not subject to UN sectoral sanctions.		
Risk 17	17. Risk of fraud and corruption in project procurement and implementation		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	There is a risk that fraudulent practices, bribery, corruption, or collusion may occur across various stages of project implementation, including procurement processes, partner selection, and the execution of project activities. Such risks may manifest in multiple forms including bid rigging, falsification of financial records, manipulation of evaluation criteria to favour predetermined vendors, or collusion among bidders to suppress competition and inflate contract values. Since the project is being implemented across diverse geographical and institutional contexts, decision-making authority is dispersed across multiple implementing agencies, and the volume and complexity of procurement transactions might create opportunities for misconduct.		
Consequences	Left unaddressed, fraudulent and corrupt practices can result in significant financial losses, diversion of project resources away from intended beneficiaries, compromised quality of project deliverables, and serious reputational, legal, and regulatory consequences for both the implementing agencies and the project's funding partners, including UNDP and the Green Climate Fund (GCF). Further, the occurrence of fraud or corruption may trigger an OAI investigation, suspension of disbursements, termination of contractual arrangements, legal proceedings under national anti corruption laws, and demands for recovery of funds.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 6 - Medium

Mitigation Measure(s)	To mitigate fraud, bribery, corruption, and collusion risks, all UNDP-supported procurement will follow transparent and competitive UNDP procedures with fully documented processes. Clear evaluation criteria and multi-member committees will reduce risks of bias and collusion. Anti-fraud and anti-corruption clauses will be included in all contracts and agreements. Regular monitoring, spot checks, and third-party verification of outputs and expenditures will help detect misconduct early. An accessible grievance redress mechanism will enable confidential reporting of suspected violations without fear of reprisal. Capacity-building activities on compliance, ethics, and financial management will also be provided to implementing partners. For directly implemented activities, the Government's safeguards include statutory oversight, digital governance systems such as GeM, CAG audits, the Right to Information mechanism, and national and state-level enforcement measures.		
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 such risks reported during the reporting period.		
Risk 18	18. COI exposure among project personnel, evaluators, and institutional counterparts		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	There is a risk that individuals occupying key roles in project governance, procurement, or partner selection including government officials, evaluation committee members, project managers, and decision-making authorities may hold undisclosed personal, financial, or professional interests in entities that stand to benefit from project-related decisions, thereby compromising the objectivity and integrity of those decisions. Such conflicts of interest may take various forms, including direct financial stakes in bidding companies, close personal or familial relationships with vendor representatives, prior or concurrent employment with contracting firms, or other pecuniary interests that create a bias whether actual or perceived in the evaluation, selection, or award of contracts and partnerships. The risk is particularly acute when disclosure requirements are weak, declaration mechanisms are absent or not enforced, and there is no independent oversight to identify and manage potential conflicts before they influence procurement outcomes.		
Consequences	This could undermine fairness and transparency in project processes, leading to biased decisions, reduced credibility, and potential challenges in audit and compliance reviews. Left unaddressed, undisclosed conflicts of interest can lead to the selection of ineligible or overpriced vendors, exclusion of qualified competitors, distortion of evaluation criteria, and the diversion of project resources ultimately undermining value for money, eroding stakeholder trust, and exposing the project and its funding partners, including UNDP and the GCF, to reputational and fiduciary risk.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	To mitigate conflict of interest risks, all personnel involved in procurement and decision-making, including project management units, will submit mandatory conflict of interest declarations, with records maintained as part of the compliance framework. Independent and multi-layered review mechanisms will apply to key decisions, including procurement evaluations and partner selection, to prevent undue influence. Conflict of interest clauses will be included in all partner and vendor contracts, while regular awareness sessions and ethics training will promote transparency and accountability across project implementation. Government safeguards further strengthen risk management through conduct rules, mandatory asset declarations, procurement disqualification provisions, Integrity Pact mechanisms, Central Vigilance Commission oversight, and judicial accountability measures, helping ensure that personal or financial interests do not improperly influence procurement, governance, or partner selection decisions.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity

	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Comments	No cases of Conflict of Interest reported during the reporting period.		

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
India	Grants	USD	43,418,606	13,587,451	2,126,007.92	7,560,958.22	0%	100%
Total		USD	43,418,606	13,587,451	2,126,007.92	7,560,958.22	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
Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change	Grants	USD	20,000,000	179,430	179,430	10,732,604	0%	100%
State Government of Maharashtra	Grants	USD	26,850,000	1,429,137	1,429,137	6,826,435	0%	100%
State Government of Andhra Pradesh	Grants	USD	20,000,000	5,001,026	5,001,026	14,569,132	0%	100%
State Government of Odisha	Grants	USD	20,000,000	2,172,612	2,172,612	8,672,823	0%	100%
Total		USD	86,850,000	8,782,205	8,782,205	40,800,994	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

No additional finance mobilized information provided.

File Name: PIMS 5991_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 ☐

FAA Covenant 10.02 (e): Updated ESMF was finalised (March 2025) based on the revised SESP (2024) and in response to the RP. The updated ESMF stipulates the project's Area of Influence (AoI), and outlines strengthened procedures for site level environmental and social risk screening, assessment and corresponding risk management/mitigation and monitoring.

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, safeguards actions focused on strengthening compliance systems, risk mitigation, stakeholder engagement, and grievance redress across all project landscapes. Stakeholder Engagement • Implemented the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) through 150 structured consultations, including 115 community-level consultations across Andhra Pradesh, Odisha, and Maharashtra, meaningfully engaging SC/ST and vulnerable groups. •

Key engagements included the Annual Work Plan consultation in Andhra Pradesh (February 2025) and mangrove restoration consultations at Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary (February 2025). FPIC Implementation • Revised FPIC guidelines and reporting templates were applied prior to activity initiation across all project landscapes, ensuring documented, culturally appropriate consultations with tribal and vulnerable coastal communities. • Consultations were conducted in local languages, with documented consent from community institutions (VSS/EDCs) and inclusive participation of women and small-scale fishers. Capacity Building • SES-focused capacity-building sessions were conducted for DPMU and SPMU teams, including an in-person training in Bhubaneswar, Odisha (September 2025) and a follow-up online session (November 2025), covering FPIC, GRM, and environmental and social risk management, with approximately 31 officials participating. • Sector-specific trainings for seaweed farming and ornamental fisheries further integrated safeguards considerations into field-level implementation. Grievance Redress • The 2023 SRM complaint was formally referred in May 2025 to the State-level GRM system, with ongoing follow-up with the Government of Andhra Pradesh; the State Forest Department is scheduled to submit a resolution report by end of Q1 2026. • The online GRM is being integrated with the project MIS under NPMU and MoEFCC supervision. • A grievance related to a 50-hectare mangrove plantation in Gundalba village, Odisha (filed September 2025) was addressed through field inspections, Joint Inquiry Committee verification, and corrective maintenance measures, with UNDP continuing compliance oversight. Monitoring & Supervision • Strengthened through regular site visits, compliance reviews, and weekly field monitoring by DPMU teams and Climate Champions.

Outputs during the reporting period

During the reporting period, standardized community consultation and consent processes were applied across intervention villages. FPIC documentation, including consultation minutes and consent records, was maintained at the field level, providing documented evidence of compliance with stakeholder engagement requirements. 525 FPIC exercises were conducted prior to execution of project activities during the reporting period, covering 3481 Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe communities. Through the project 27,497 people were trained on safeguard-related issues. Compliance is further evidenced through 991 monitoring and supervision by DPMUs and NGOs. Additionally, UNDP Country Office conducted field monitoring missions during implementation period. Structured engagement with MCMCs, SHGs, and fisherfolk groups resulted in documented consultation 167 proceedings and training records. These records reflect continued stakeholder participation in project. Collectively, these outputs demonstrate the establishment of documented consultation processes, maintained safeguard records, and functional monitoring systems aligned with SES compliance requirements.

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

During the reporting period, key environmental, social, and gender-related risks were actively managed through targeted mitigation and strengthened supervision mechanisms. Environmental Risk Management • Tidal fluctuations, coastal erosion, and grazing pressure at mangrove, seagrass, and saltmarsh restoration sites were addressed through protective GI fencing and site-specific hydrological measures. • Variable plantation survival risks were mitigated through selection of climate-resilient native species and seedling quality assurance through nursery management across all project landscapes. • Seagrass and saltmarsh restoration risks were managed through science-based planning and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) oversight, with baseline ecological information informing site selection and phased implementation approaches adopted to reduce ecological disturbance. Climate and Livelihood Risks • Climate-related risks affecting agriculture and coastal livelihoods were mitigated through promotion of climate-resilient practices such as the System of Rice Intensification (SRI), complemented by farmer training and diversification into adaptive livelihoods including crab farming, ornamental fisheries, and seaweed cultivation. Social and Gender Risk Management • Risks of exclusion of women, tribal communities, and vulnerable coastal households were addressed through structured consultations under the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and FPIC processes in tribal areas. • Community engagement is maintained through Eco Development Committees (EDCs) and Van Suraksha Samitis, with 9 VSS in Odisha, 19 VSS and 36 EDCs in Andhra Pradesh, and 108 Mangrove Co-management Committees operational in Maharashtra. • Livelihood-related risks such as restricted grazing access due to fencing were mitigated through designated forage areas and community-managed grazing spaces. • Livelihood diversification initiatives, including EDC-managed cafeteria services in Bhitarkanika, reduced dependence on vulnerable resources and strengthened local incomes. Monitoring and Compliance • Regular safeguard screening and district-level reviews supported identification and follow-up of emerging environmental and social risks, strengthening compliance oversight throughout implementation.

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

<i>The project team and CO continue to work jointly to strengthen SES compliance, implementation, and monitoring, and to address any environmental, social, and gender-related risks and grievances in a timely manner through established mechanisms. At present, there are no outstanding issues requiring additional action or attention from the Accredited Entity or the GCF.</i>	
Remarks/Notes	
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	
Andhra Pradesh - Capacity-building programs supported Fishermen Cooperative Societies, SHGs, Mandala Mahila Samakhyas, and FFPOs on sustainable crab farming, seaweed cultivation, and ornamental fisheries. - Exposure visits to RGCA, CMFRI, CSMCRI, Central Institute of Brackish Water Aquaculture, and NCSCM facilitated best-practice adoption, organized in collaboration with the Fishery Department and SERP. - DLCC meetings strengthened convergence and safeguard compliance. - Awareness campaigns marked International Mangrove Day, World Wetlands Day, World Environment Day, Climate Day, and the Flamingo Festival, reinforcing inclusive and sustainable coastal management. Maharashtra - Capacity-building programs supported Mangrove Co-Management Committees, SHGs, Mahila Gramsanghs, fishers, farmers, and youth on mud crab farming, mussel and oyster culture, seaweed farming, ornamental fisheries, value addition, and SRI. - Exposure visits, site assessments, and market linkage sessions promoted income diversification and community capacity. - DLCC meetings and consultations with District Collectors and line departments improved convergence and safeguard compliance. - Stakeholder consultations informed coral restoration planning, with awareness campaigns supported by NGO partners including Mangrove Foundation, Dilasa, WOTR, and Jaljeevika. Odisha - An inception workshop with IIT Bhubaneswar aligned stakeholders on seagrass and saltmarsh restoration methodologies and monitoring approaches. - Capacity-building programs at ICAR-CIFA enhanced community skills in ornamental fisheries breeding, culture, and market linkages. - State-level convergence workshops improved inter-departmental planning and implementation of livelihood interventions. - Exposure visits to the Rajiv Gandhi Centre for Aquaculture strengthened crab hatchery management knowledge among community fishers and Fishery Department officials. - Specialized training on GIS, remote sensing, drone surveys, and coastal ecology improved scientific monitoring capabilities.	

The Government-established Technical Advisory Committee, comprising national and international experts, provided strategic guidance and ensured adaptive ecosystem restoration for seagrass and saltmarsh planning.
Dates and venues of engagement activities
Stakeholder engagement spanned three states Andhra Pradesh (2025) held awareness sessions, Flamingo Festival stalls (18–19 Jan, Nelapattu), World Wetlands Day (2 Feb, Coringa WLS, Kakinada), mangrove-maintenance consultations (6 Feb, Coringa WLS), FPIC consultations, seaweed-farming training (10 Mar, Krishna WLS), and Great Green Wall inauguration (9 Sep, Suryalanka, Bapatla). Odisha (Bhubaneswar) held an IIT seagrass/saltmarsh workshop (4 Feb), ornamental fisheries training (5–7 Mar), SRI workshops (16 Jul), GIS/drone training (21–22 Aug), and TAC meetings (4 Jun, virtual). Maharashtra reached 18.41% mangrove target with mud-crab training (26–28 May, Palghar), coral consultation (1 Nov, Sindhudurg), coastal cleanup (20 Sep), and resource-person training (23 Dec); cross-state visits recommended.
Sex-disaggregated data on stakeholder engagement participants (male + female = total)
Andhra Pradesh: 7,725 male + 2,150 female = 9,875 total participants Engagement activities reached a substantial number of stakeholders; however, women's participation (approximately 22%) remained comparatively lower than men's. Dedicated capacity-building sessions were conducted to strengthen women's engagement in crab farming, ornamental fisheries, and seaweed cultivation, and to support self-empowerment through SHGs and Mahila Grama Samakhya. FPIC meetings and targeted awareness campaigns were organized at community level to enhance inclusive participation. While outreach was broad, continued efforts are required and will be prioritised to increase women's representation in technical livelihood trainings. Maharashtra: 1,781 male + 1,863 female = 3,644 total participants Participation in Maharashtra reflected strong gender inclusion, with women accounting for over 50% of participants. Engagement with SHGs, Mahila Grama Samakhya, MCMCs, and fishers ensured balanced representation. Structured trainings, exposure visits, and awareness campaigns were designed to reach women, small producers, and marginalized groups. Dissemination of revised FPIC guidelines and inclusive consultations supported compliance with the Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Odisha: 382 male + 202 female = 584 total participants Women represented approximately 35% of participants. Targeted inclusion of women Climate Champions and SHGs strengthened participation in restoration and livelihood activities. Technical trainings, convergence workshops, and seasonal planning meetings were structured to ensure representation of community institutions, though continued efforts are needed to further enhance women's participation in technical and scientific training domains. List of CSOs, NGOs, or other platforms, initiatives, and organizations Stakeholder engagement during the reporting period covered a broad and relevant range of actors across community, civil society, technical, and government levels. Community-Level Stakeholders: Engagement focused on primary project-affected groups, including Self-Help Groups (SHGs), Mahila Grama Samakhya, Mangrove Co-Management Committees (MCMCs), Eco-Development Committees, Village Forest Committees, Fisherman Cooperative Societies, Farmers Fish Producer Organizations (FFPOs), fishers, aquaculture farmers, Climate Champions, Community Resource Persons (CRPs), youth groups, and Panchayati Raj Institution representatives. These groups were central to livelihood planning, ecosystem restoration, and community-based monitoring. Civil Society and Facilitating NGOs: Local and regional NGOs supported field implementation, community mobilization, and safeguard compliance, including organizations such as Nature's Club, LIPICA, Pallishree, Balasore Social Service Society, Humara Bachpan Trust, SWAD, WOTR, Dilasa, Jaljeevika Foundation, Youth Beats for Climate, and Vanashakti. These partners helped reach marginalized communities and strengthen grassroots engagement. Technical and Scientific Institutions: Specialized technical partners—including IIT Bhubaneswar, IIT Mumbai, CIFA, NRRI, NCSCM, Chilika Development Authority, and CMFRI—provided scientific guidance for ecosystem restoration, climate-resilient agriculture, aquaculture diversification, and monitoring frameworks. Government Departments and Line Agencies: State and district-level departments (Fisheries, Agriculture, Planning & Convergence, Science & Technology), District Collector offices, Mangrove Cell, Maritime Board, MPEDA, MSRLM/UMED, and Mangrove Foundation supported inter-departmental coordination, policy alignment, and safeguards oversight.
Information shared with stakeholders

During the reporting period, consultations and workshops focused on sharing technical, operational, and strategic information related to ecosystem restoration and climate-resilient livelihoods. Stakeholders were briefed on restoration strategies for seagrass and saltmarsh ecosystems, including site selection, scientific monitoring protocols, GIS and drone-based spatial mapping, and species identification. Technical Advisory Committee meetings provided guidance on refining restoration methodologies and strengthening science-based implementation. In the fisheries and livelihood domain, information was shared on ornamental fish breeding and culture, crab hatchery operations, freshwater ornamental fish production, and market linkages including export procedures and income diversification opportunities. Convergence workshops highlighted relevant fisheries schemes, inter-departmental coordination mechanisms, and joint monitoring approaches. At village and Gram Panchayat levels, FPIC meetings were held prior to activity initiation to obtain community consent and provide information on the project-level GRM. Capacity-building sessions covered System of Rice Intensification (SRI), GHG sampling methodologies, and climate-resilient agriculture planning. State-level review meetings disseminated project progress, financial guidelines, and field-level implementation strategies. Stakeholders were briefed on roles and responsibilities of Mangrove Co-Management Committees, SHGs, Community Resource Persons, and line departments. Monitoring processes and documentation requirements were clarified to ensure transparency, accountability, and inclusive, ESS-aligned implementation across all project landscapes.	
Outputs including issues raised and addressed during the reporting period	
During the reporting period, stakeholders raised issues related to technical capacity, livelihood viability, market access, and implementation coordination. These concerns were addressed through targeted mitigation measures and adaptive implementation. In Andhra Pradesh, stakeholders highlighted technical knowledge gaps and operational challenges in livelihood activities, along with concerns regarding market access, pricing, and export procedures. These were addressed through structured hands-on trainings, exposure visits, practical demonstrations, and specialized technical sessions with expert institutions. Focused orientation on market linkages and export processes helped reduce uncertainty. DLCC and LLPMU meetings improved institutional coordination and clarified roles and responsibilities. In Maharashtra, stakeholders raised concerns regarding livelihood viability, technical capacity, market access, and inter-departmental coordination. These gaps were addressed through demonstrations (e.g., crab box systems and raft installation), exposure visits, and technical collaborations with the Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute (CMFRI) and Marine Products Export Development Authority (MPEDA) to strengthen technical guidance and market readiness. Sessions on export licensing and product diversification improved market preparedness, while pre-season planning, soil sampling, and System of Rice Intensification (SRI) training strengthened climate-resilient agriculture. DLCC, MCMC, and SHG consultations enhanced convergence and implementation clarity. In Odisha, stakeholders identified the need for clearer restoration methodologies, improved site selection criteria, enhanced scientific monitoring, and stronger coordination. Inception workshops and TAC guidance addressed these gaps by strengthening understanding of restoration approaches and evidence-based planning. Technical trainings on GIS, remote sensing, drone surveys, and morphometric analysis improved scientific monitoring capacity. Livelihood trainings enhanced technical and market readiness, while state-level reviews improved coordination, reporting clarity, and convergence planning.	
Remarks/Notes	
The reporting period reflects strong alignment with Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) standards through inclusive participation, science-based restoration approaches, and capacity strengthening of community institutions, including women-led groups. Emphasis on technical rigor (GIS, ecological monitoring, TAC guidance) supports environmental risk mitigation, while convergence workshops and structured review mechanisms enhance governance and accountability. Continuous engagement with community stakeholders and technical agencies has strengthened transparency, participatory decision-making, and long-term sustainability of ecosystem and livelihood interventions under the ECRICC Project.	

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	
Planned Safeguards Activities – Next Reporting Period. Safeguards activities for the next reporting period will focus on strengthening SES compliance, institutional capacity, and stakeholder accountability. GRM Awareness and Operationalisation (Q1–Q4 2026) Outreach on the project-level GRM will strengthen awareness and use of grievance channels, with targeted efforts for tribal and marginalised communities using local-language and culturally appropriate materials. Monitoring will track awareness sessions, sex-disaggregated participant lists, materials disseminated, and feedback received. SES Capacity Building for PMUs and IP (Q1–Q3 2026) Four training sessions will be conducted for PMUs (NPMU, SPMU, DPMU) covering environmental and social risk screening, FPIC, GRM processes, and compliance reporting. Each session will be followed by a PMU-led reflection session to reinforce learning and address implementation gaps. Monitoring will include attendance registers, pre/post assessments, and field observations. SES Monitoring and Risk Management (Continuous 2026) A SES monitoring plan will be developed and rolled out in Q2 to track environmental, social, and gender risks across project sites. District and state teams will conduct periodic field verification visits to assess compliance and ensure timely mitigation. Monitoring will cover field checklists, updated risk registers, and supervision reports. Participatory Stakeholder Engagement and FPIC (Continuous 2026) Structured consultations and FPIC processes will be conducted prior to and during livelihood and restoration activities, ensuring inputs from women, tribal communities, and vulnerable groups are integrated into project planning. Culturally appropriate engagement formats will address participation barriers. Monitoring will include FPIC records, disaggregated participation data, and evidence of community inputs. Grievance Documentation and Resolution (Continuous 2026) All grievances, including pending complaints from prior periods, will be tracked and documented through established GRM procedures. Monitoring will cover GRM logs, resolution timelines, follow-up actions, and quarterly compliance reviews.	
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	
The project has generated valuable insights in promoting gender inclusion and fostering active participation of indigenous peoples and local communities. A standout practice has been elevating women into leadership roles, with 98% of Odisha's Climate Champions being women and a minimum 50% female beneficiary requirement across all interventions transforming women into frontline knowledge holders, resource stewards, and climate governance decision-makers. Inspiring journeys, including that of Rehana Khatun – a differently-abled young woman who rallied 183 community members and strengthened government linkages – and Chameli Jena, who evolved from homemaker to community leader mentoring 40 farmers in climate-smart agriculture, illustrate the far-reaching impact of gender-responsive programming. These stories are captured through field documentation, case studies, and publications. Introducing mud crab aquaculture has effectively blended indigenous ecological knowledge with sustainable practices, boosting household incomes while easing fishing pressures. In Kendrapada, restoration workers built affordable shade shelters from locally sourced materials to combat heat stress – a grassroots innovation planned for broader replication. Key takeaways highlight the need for continuous technical support, context-sensitive engagement, and structured leadership platforms to reinforce robust safeguards implementation across project states.	
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>During the reporting period, one grievance was received concerning the condition of a 50-hectare mangrove plantation in Gundalba village, Astaranga Block, Puri District, Odisha. The complaint was received through the Government's grievance redress mechanism alleging concerns regarding a 50 ha mangrove plantation in Gundalba Village, Odisha. The complaint, initially raised via social media on 2 September 2025, and subsequently re-filed through formal channels on 8 December 2025, alleged concerns regarding species suitability, plantation survival rates, and overall plantation health. In response, the Forest Department, State Project Management Unit (SPMU), and District Project Management</i>	

Unit (DPMU) conducted field inspections and site assessments and coordinated follow-up actions. A Joint Inquiry Committee constituted by the Government of Odisha undertook site verification and submitted a formal report that concluded that the species selected were suitable for the site conditions, the first year plantation survival rate exceeded 90%, and there was no evidence of misuse of project funds. The complainant subsequently sought a further review through the State GRM on 21 December 2025. A second level assessment reaffirmed the findings of the initial inquiry and the findings were communicated to the complainant by the Divisional Forest Officer on 31 December 2025. UNDP Country Office maintained regular follow-up with the SPMU and the State Government to ensure due process under the project's Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM). The grievance has been considered resolved and no outstanding issues remained. Maintenance measures for the 2024–25 plantation cycle have been initiated, along with annual plantation assessments. While plantation management rests with the State Government, UNDP continues to support monitoring, documentation, and safeguard compliance oversight in line with project requirements.

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

The Gender Action Plan (GAP) is progressing, with evidence of women's leadership, participation, and access to climate-resilient livelihoods across three project states. Women's representation in community institutions and project platforms has grown, supported by leadership models such as Climate Champions, with 282 active women champions out of 288 in Odisha strengthening climate governance. Capacity-building efforts have reached 30,954 women, while 8,178 women in Andhra Pradesh and Maharashtra reported increased participation in Gram Sabha processes, mangrove co-management, livelihood consultations, and other community-based organization meetings and public forums.

Participation targets of ≈60% women in leadership and project activities are being met, including outreach to women-headed and economically poor households. Adoption of climate-resilient livelihoods across fisheries, agriculture, and nature-based enterprises has improved household income and resilience. Women champions and beneficiaries are represented at national workshops, conferences, and knowledge-sharing forums, amplifying voices beyond local and demonstrating gender-inclusive climate action models at national platforms.

Key challenges include socio-cultural norms, seasonal participation constraints, and technical capacity gaps in new livelihood models. Corrective measures include flexible training schedules, last-mile technical support, convergence with line departments, and gender sensitization. Lessons confirm women-led approaches accelerate community ownership, improve climate-resilient practice adoption, and enhance project sustainability.

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

Yes ☒ No ☐

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

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

GAP Activity

Activity 1.1 Conducting coastal vulnerability assessments to guide the planning and design of ecosystem-based and community-based climate adaptation interventions: It involves systematically analyzing coastal risks such as erosion, flooding, salinity intrusion, and other climate-induced hazards, while also assessing the socio-economic vulnerability of coastal communities. The assessment helps identify priority hotspots and informs the selection of locally suitable adaptation measures such as mangrove restoration, climate-resilient livelihoods, nature-based protection measures, and community preparedness systems, ensuring that interventions are evidence-based, location-specific, and aligned with long-term resilience goals.

Indicator

1. Active participants of the community vulnerability assessment process are women 2. Active participants of the community vulnerability assessment process are women from female headed households 3. Vulnerability assessment tools developed are gender sensitive.

Rating of Indicator

AMBER (needs attention to be met)

Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	50
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
The gender-sensitive coastal vulnerability assessment is under development and remains only partially completed, contributing to the Amber rating. While primary data collection was initially planned for the socio-economic vulnerability assessment, implementation delays led the Government to initiate the framework using secondary data (Census 2011) to avoid further postponement. The methodology has been piloted in Pulicat Lake and submitted to the Project Board for approval during the reporting period. Upon approval, the methodology will be scaled across all project landscapes. The forthcoming rollout will include structured community-level consultations ensuring at least 50% women's participation, including a minimum of 12% women from female-headed households, in line with GAP targets. The finalized assessment will inform the establishment of a gender-sensitive Decision Support System by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC), Government of India, enabling evidence-based planning that addresses differentiated climate vulnerabilities of women and marginalized groups.	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
Physical & Ecological Vulnerability is completed for all project landscapes with support of National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management and has been delivered under government co-financing part of the project. However, a pilot assessment of socio-economic vulnerabilities has been completed for Pulicat Lake and is currently awaiting approval from the Project Board. Upon receiving approval, this same approach will be extended and applied across all other project landscapes to evaluate their socio-economic vulnerabilities.	
Budget	748,977
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	30 June 2026
Responsibility	
Ministry of Environment Forest and Climate Change, Government of India	
Remarks/Notes	
Target - At least 50 percent participants of the community vulnerability assessment process are women - At least 12 percent of participants of the community vulnerability assessment process is women from female headed households 100% of vulnerability assessment tools developed are gender sensitive *Remarks* The National Project Management Unit (NPMU) is closely following up with NCSCM to finalize the Vulnerability Assessment by 2nd Quarter of 2026. Catch-up Action: Consultative workshops to finalize the methodology for the vulnerability assessment will be conducted to capture inputs from relevant stakeholders.	
GAP Activity	
Activity 1.2 Community-based conservation and restoration of coastal ecosystems for increased ecosystem resilience centers on empowering local communities to actively participate in the conservation and restoration of coastal ecosystems, with the goal of enhancing their long-term resilience against environmental challenges such as climate change, erosion, and biodiversity loss. A key emphasis of this activity is ensuring the meaningful involvement of	

women, who play a vital role in the sustainable management of coastal resources. Women in coastal communities often possess traditional knowledge about local ecosystems and are directly dependent on these resources for their livelihoods, making their participation essential for the success of conservation efforts.

Indicator

Participants in paid work opportunities on restoration of ecosystems are women

Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	20

Annual progress update (Reporting Period)

Community-based restoration activities progressed significantly across all three project states. Under mangrove restoration initiatives, 21,267 individuals received paid work opportunities, including 7980 women (38%) and 13,287 men, thereby significantly exceeding the target of at least 20% women's participation. Women actively contributed to plantation, nursery management, and maintenance activities, demonstrating meaningful engagement beyond nominal inclusion.

In addition, watershed restoration activities across Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, and Odisha generated wage-based employment for 5016 individuals, of whom 3074 (61%) were women and 1942 were men. This reflects strong uptake of women's participation in ecosystem restoration-linked livelihood opportunities.

Overall, the target of ensuring at least 20% women's participation in paid restoration work has been met and exceeded during the reporting period. Continued efforts will focus on sustaining women's engagement and expanding their roles in supervisory and decision-making functions within restoration activities.

Cumulative progress update (Entire period)

A total of 9952 women have benefited from wage labor under ecosystem restoration

Budget	4,616,467
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 December 2026

Responsibility

State Project Management Units of Odisha, Maharashtra, and Andhra Pradesh

Remarks/Notes

Target: At least 20% of participants in paid ecosystem restoration work are women.

Remarks: This year marked a transformative shift in women's engagement in ecosystem restoration across three states. A total of 7,687 women directly benefited through daily wages linked to mangrove and watershed restoration an environmental win that also advanced gender equity and ecological recovery.

Catch-up action: Women will be actively involved in restoring seagrass, saltmarshes, coral reefs, mangroves, and watersheds. IIT Bhubaneswar will deliver targeted

GAP Activity

Activity 2.1: Building climate-resilient livelihoods and enterprises through value chains and strengthened access to markets In the face of accelerating climate change, the vulnerability of rural and coastal communities particularly women to environmental and economic shocks has never been more acute. Addressing this dual challenge requires a strategic approach that goes beyond relief and subsistence, toward building sustainable, climate-resilient livelihoods

and enterprises anchored in robust value chains and expanded market access. Central to this vision is the recognition of women as primary recipients of technical support for climate-adaptive value addition equipping them not just to survive climate change, but to build enterprises that thrive within it.

Indicator

- Recipients of technical support to climate adaptive value addition are women
- Recipients of technical support to climate adaptive value addition are women from women headed Households

Rating of Indicator

AMBER (needs attention to be met)

Baseline

0

Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable

60

Annual progress update (Reporting Period)

During the reporting period, 75,440 women (63% of total beneficiaries) received technical support for climate-adaptive value addition, exceeding the target of at least 60% women beneficiaries. Support was provided across diversified climate-resilient livelihood activities including System of Rice Intensification (40630), fish value addition (29280), crab fattening (1325), ornamental fisheries (1875), oyster farming (1125), mussel farming (225), and seaweed cultivation (980). These interventions strengthened women's economic resilience and market-linked enterprise development across project states.

Regarding outreach to women from women-headed households, Odisha reported 1167 beneficiaries under this category. However, disaggregated data from the other two states was not available during the reporting period. Strengthening data collection and tracking mechanisms across all states will be prioritized to ensure comprehensive reporting against the 15% target in the upcoming period. Overall, progress toward women's participation targets is strong, though improved tracking of women-headed households is required to fully assess performance against all GAP indicators.

Cumulative progress update (Entire period)

A total of 134,412 female beneficiaries reached till date under activity 2.1 through various climate-resilient livelihood activities, including System of Rice Intensification, crab fattening, ornamental fisheries, oyster and mussel farming, seaweed cultivation and fish value addition.

Budget

1,445,377

Currency

USD

Timeline (Planned completion of activity)

31 December 2026

Responsibility

State Project Management Units of Odisha, Maharashtra, and Andhra Pradesh

Remarks/Notes

Target:

- At least 60% of recipients of technical support for climate-adaptive value addition are women
- At least 15% are women from women-headed households

Remarks: State-wise performance under Activity 2.1 — Andhra Pradesh (77%), Odisha (74%), and Maharashtra (33.33%) — reflects a program delivering on its gender commitments across diverse and challenging geographies. All three states are on track.

Catch-up action: Targeted training programmes for women on value addition in seaweed, crab fattening, ornamental fisheries, and the System of Rice Intensification (SRI) are planned, to be conducted by various technical institutes.

GAP Activity	
Activity 2.2 Improving capacities of local communities for community-based adaptation and climate-resilient Livelihoods- strengthens local resilience by building the capacities of communities to identify, plan, and respond to climate-related risks in ways that are contextually appropriate and locally owned. This involves interventions focus on diversifying income sources, promoting climate-smart agriculture, ecosystem-based approaches, and sustainable natural resource management to reduce dependence on climate-sensitive sectors	
Indicator	
Increase per year in number of women active in livelihoods planning structures in target landscapes • Recipients of training on climate adaptive livelihoods are women • Recipients of training on climate adaptive livelihoods are women from women-headed Households	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	10
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
- At least 10% increase per year in number of women active in livelihoods planning structures in target landscapes Overall for Activity 2.1 and 2.2 combined there is an increase of 78% in number of women active in livelihoods planning structures in target landscapes (e.g 105282 women beneficiaries) as compared to the previous year (e.g 58,972 beneficiaries reported last year) - At least 60 percent of the recipients of training on climate adaptive livelihoods are women Overall, 29,842 women (68%) received training on climate-adaptive livelihoods, exceeding the target of at least 60%. State-level performance shows strong participation in Andhra Pradesh (85%) and Odisha (73.6%), while Maharashtra reported 41%, indicating scope for improvement. - At least 16 percent of the recipients of training on climate adaptive livelihoods are women from women-headed Households Only Odisha reported disaggregated data, with 10% of beneficiaries identified as women from women-headed households, slightly below the 16% target. Data gaps from the other two states limit full assessment against this indicator.	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
The reach and impact of these interventions are reflected in the growing number of women who have directly benefited from this work. Overall, 164254 female beneficiaries have been covered under this activity to date — with 58,972 female beneficiaries reached in 2024, and a significantly higher 105282 female beneficiaries in 2025, reflecting both the scaling of efforts and the deepening of community engagement over time. This upward trend underscores the program's commitment to gender-responsive climate resilience, ensuring that women — who are disproportionately affected by climate-related risks — are at the center of local adaptation and resource management efforts.	
Budget	7,082,497
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 December 2026
Responsibility	
State Project Management Units of Odisha, Maharashtra, and Andhra Pradesh	
Remarks/Notes	

Female beneficiaries rose notably from 58,972 in 2024 to 105,282 in 2025, bringing the cumulative total to 164,254—indicating expanded program outreach and coverage. This focus on women as primary beneficiaries aligns with integrating gender considerations into climate resilience programming, given women's heightened vulnerability to climate-related impacts. However, while rising numbers reflect greater reach, assessing true outcomes requires further evidence on the quality, depth, and sustained impact of interventions on beneficiaries' livelihoods.

Catch-up action: Focus will shift toward increasing the number of women-headed households benefiting from each livelihood activity.

GAP Activity

Activity 3.1 Network of institutions for enhanced climate resilience and integrated planning and governance in all coastal states

A robust and interconnected network of institutions plays a pivotal role in strengthening climate resilience and advancing integrated planning and governance across all coastal states of India. Given the heightened vulnerability of coastal ecosystems and communities to climate-induced risks including sea-level rise, cyclones, coastal erosion, and saltwater intrusion fostering institutional collaboration across national, state, and local levels is essential for coordinated and effective climate action. This network brings together government agencies, academic and research institutions, civil society organizations, and community-based bodies to facilitate knowledge exchange, evidence-based decision-making, and the mainstreaming of climate considerations into coastal development planning.

Indicator

1. Increase per year in number of women active in multistakeholder coordination structures in target landscapes 2. District specific, coast EbA knowledge products in local languages are gender sensitive

Rating of Indicator

AMBER (needs attention to be met)

Baseline

0

Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable

10

Annual progress update (Reporting Period)

1. At least 10% increase per year in number of women active in multistakeholder coordination structures in target landscapes

A total of 978 activities and events were organized across the three project states through various institutional platforms, including District and Landscape Level Coordination Committees, Mangrove Co-management Committees, Eco-development Committees, Self-Help Groups, and Panchayati Raj Institutions. These activities reached 44,282 beneficiaries in total, of whom 17,532 were male and 26,750 were female (60%) with a significant increase in number of female participation as compared to the data reported in year 2024 (e.g. 2,802 female beneficiaries) indicating a greater proportion of women engaged under the program.

2. 100% of district specific, coast EbA knowledge products in local languages are gender sensitive
Knowledge products are developed in project status in local languages

Cumulative progress update (Entire period)

Across three project states, 978 activities and events were conducted through institutional platforms including Coordination Committees, Mangrove Co-management Committees, Eco-Development Committees, Self-Help Groups, and Panchayati Raj Institutions, reaching 44,282 beneficiaries 17,532 males (40%) and 26,750 females (60%). This marks a significant rise in women's participation compared to just 2,802 female beneficiaries recorded in 2024, reflecting strong progress in gender inclusion. Women's growing engagement in community platforms has strengthened gender-responsive coastal adaptation planning. Additionally, all project knowledge products are gender-sensitive and available in local languages, ensuring meaningful access for women and marginalized grassroots communities.

Budget	425,326
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 December 2026
Responsibility	
Active participation of women in multi-stakeholder coordination structures has been a significant feature of the program's implementation across target landscapes. A total of 29,552 female beneficiaries have been reported across 2024 and 2025 as having actively engaged in these coordination mechanisms, reflecting a sustained and meaningful involvement of women in collective decision-making and governance processes at the landscape level.	
Remarks/Notes	
Notable strides were made in ensuring women's meaningful participation in multi-stakeholder coordination structures across target landscapes. A cumulative total of 29,552 female beneficiaries were actively engaged through institutional platforms such as District and Landscape Level Coordination Committees, Mangrove Co-management Committees, Eco-development Committees, Self-Help Groups, and Panchayati Raj Institutions—contributing directly to climate resilience planning, ecosystem governance, and natural resource management. Steady engagement across both reporting years demonstrates the program's continued emphasis on gender-inclusive governance and locally driven climate adaptation strategies. Catch-up action: A cadre of women champions will be trained and capacitated in Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh, following the model established in Odisha.	
GAP Activity	
Activity 3.2 Integrating ecosystem-centric approaches to climate change adaptation into public and private sector policies, plans and budgets, and scaling up finance for EbA Integrating ecosystem-centric approaches to climate change adaptation into public and private sector policies, plans, and budgets represents a critical and transformative step toward building long-term climate resilience in India. Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) which harnesses the role of healthy ecosystems such as mangroves, wetlands, forests, and coastal habitats in buffering communities against climate-related risks must be systematically embedded within national and subnational planning frameworks, sectoral policies, and financial mechanisms to achieve meaningful and sustained impact. This requires deliberate policy mainstreaming across key sectors including environment, agriculture, fisheries, urban development, water resource management, and disaster risk reduction, ensuring that ecosystem considerations are not treated as peripheral but are central to development planning and investment decisions.	
Indicator	
1) EbA plans for coastal Smart Cities are gender-Sensitive participating in national intersectoral dialogues on coastal EbA 2) Increase per 2 years in number of women	
Rating of Indicator	AMBER (needs attention to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	10
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
Not reported for this year	

Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
Not reported	
Budget	0
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 December 2026
Responsibility	
Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India	
Remarks/Notes	
Target - At least 10% increase per 2 years in number of women participating in national intersectoral dialogues on coastal EbA 100% of EbA plans for coastal Smart Cities are gender-Sensitive *Budget* Co-finance activity *Remarks* Target off-track for all three project states. With the initiation of the National Coastal Mission in the year 2025, The EbA plans for coastal smart cities would be developed. This activity is co-financed by the Government. Catch-up action: Conduct meetings with the Ministry and the three Responsible Parties to initiate the development of gender-sensitive coastal smart cities.	
GAP Activity	
Activity 3.3. Knowledge management for coastal resilience Knowledge management serves as a foundational pillar for building and sustaining coastal resilience in India, enabling the systematic generation, documentation, synthesis, and dissemination of evidence, experiences, and best practices drawn from on-the-ground implementation. Under Activity 3.3, efforts are directed toward establishing robust knowledge management systems that capture lessons learned from ecosystem-based adaptation interventions, community-level climate resilience initiatives, and multi-stakeholder governance processes across India's diverse coastal landscapes. This includes the development and dissemination of knowledge products such as case studies, technical guidelines, policy briefs, training manuals, and research publications that translate field-level insights into actionable evidence for practitioners, policymakers, and development partners.	
Indicator	
- Exchange visit participants include women - EbA vocational /academic training courses beneficiaries include women	
Rating of Indicator	AMBER (needs attention to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	50
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	

A diverse range of capacity-building activities, training sessions, and events have been conducted across multiple levels to enhance community knowledge and foster grassroots engagement on climate and conservation themes. These have included exposure visits and environmental awareness programs organized around key global observances such as Earth Day, World Wetlands Day, International Women's Day, International Day for Biological Diversity, World Ocean Day, and Coastal Clean-Up Day, held across various districts. Such events provided meaningful platforms for community members particularly women and youth to engage in dialogues and hands-on activities centered on ecosystem conservation and climate resilience. Collectively, 60% of all participants in these events were female, accounting for 26,750 beneficiaries, underscoring the program's strong gender-inclusive outreach. At the state level, Andhra Pradesh organized 98 programs reaching 8,676 beneficiaries, comprising 7,576 males and 1,100 females. Maharashtra conducted 34 programs that benefited 2,058 individuals, of whom 1,126 were male and 932 were female. Odisha recorded the highest outreach, with 846 programs covering 33,548 beneficiaries — including 8,830 males and 24,718 females — reflecting a remarkably strong representation and participation of women across its programs.

Cumulative progress update (Entire period)

Against the program targets of ensuring at least 50% female participation in both exchange visits and EbA vocational/academic training courses, the cumulative data reflects encouraging and consistent progress. A total of 68,801 female beneficiaries have been recorded to date across these activities, comprising 42,051 females reported in 2024 and 26,750 females reported in 2025. This cumulative figure not only demonstrates the program's sustained outreach to women across reporting periods but also indicates that female participation has been actively prioritized and systematically tracked as a key performance benchmark.

Budget	622,352
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 December 2026

Responsibility

State Project Management Units of Odisha, Maharashtra, and Andhra Pradesh
National Project Management Unit

Remarks/Notes

The cumulative engagement of 68,801 female beneficiaries across exchange visits and EbA vocational and academic training reflects steady progress toward the program's target of at least 50% female participation. Consistent reporting indicates a structured approach to gender-responsive programming. However, sustaining these gains will require continued investment in targeted outreach, institutional capacity, and enabling environments supporting women's meaningful participation beyond mere attendance. Greater emphasis on tracking qualitative outcomes—knowledge retention, skill application, and women's enhanced role in local decision-making—will be critical to demonstrating deeper, lasting impact.

Catch-up action: Develop knowledge products, including training materials focused on women beneficiaries, for use across capacity-building programs.

F.9. Gender Action Plan implementation review

Is the gender expert for the project/programme engaged to support the implementation of the gender action plan? If engaged previously, please advise if the gender expert has been retained by the project/programme, including plans to engage another expert if a previously engaged expert has left the project/programme.

Yes ☒ No ☐

The Gender Analyst engaged at UNDP Country Office provides technical and assurance support to the project in implementing gender-responsive interventions. Complementing this, the Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) personnel at the State Project Management Unit (SPMU) level serve as Gender Focal Points, ensuring effective operationalization of the Gender Action Plans (GAPs). These arrangements facilitate integration of gender considerations across planning, implementation, monitoring, and reporting processes. Through capacity-building, guidance, and continuous oversight, the project promotes equitable participation, strengthens women's empowerment, and ensures that both men and women

benefit from climate-resilient livelihood and ecosystem-based adaptation interventions in a transformative and inclusive manner.	
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 ☐
Yes. Implementation of the Gender Action Plan (GAP) is consistent with the Funded Activity Agreement (FAA) requirements on gender compliance and with GCF's Updated Gender Policy 2020–2023. The continued sex-disaggregated reporting, gender-responsive livelihood design, and integration of women's SHGs in planning and delivery aligns with updated policy. The project-specific Gender Action Plan provides dedicated budget allocations across 3 outputs. These allocations support gender-sensitive vulnerability assessments, women's participation targets (60 percent in livelihoods), SHG strengthening, and gender-responsive governance mechanisms. The implementation of GAP has resulted in tangible progress toward gender equality across leadership, decision making, community participation, and monitoring systems. This achievement demonstrates the project's commitment to inclusivity and sustainability in adherence with FAA and GCF's Updated Gender Policy.	
Are the planned activities, targets, indicators, timelines, etc. on track during the reporting period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
Overall, the planned activities and targets are largely on track with some outputs with good progress while delays in few. Methodology for socio-economic vulnerability is still in the process of finalization. However, activities related to building climate-resilient livelihoods and enterprises through value chains and strengthened access to markets have gained pace. 63% of the total beneficiaries on climate resilient livelihood demonstrations activities are women against the target of 50%. The percentage recorded includes both women and women headed households. 60% of the total women participations were reported in different multistakeholder meetings, awareness activities and events. Women's engagement in SHGs, co-management committees and training events is progressing, with expanded mobilization platforms and NGO Onboarding.	
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 ☒
N/A	
Are the reported results on track to contribute to meeting the sex-disaggregated targets for the direct beneficiaries in the funding proposal, if applicable?	Yes ☒ No ☐
The reported results are on track to contribute meeting the sex-disaggregated targets for direct beneficiaries, though continued effort is required to maintain proportional balance across States. Beyond direct women beneficiaries, SHG platforms demonstrate strong institutionalized female engagement across project activities.	
Has the project/programme experienced any implementation challenges that affect gender-related activities? If yes, please include lessons learnt and how they are informing ongoing actions.	Yes ☒ No ☐
Ensuring consistent and fair inclusion of women, especially from SC/ST and vulnerable groups in livelihood opportunities remained a key area of focus. As activities expanded to new villages, the need to maintain active FPIC processes became essential to avoid any perception of exclusion or uninformed participation. The project strengthened coordination with State-run livelihood programs like UMED (MSRLM) and MAVIM through convergence to ensure women's participation, resource efficiency and harmonization with government-led livelihood missions. In Maharashtra, revised fund routing and multi-tier approvals delayed livelihood unit establishment and transfers to SHGs. This temporarily slowed women-led enterprise rollout and bank linkage processes. Women's participation improves significantly when NGOs and	

SHG federations are actively engaged. Gender-responsive planning must account for climate risks and weather-informed contingencies with streamlined fund flow to enhance women's enterprises.

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 ☐

During the reporting period, several best practices and emerging case examples were identified demonstrating women and female-headed households acting as agents of climate action, particularly in ecosystem restoration and climate-adaptive livelihoods. Institutionalizing women Climate Champions as local knowledge intermediaries improves sustained community engagement and accelerates adoption of adaptive practices as detailed in the compendium documenting the best practices demonstrated by Climate Champions in Odisha. Leveraging existing SHG federations reduces entry barriers for women into non-traditional, higher-value aquaculture enterprises wherein a SHG cluster in Sindhudurg diversified from traditional fish vending into ornamental fisheries, generating supplementary income and reducing climate-related income variability. Climate-smart agriculture interventions are more rapidly adopted when delivered through women's groups and supported by demonstration plots led by women. In the reporting period, women are not only beneficiaries but active agents of restoration, livelihood diversification, and climate governance. Documentation efforts (including photo documentation, videos, training registers, and field narratives) have strengthened gender-responsive reporting.

Provide planned activities on gender elements for the next reporting period

Activity 1.1: Conduct socio-economic vulnerability assessments across project landscapes to guide ecosystem-based adaptation strategies, ensuring at least 50% participation from women and marginalized groups. Piloted at Pulicat Lake; will be replicated after Project Board approval, with FPIC principles applied throughout. (Q2 2026) Activity 1.2: Engage women in restoring coastal ecosystems, mangroves, seagrass, and coral reefs by strengthening leadership through SHGs, climate champions, and Eco-Development Committees, with women participating across planning, implementation, monitoring, and community engagement in all project states. IIT Bhubaneswar is planning specialized seagrass and saltmarsh training in Odisha. (Q1–Q4 2026) Activity 2.1: Provide technical assistance to women and marginalized groups for climate-resilient livelihoods across value chains, with government linkages. Targeted training planned by CIBA, CIFA, and qualified private organizations. (Q1–Q4 2026) Activity 2.2: Organize village-level capacity-building on diversified livelihoods, SRI, crab fattening, ornamental fisheries, seaweed cultivation, aquaculture for vulnerable households via SHGs, CBOs, and Panchayati Raj institutions, ensuring 50% women's participation to boost income and resilience. (Q1–Q4 2026) Activity 3.1: Strengthen women-led institutions and platforms, producing gender-sensitive EbA knowledge products and video documentaries featuring Climate Champions and best practices. (Q1–Q4 2026) Activity 3.2: Embed women's needs into climate policies and Smart City plans via two women-exclusive coastal calculator trainings. (Q4 2026) Activity 3.3: Develop and translate national knowledge products for training women's groups and SHGs. (Q1–Q4 2026)

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: 2025 APR_Annex 1 GHG CO2 mitigation calculation.xlsx
Annex 2: Communication and visibility material
File Name: 2025 APR_Annex 2 Communication and visibility material.docx
Annex 3: List of grievances received
File Name: 2025 APR_Annex 3 List of grievances received.docx
Annex 4: Procurement information
No annexes provided.
Annex 5: Updated implementation timetable for the Funded Activity for the following year
File Name: 2025 APR_Annex 5 Implementation plan.docx
Annex 6: Updated Gender Assessment and/or Action Plan
No annexes provided.
Additional Annexes (if applicable)
File Name: 2025 APR_Stakeholder Engagement list.docx File Name: Stakeholder Engagement list.docx

