
Annual Performance Report

Project/Programme title: Carbon Sequestration through Climate Investment in Forests and Rangelands in Kyrgyz Republic (CS-FOR) (FP116)

Accredited Entity: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Date of Report submission: 15 April 2026

Version number V1.0



Contents

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

RATIONALE

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

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

METHODOLOGY

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

A. PROJECT DATA (Prefilled where possible)				
Should any information/data prefilled from Section A.1 to Section A.12 be incorrect or require updating, please inform GCF's Project Lead of appropriate corrective action.				
A.1. Date of report submission		15 April 2026		
A.2. Project or programme	Project	A.3. Sector	Public	
A.4. Total Financing (GCF + Cofinance)	GCF Financing		Mill. USD 30.0	
	Grants		Mill. USD 30.0	
	Co-Financing		Mill. USD 20.0	
	Grants		Mill. USD 0.400	
	SeniorLoans		Mill. USD 15.0	
	Other		Mill. USD 3.6	
	InKind		Mill. USD 0.999	
	Total Financing		Mill. USD 50.0	
A.5. Total GCF funding disbursed to this date	NA (draft)			
A.6. Implementation period	From 1 January 2018 to NA			
A.7. ESS Category (Refers to GCF revised <u>Environmental and Social Policy</u> and GCF ESS Standards to assess your FP category.)			Category B	
A.8. Executing Entity Information				
Full legal name	Country of registration (or, for intl orgs, country of HQ)	Entity type	Role in project	Focal Point(s) and email(s)
Russian-Kyrgyz Development Fund (RKDF)	Kyrgyzstan	Private sector – Registered legal entities which are not government-controlled (e.g. forprofit entities, financial institutions)	Executing Entity	office@rkdf.org
Community Development and Investment Agency (ARIS)	Kyrgyzstan	Public sector – Government-controlled subnational, national or regional entity	Executing Entity	office@aris.kg
Forest Service under the Ministry of Emergency Situations	Kyrgyzstan	Public Sector - Government acting through a ministry or department	Executing Entity	info@mnr.gov.kg
FAO Kyrgyztan	Kyrgyzstan	UN System Entity – a specialized agency, subsidiary organ or other part of the UN system	Executing Entity	FAO-KG@fao.org

A.9. Co-Financier information				
Full legal name	Country of registration <i>(or, for intl orgs, country of HQ)</i>	Focal Point(s) and email(s)	Ownership Type	Beneficial Owner(s)
Russian-Kyrgyz Development Fund (RKDF)	Kyrgyzstan	office@rkdf.org	Private Entity	Russian Federation and Kyrgyz Republic
FAO Kyrgyzstan	Kyrgyzstan	FAO-KG@fao.org	UN System Entity – a specialized agency, subsidiary organ or other part of the UN system	UN
Community Development and Investment Agency (ARIS)	Kyrgyzstan	office@aris.kg	Government	Government of the Kyrgyz Republic
Kyrgyz Republic's Ministry of Agriculture, Food Industry, and Melioration (MAFIM)	Kyrgyzstan	Mr. Azamat Shamiev	Government	Government of the Kyrgyz Republic
Ministry of Agriculture	Kyrgyzstan	info@agro.gov.kg	Government of the Kyrgyz Republic	Kyrgyz population

A.10. Alignment with country NDCs & NAP <i>(NB Only populate if applicable, e.g., if your project/programme specifically contributes to a country's NDC or NAP target/s)</i>				
Country	Date of NDC/ NAP submission	NDC/ NAP objective	Brief description of project's alignment with NDC/ NAP objectives	Percentage of target met with proposed project. Beneficial owner(s)
Kyrgyzstan	2 February 2025	Kyrgyzstan NDC objective is to increase carbon sequestration and strengthen resilience through sustainable forest and rangeland management.	The project promotes afforestation, sustainable forest and rangeland management, and climate-resilient land-use practices. These interventions enhance carbon sequestration, reduce land degradation, and strengthen resilience of mountain ecosystems, contributing directly to Kyrgyz Republic's NDC mitigation and adaptation priorities.	100%

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

B. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

B.1. Summary

The project increased carbon sequestration through improving forests and rangelands management, strengthening institutional capacity, mobilizing communities, and initiating landscape restoration activities.

A key milestone was the development and approval of 12 Integrated Natural Resource Management and Climate Resilient Plans (INRMCRPs), guiding sustainable land use and climate adaptation at community level. To implement these plans, 12 Community Landscape Management Groups were created and engaged in planning and monitoring natural resource use. Social mobilization reached more than 3,300 community members, including 55% women and 24% youth, ensuring inclusive participation.

The project delivered tangible environmental results. Forest plantations and orchards were established on 143.32 ha hectares, using local forest and income generating species such as apple, apricot, walnut, and poplar, contributing to increased vegetation cover and long-term carbon sequestration amounted to -1,520.93 tCO₂-eq. Environmental and social safeguards were strengthened through the approval of the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) and 11 site-specific ESMPs for forestry activities. To support evidence-based land management, monitoring systems using geospatial analysis and satellite data were introduced to assess pasture productivity and identify degraded areas. Despite limited technical capacity and grazing pressure, targeted training, institutional partnerships, and participatory planning addressed these barriers

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)

Overall Progress in 2025

In 2025, the project "Carbon Sequestration through Climate Investment in Forests and Rangelands in the Kyrgyz Republic (CS-FOR)" made substantial progress across governance, ecosystem restoration, and climate-resilient investments. Activities focused on establishing the institutional, technical, and social foundations necessary for long-term ecosystem restoration and carbon sequestration.

A central milestone was the development and approval of 12 Integrated Natural Resource Management and Climate Resilience Plans (INRMCRPs) covering forests, pastures, land, biodiversity, and water resources, across target municipalities which introduce improved pasture rotation practices, restoration of degraded lands, biodiversity conservation, and satellite-based vegetation monitoring, enabling more systematic assessment of pasture conditions and degradation trends. These were developed through participatory processes involving local government bodies, community members, and technical experts, with at least 30 % participation of women and youth.

The project supported the development of 12 INRMCRPs and establishment of 12 Community Landscape Management Groups (CLMGs) and, a key instrument to support the implementation of INRMPCRPs.

Ecosystem restoration activities were also initiated, with forest plantations and orchards established across 143.32 hectares (ha), including local forest and income generating species. Estimated carbon sequestration from these plantations reached -1520.93 tCO₂eq.

Market assessments and value chain analyses were conducted to identify viable green economic opportunities in sectors such as livestock production, non-timber forest products, and climate-resilient agriculture. Engagement with financial institutions led to the preparation of a concessional credit line designed to support climate-friendly rural enterprises in project districts.

Key Achievements by Component

Component 1

Community mobilization was completed in all 12 target municipalities, resulting in the establishment of 12 Community Landscape Management Groups (CLMGs), a key instrument to support the implementation of INRMPCRPs. Social mobilization activities included 89 village-level meetings, 12 municipal consultations, and 351 focus group discussions, reaching over 3,300 community members (55% women, 24% youth). This inclusive engagement strengthened community ownership of the planning process and improved the integration of local priorities into landscape management plans.

Communication activities strengthened awareness and outreach. Outputs included 7 video products, 2 printed materials, and a branded field kit. Outreach reached an estimated 547,247 people, including 11,206 through direct events and training and over 526,000 through social media.

At national level, the project supported development of the National Afforestation and Reforestation Strategy to 2050, forest plantation standards, and a monitoring and verification methodology for plantations, in collaboration with the Forest Institute of the National Academy of Sciences. These materials help strengthen the national framework for climate resilient forestry and are referenced in Section G.

These achievements significantly enhanced local governance capacity for sustainable natural resource management and helped communities address land degradation and climate risks in a coordinated manner.

Component 2

Significant progress was achieved in strengthening forest landscape restoration planning, environmental safeguards, and technical capacity for climate-resilient forestry. Forest activities across **143.32 ha of forest plantations and orchards** were screened, assessed, and implemented in pilot districts. These restoration activities included the planting of fruit and forest species such as walnut, apple, apricot, and poplar, contributing both to ecosystem restoration and diversification of rural livelihoods.

Environmental and social safeguards were fully integrated into forestry interventions. The project finalized and disclosed the **general ESMP** and conducted environmental and social screening for forestry sites planned for 2025 and 2026. As a result, **11 site-specific ESMPs** were prepared and implemented for forestry activities. These safeguards ensure that restoration activities comply with environmental and social standards while minimizing risks to local communities and ecosystems.

The national technical framework for forest restoration was strengthened through the development of key normative documents, including methodologies for plantation monitoring, establishment guidelines and standards for transferring plantations into officially recognized forest land. Climate risk assessments for spruce, juniper, walnut and pistachio, alongside geospatial analyses of forest distribution across altitude and climate zones, improved the precision and climate resilient of future restoration planning. Field assessments for restoration activities scheduled for 2026–2030 established a strong pipeline of ecologically suitable sites.

To strengthen rangeland management capacities, FAO and the Department of Pasture prepared contributions to the **2026 Regional School for Young Pastoralists**, including two practical workshops at SonKul on pasture monitoring, sustainable grazing and drone-based data collection.

In response to a request from the Veterinary, Livestock Development, Pasture and Feed Service, FAO signed a **Letter of Agreement** to support national pasture monitoring through the development of a modern **Information System on Pasture Conditions**. Training, data digitization, satellite analysis and drone-based field verification were complemented by provision of essential equipment to enable independent national level monitoring.

Public awareness improved through outreach events and a televised report showcasing community-based pasture management, reaching over **3,000 viewers online** and more than **5,500 people** through social media. Environmental education was further supported through distribution of **1,000 fruit seedlings** to 25 schools in partnership with local communities and members of the Supreme Council of Kyrgyzstan (Jogorku Kenesh).

Collectively, these actions strengthened institutional capacity for climate resilient forest and pasture management, established safeguards for scaling restoration and contributed to increased carbon sequestration across project landscapes. In April 2025, CSFOR also co-organized the International Mountain Conference, where a dedicated session showcased the project's contribution to climate adaptation and carbon sequestration efforts through forest and pasture restoration.

Component 3

The project advanced climate-smart business development and green value chains in forests, non-timber forest products (NTFPs), fruits, and livestock. Key activities included market and value chain assessments (139 interviews, 16 focus groups), technical support to green value chains and entrepreneurs, and training on livestock management, business development and NTFP collection. National consultants delivered business plan templates, mentoring, and investment guidance, while collaboration with financial institutions enabled development of a concessional credit line.

The project also strengthened collaboration with financial institutions to mobilize green investments. A roundtable discussion with financial institutions was organized to explore financing mechanisms for climate-resilient enterprises. As a result, a framework was developed for establishing a **concessional credit line** that will provide financial support to small and medium enterprises engaged in sustainable agriculture, livestock production, and forest-based value chains.

Environmental and social safeguards were also integrated into the design of investment activities. The project developed an **ESS screening checklist for business plans** and guidance for preparing site-specific environmental and social management plans for investment subprojects.

Certification preparation for sustainable forest and organic products was initiated. These activities strengthened local enterprises, improved climate resilience, promoted sustainable resource use, and laid the foundation for scaling green investments and livelihoods.

These activities establish institutional and financial foundations for scaling climate-smart investments that diversify rural incomes while contributing to sustainable land management and reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

Innovations & Emerging Good Practices

The project introduced several innovative approaches that combine participatory governance with advanced environmental monitoring technologies. One of the most notable innovations is the **Integrated Natural Resource Management and Climate Resilience Planning model**, which brings together holistic and integrated management of forests, pastures, water, and agricultural land into a single landscape-level planning framework. This integrated approach allows communities to address land degradation and climate risks in a coordinated manner.

Another important innovation is the integration of **remote sensing and geospatial analysis** into natural resource management planning and monitoring. Satellite-based vegetation monitoring using indices such as NDVI provides objective data on pasture productivity and vegetation trends over time. This information helps identify degraded areas and prioritize restoration interventions.

The project also demonstrated strong progress in applying **gender-responsive and inclusive planning approaches**, ensuring meaningful participation of women and youth in community consultations and decision-making processes.

These approaches represent promising models that can be replicated and scaled through national natural resource management programs.

Challenges & Risk Mitigation

Implementation during the reporting period required navigating complex operational conditions, including work in remote mountainous areas and the need for specialized technical expertise. The project responded by strengthening collaboration with national institutions, engaging qualified national experts and consulting firms, and ensuring effective coordination to maintain progress across components.

Environmental risks, including overgrazing and pasture degradation, remain important considerations. These are being addressed through improved pasture management planning, community engagement and enhanced monitoring systems that support more sustainable grazing practices.

Environmental and social safeguards were applied consistently, including systematic screening, public consultations and preparation of site-specific ESMPs. These measures helped ensure that restoration and investment activities were undertaken responsibly, reduced potential risks to communities and ecosystems, and supported the long-term sustainability of natural resource management in project areas.

Priorities for 2026

The project will scale implementation of the INRMCRPs by expanding forest and pasture restoration and strengthening monitoring systems for forests and rangelands. A major priority will be increasing the supply of high-quality planting material through the modernization of two forest nurseries, including improved irrigation, seed storage, climate resilient species selection and enhanced propagation techniques. Training for nursery staff will ensure reliable seedling production for largescale restoration efforts.

The project will also operationalize the concessional credit line for climate friendly enterprises and continue developing sustainable value chains in livestock and non-timber forest products. Strengthening the capacities of local governments and community groups will remain central to ensuring long-term sustainability, supporting increased carbon sequestration, healthier ecosystems and more resilient rural livelihoods.

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	2,962,703	7,900,544	19,751,354	0	1,520	1,520

(PMF) M1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO ₂ eq) reduced as a result of GCF-funded projects/programmes (IRMF) Core 1 Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered							
Provide the total GHG emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered (tCO ₂ eq) as a result of GCF support, disaggregated by result area.							
Unit							Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent
Disaggregation by: Result Areas (Mitigation)	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Lifetime	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Forestry and land use	0	2,962,703	7,900,544	19,751,354	0	1,520	1,520

(PMF) M1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO ₂ eq) reduced as a result of GCF-funded projects/programmes (IRMF) Core 1 Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered							
Provide the total GHG emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered (tCO ₂ eq), disaggregated by Country.							
Unit							Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Lifetime	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Kyrgyzstan	0	2,962,703	7,900,544	19,751,354	0	1,520	1,520

Forestry and land use

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) M9.1 Hectares of land or forests under improved and effective management that contributes to CO ₂ emission reductions (IRMF) Core 4: Hectares of natural resource areas brought under improved low emission and/or climate resilient management practices					
Provide the total degraded or converted ecosystems under restoration (ha).					
Unit					Hectares
Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value <i>(automatically calculated)</i>
	Mid-term	Final target			
0	867,075	279,412	0	155	155

(PMF) M9.1 Hectares of land or forests under improved and effective management that contributes to CO ₂ emission reductions (IRMF) Core 4: Hectares of natural resource areas brought under improved low emission and/or climate resilient management practices						
Provide the total degraded or converted ecosystems under restoration (ha), disaggregated by country.						
Unit						Hectares
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Kyrgyzstan	0	867,075	279,412	0	155	155

(PMF) M9.1 Hectares of land or forests under improved and effective management that contributes to CO2 emission reductions (IRMF) Core 4: Hectares of natural resource areas brought under improved low emission and/or climate resilient management practices						
Provide the total degraded or converted ecosystems under restoration (ha), disaggregated by land type.						
Unit						Hectares
Disaggregation by: Land Type	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Forest Land (afforestation)	0	75,144	31,572	0	155	155
Grassland	0	791,931	276,255	0	0	0

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by 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	86,490	432,450	12,761	11,615	24,376

(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	37,191	185,953	3,745	6,309	10,054
Female	0	49,299	246,497	3,076	5,306	8,382

(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
Kyrgyzstan	0	86,490	432,450	12,761	11,615	24,376

(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
Livelihoods of people and communities	0	86,490	432,450	12,761	11,615	24,376

(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	32,433	162,168	11,208	18,927	30,135
Female	0	75,678	378,394	10,140	15,918	26,058

(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
Kyrgyzstan	0	86,490	432,450	12,761	11,615	24,376

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	37,191	185,953	3,745	6,309	10,054
Female	0	49,299	246,497	3,076	5,306	8,382

(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
Kyrgyzstan	0	86,490	432,450	12,761	11,615	24,376

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.

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	867,075	307,827	0	155	155

(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
Kyrgyzstan	0	867,075	307,827	0	155	155

(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
Forest	0	75,144	31,572	0	155	155
Grassland	0	791,931	276,255	0	0	0

Project Specific Indicators

Indicator	Unit	Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
			Mid-term	Final target			
A5.2 Number and level of effective coordination mechanisms	No. of Coordination Mechanisms	0	1	1	1	0	1

Activities

Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

C.2.1. Subprojects

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

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

C.3. Compliance with FAA covenants

Yes ☒ No ☐

C.4. Funded Activity Implementation Arrangements in the Following Year

Yes ☒ No ☐

By Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Kyrgyz Republic dated 27 January 2025 No. 39, the Department of Breeding Livestock, Pastures, and Fodder under the Ministry of Water Resources, Agriculture, and Processing Industry was merged with the Veterinary Service under the same Ministry and renamed the "Service for Veterinary Affairs, Livestock Development, Pastures, and Fodder under the Ministry of Water Resources, Agriculture, and Processing Industry of the Kyrgyz Republic.

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	Test0		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Money Laundering (ML) & Terrorist Financing (TF)		
Description	Test		
Consequences	Test		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	Test		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Comments	Test		
Risk 2	Test1		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Sanctions		
Description	Test		
Consequences	Test		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	Test		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low

Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Comments	Test		
Risk 3	Test2		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Fraud / Bribery & Corruption / Collusion and any other prohibited practice		
Description	Test		
Consequences	Test		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	Test		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Comments	Test		
Risk 4	Test3		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Conflict of interest		
Description	Test		
Consequences	Test		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	Test		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Comments	Test		
Risk 5	Implementation Risks under Climate Change Conditions		
Risk Origin	External Factors		
Risk Area	Natural hazard		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Projected shifts in climate zones may create a mismatch between current altitude planning for afforestation and reforestation activities and the climatic conditions expected by the mid-21st century. According to the Analytical Report on the Assessment of Climatic Conditions in the CS-FOR Project Target Districts (2025), under SSP245–SSP585 climate scenarios, average annual air temperature in the pilot districts has increased over the past 30 years and is projected to continue beyond. Climate modelling indicates an upward shift of optimal elevation zones for key forest species by approximately 300–400 m, which may reduce survival and growth rates of forest plantations under current distribution. Although natural upward migration of forest species occurs over time, the projected pace of temperature increase exceeds natural dispersal and adaptation rates. Consequently, without climate informed adjustments to planting elevations and species selection, there is a risk of maladaptation, undermining the ecological and economic performance of forest interventions.		
Consequences	The projected shifts in the climate zones may result in: Reduced survival of forest plantations, failure to translate forest cultures into forest-covered land, decreased carbon sequestration performance and potential underachievement of FP116 mitigation targets (19.8 MtCO₂eq) (Annex 1 Funding Proposal)		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 4 - High	Severity 12 - Medium High

Mitigation Measure(s)	• Use climate projections SSP245/SSP585 for planting altitude planning • Apply vertical climate gradient models • Revise technical standards for plantation zoning- Introduce assisted migration practices, transferring seed sources from lower/warmer zones to higher elevations • Introduce mixed forest culture rather than monoculture to reduce vulnerability to climate stressors, pests, and diseases. • Prioritize climate-resilient and drought-tolerant species • Annual monitoring of survival rates		
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 6	Overgrazing Pressure and High Level of Pasture Degradation in Suzak and Uzgen Districts		
Risk Origin	External Factors		
Risk Area	Natural hazard		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Suzak and Uzgen districts are experiencing significant anthropogenic pressure on pasturelands. As of 1 January 2025, livestock numbers in Suzak district amount to 29,230 livestock units over 21,333.6 ha of pasture (1.37 livestock units/ha), while in Uzgen district livestock numbers reach 15,463 livestock units over 14,014 ha (1.10 livestock units/ha). Considering an ecologically sustainable grazing capacity for semi-arid degraded pastures of approximately 0.6–0.8 livestock units per hectare, the current grazing pressure exceeds sustainable levels by: • 70–130% in Suzak district • 40–85% in Uzgen district Such exceedance has already resulted in a high level of pasture degradation, including reduced vegetation cover, soil compaction, and increased erosion processes. The persistently high livestock population is unlikely to decrease in the short term, creating continuous risk of seedling trampling, browsing damage, and plantation failure in CS-FOR afforestation sites.		
Consequences	• Damage and mortality of planted seedlings • Accelerated soil erosion, soil compaction, and land degradation • Increased costs for fencing and protection measures • Risk of underachievement of CS-FOR afforestation targets		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	4 - High	12 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	• Physical protection of plantation sites using temporary fencing of newly established plantations • Alternative grazing and fodder support through establishment of additional fodder production plots • Introduction of regulated community-based grazing schemes • Seasonal grazing restrictions in afforestation areas • Improve the livestock monitoring schemes through innovative approaches • Integration of pasture management plans with CS-FOR activities • Engagement with local pasture committees and communities		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 7	Delays in procurement by Project Implementation Unit (PIU) Forest Service (FS) which led to delays delivering fencing to the planted areas		
Risk Origin	Partner Related		
Risk Area	Partner capacity and suitability		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		

Description	Delays in procurement by the PIU FS resulted in late delivery of fencing materials to the planted areas. As a consequence, several sites remained unprotected for an extended period following planting. Due to the high density of livestock in the surrounding areas, this lack of timely fencing led to moderate damage to the planted seedlings, primarily through grazing and trampling. The damage has affected seedling survival rates and may require replanting and additional maintenance efforts.		
Consequences	Due to high population of livestock caused moderate damage of planted seedlings Risk of underachievement of CS-FOR afforestation targets in 2025		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	To address these challenges, several mitigation measures are being implemented. Efforts are underway to improve procurement planning and timelines to ensure the timely delivery and installation of fencing and other protective infrastructure in future planting cycles. In addition, consultations are being conducted with local communities to raise awareness and agree on seasonal grazing restrictions in areas adjacent to afforestation sites. Engagement with local pasture committees is being strengthened to support community-based monitoring and enforcement of these restrictions. Furthermore, on time fencing solutions are being introduced to protect newly established plantations during the most vulnerable early growth stages. These measures are complemented by increased coordination with local stakeholders to promote shared responsibility for safeguarding planted areas and reducing the risk of damage from livestock.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 6 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 8	Implementation risks		
Risk Origin	Partner Related		
Risk Area	Partner capacity and suitability		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Operational partners are implementing project activities within evolving institutional and procedural environments. While core systems and capacities are in place, some processes—particularly related to procurement documentation, internal coordination, and workload planning—continue to be strengthened and aligned with project requirements. Recent audit and assessment processes identified areas where further improvements are ongoing, particularly in ensuring consistency of documentation, traceability of transactions, and coordination of implementation processes		
Consequences	This may result in temporary inefficiencies in implementation, including delays in procurement processing, reporting, or verification, particularly during periods of scaling up activities		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Mitigation measures are being implemented through Annex 9 – Risk Mitigation and Assurance Plan, including strengthening internal procedures, improving procurement documentation and record-keeping, enhancing coordination mechanisms, and aligning operational processes with FAO requirements		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 4 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 4 - Medium
Comments	N/A		

D.2. Report risk incidents

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

(this section is confidential)

E. FINANCIAL INFORMATION

E.1. GCF financing

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

Country	Instrument	Currency (as per FAA)	Committed Amount	Disbursed Amount	Expenditure (reporting year)	Cumulative Expenditure	Mitigation	Adaptation
Kyrgyzstan	Grants	USD	29,988,520	7,510,707	2,845,959	4,857,050	50%	50%
Total		USD	29,988,520	7,510,707	2,845,959	4,857,050	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
Russian-Kyrgyz Development Fund - RKDF	Loans	USD	15,000,000	0	0	0	50%	50%
beneficiaries	In-kind	USD	3,602,000	0	0	0	50%	50%
Forestry Service FS	In-kind	USD	340,000	0	30,394.93	68,648.17	50%	50%
ARIS	In-kind	USD	342,480	0	34,257.57	99,524.5	50%	50%
Gov of Kyrgyzstan	In-kind	USD	317,000	0	35,353.92	53,918.05	50%	50%
FAO	Grants	USD	400,000	0	38,000.19	104,632.19	50%	50%
Total		USD	20,001,480	0	138,006.61	326,722.91	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

No additional finance mobilized information provided.

File Name: CS-FOR_APR2025 grant-financial-progress-detailed_14042026_draft_3 NO ETL.xlsx

F. ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS, GENDER, and INDIGENOUS PEOPLES	
<i>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.</i>	
F.1. progress on key challenges and updates regarding Environmental and Social Safeguards	
Key Environmental and Social Changes <i>Have there been any changes in the key environmental and social risks and impacts? If you tick 'Yes,' please provide further information.</i>	Yes ☐ No ☒
Environmental and Social Safeguarding Updates <i>Have there been any change/update on environmental and social safeguarding? you tick 'Yes,' please provide further information.</i>	Yes ☐ No ☒
F.2. Compliance with laws and regulations applicable to ESS. Gender and Indigenous Peoples.	
Have there been any changes or updates regarding compliance with applicable laws and regulations of the country, as well as the relevant conditions or covenants under the FAA?	Yes ☐ No ☒
F.3. ESS standards implementation progress	
Does this reporting period include any ESS standards-related activities or updates?	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>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.</i>	
Activities implemented during the reporting period, including monitoring	

Human Resources Two ESS specialists were hired by subcontractor ARIS to mobilize beneficiaries, develop grant subproject and business plans, and conduct ESS screenings of 33 subprojects and approximately 100 business plans under Component 3. *Safeguards Documents* The general ESMP has been finalized, approved, and published. Disclosure, training, and implementation are underway. Templates for the Site-Specific Environmental and Social Management Plan (SESMP) and ESS checklist for business plans have been developed, with training provided on their use. ESS screenings were conducted for forestry subprojects across four pilot areas (approx. 1,000 hectares), and 11 site-specific ESMPs were developed and handed over to subproject heads for implementation. Disclosure of Project Information ESS-related materials were widely disseminated through video content and key sessions, including presentations at the National Steering Committee (April 2025), a Forest Service planning workshop (May 2025), a training session for women activists (July 2025), a partner retreat (December 2025), and a Department of Livestock Breeding training (December 2025). *Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)* A weather-resistant information board template was developed for all subproject sites, providing GRM details to local populations and stakeholders. A training for all stakeholders on project implementation mechanisms was held at the Soluxe Hotel, Bishkek (September 2025). *Stakeholder Engagement* Public consultations were conducted during ESS screenings in pilot regions, ensuring women's participation. Sex-disaggregated data was collected to track inclusive engagement. Capacity Building Staff and partners received multiple safeguards trainings, including participation in the GCF Community of Practice event (September 2025), field screening training for regional CS-FOR representatives (October 2025), FAO Grievance Mechanisms training (October 2025), the 16 Days of Activism Against Gender-Based Violence event (November 2025), and mandatory PSEAH training (December 2025).

Outputs during the reporting period

Field ESS screenings were conducted for subprojects across four pilot areas for 2025–2026, covering approximately 1,000 hectares. A total of 11 site-specific Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) were developed for afforestation subprojects on 172 ha and handed over to subproject managers for implementation. The 11 site-specific ESMPs covered forest plantations in the following locations: Uzgen LH, Iyri-Suu AA (Uzgen region), Toguz-Toro LH, Toguz-Toro AA, Ak-Talaa LH, Kara-Burgon AA (Ak-Talaa region), Kara-Alma LH, Ortok LH, Kyz-Kol AA, Kyz-Kol AA (Almaluu-Bulak), and Kyz-Kol AA (Kok-Bulak). The CS-FOR project continued implementing protective measures in line with FAO and GCF safeguard standards, including: - Disclosure of the general ESMP, ESMF, and GRM to all stakeholders and partners. - Familiarization with FAO/GCF ESS policies and standards. - Application of social safeguard measures in subproject planning, covering Stakeholder Engagement, Labor and OHS/Child Labour, Gender and Social Inclusion, SEAH, Biodiversity, and Livestock Management Plans. - Field ESS screenings at all subproject sites planned for 2025–2026, including public consultations. - Integration of ESS policy into INRMCRP development and project documents (TOT, TOR, LoA, agreements).

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

- Due to the high population density in southern Kyrgyzstan, there is a risk in the Uzgen and Suzak districts that local residents will oppose the installation of fencing for afforestation. This would restrict the grazing areas available to local livestock - Due to strong livestock farming traditions, where the primary source of income is livestock that emits the greenhouse gas methane, it will be difficult to implement the general ESMP guidelines under the Livestock Management Plan.

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

N/A

Remarks/Notes

Implementation has faced challenges due to the limited capacity of Leshozes, making it difficult for them to independently fulfill ESMP/ESMF requirements. While site-specific ESMPs are expected to be prepared by beneficiaries for FAO approval, time constraints and low technical capacity often prevent this. To address this, the ESS/GRM Specialist has taken a proactive role by developing site-specific ESMPs for all Leskhoz, Ail Okmotu, and Ail Aimak sites. The Specialist also conducts targeted training sessions to ensure proper understanding and implementation at the local level, bridging capacity gaps and ensuring compliance with FAO and GCF safeguard standards.

F.4. Sub-projects information

Have any subprojects been implemented?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Title of the sub-project	test
ESS management plan/instrument in place	
test	
Stakeholder engagement plan in place	
test	
Activities/engagement conducted with Indigenous peoples	
test	
Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during this reporting period	
test	
Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention	
N/A	

F.5. Implementation of the stakeholder engagement plan	
Were any actions undertaken to increase engagement of relevant stakeholders in the project, particularly regarding environmental, social, and gender elements?	Yes ☒ No ☐
Activities implemented during the reporting period	
During the reporting period, the CS-FOR project implemented the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) in line with the approved ESMP, ensuring inclusive and meaningful stakeholder engagement in environmental, social, and gender aspects. The project carried out formal disclosure of the project's general ESMP, including site-specific ESMPs, to relevant stakeholders at national and local levels. The disclosures were presented during key events such as the National Steering Committee meeting (April 2025) and the Forest Service planning workshop (May 2025), as well as during field-level consultations. These sessions presented the ESMP provisions, mitigation measures, monitoring requirements, and the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), ensuring stakeholders were informed and able to provide feedback prior to and during implementation. A series of ESS training courses and consultations were conducted for government agencies, contractors, and community representatives. These focused on: (i) FAO/GCF Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS 1–9); (ii) environmental and social screening and categorization; (iii) implementation of ESMP/ESMF requirements; (iv) GRM procedures; and (v) gender equality and social inclusion approaches. Field engagement included site visits, ESS screening missions, and consultations with local communities and authorities in target area. These enabled disclosure of site-specific ESMPs at the community level and ensured that local concerns were identified and incorporated into subproject design and mitigation measures. Public consultations and hearings were conducted for subprojects as part of the ESMP disclosure process, ensuring transparency and stakeholder participation. Across all activities, at least 30% of participants were women, with active inclusion of vulnerable groups. Overall, SEP implementation has progressed satisfactorily, with strengthened awareness, transparency, and stakeholder engagement in ESMP implementation.	
Dates and venues of engagement activities	
February 18–27 & March 1–7, 2025: Field meetings and public consultations during ESS screenings across pilot area subproject sites. April 7, 2025: National Project Steering Committee meeting, Park Hotel, Bishkek – ESS, ESMP, GRM, and social inclusion presentation.	

May 29–30, 2025: Forest Service planning workshop, Bishkek Hotel – ESS and stakeholder engagement discussion. July 28, 2025: Training for women activists, CS-FOR office. October 25–30 & November 2–8, 2025: Field consultations across pilot areas. December 3–4, 2025: Partner retreat, Jannat Resort, Bishkek. December 16–17, 2025: Consultation with Department of Livestock Breeding, Europe Hotel, Bishkek.
Sex-disaggregated data on stakeholder engagement participants (male + female = total)
Field meetings and public consultations/hearings for local people and authorities were conducted during ESS screenings of pilot areas and subproject sites on 18–27 February 2025 Participants 48 (7 female, 41 male), 1–7 March 2025 Participants: 55 (16 female, 39 male) , 25–30 October 2025 Participants: 166 (10 female, 156 male) , and 2–8 November 2025 Participants 46 (4 female, 41 male) 7 April 2025 – 4th National Project Steering Committee Meeting: Presentation and discussion of ESS, ESMP, GRM, social inclusion, and the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, including gender aspects. Participants: 39 (12 female, 27 male). 29–30 May 2025 – Workshop organized by the Forest Service in Bishkek: Presentation and discussion on ESS, ESMP, GRM, social inclusion, and Stakeholder Engagement Plan for planning project activities, including gender aspects. Participants: 27 (4 female, 23 male). 3–4 December 2025 – Meeting with LTO and partners at Jannat-Resort, Bishkek: Presentation and discussion of ESS 1–9. Participants: 43 (18 female, 25 male). 16–17 December 2025 – Consultation with Department of Livestock Breeding, Pastures and Feed at Europe Hotel: Participants: 60 (13 female, 47 male). List of CSOs, NGOs and other platforms, initiatives, and organizations that were involved or continue to be engaged: - Local Youth Committee - Local Elders' Committee - Local Women's Jamaats - ToT for contractors as AMUCA, TATC - Consultations for new staff as regional representatives of Forestry PIU of CS-FOR - Local enterprisers - Woman activists - New 18 CLMGs - AFoCO - Republican Soil and Agrochemical Station - Forest Protection and Conservation Station - Forest Institute under the National Academy of Science - Kyrgyz Association of Forest and Land Users (KAFLU)
Information shared with stakeholders
During the reporting period, stakeholders were provided with detailed project and safeguard-related information across all engagement activities. At the March 2025 regional meetings in Chui and Kemin, stakeholders (including contractors) were introduced to the General ESMP, ESMP Framework (ESMPF), and guidance materials (FAO, 2015), with a focus on roles, responsibilities, and compliance requirements. During the April 2025 National Steering Committee meeting, presentations covered FAO/GCF Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS 1–9), the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), and the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP), ensuring high-level understanding of safeguard obligations. At the May 2025 Forest Service workshop, stakeholders received detailed explanations of ESMP/ESMF disclosure, including environmental and social screening procedures, ESS checklists, and templates for site-specific ESMPs, with emphasis on integrating gender considerations into planning. The July 2025 training for women activists focused on climate change, social inclusion, and practical application of ESMP/ESMF tools to strengthen community-level engagement. During field consultations and ESS screening missions, local communities were informed about site-specific ESMPs, mitigation measures, and GRM access. Finally, September and December 2025 meetings and trainings reinforced knowledge on ESS implementation (ESS 1–9), monitoring requirements, and inclusive stakeholder engagement, ensuring stakeholders are equipped for effective participation in project implementation.
Outputs including issues raised and addressed during the reporting period

During the reporting period, stakeholder engagement activities under the CS-FOR project provided important feedback, which was systematically addressed to improve project implementation. At the March 2025 regional meetings in target areas, local stakeholders and contractors raised initial concerns regarding land use and access to grazing areas, particularly where subproject activities (e.g., fencing or reforestation) could affect traditional livestock routes. These concerns were further elaborated during field ESS screenings and community-level consultations, where some residents expressed objections to proposed sites. In response, the project conducted additional consultations with affected communities and local authorities to identify mutually acceptable alternative locations. Several subproject sites were subsequently relocated or adjusted, ensuring continued access to grazing lands and preventing potential livelihood impacts. This approach also ensured that resettlement policies were not triggered. During the April 2025 National Steering Committee meeting and May 2025 Forest Service workshop, stakeholders highlighted the need for clearer communication on ESS procedures and grievance mechanisms. The project addressed this by strengthening information disclosure, improving presentations on the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), and ensuring that contact points were clearly communicated. At the July 2025 training for women activists, participants emphasized the importance of greater inclusion in decision-making and access to project benefits. In response, the project reinforced gender-sensitive approaches, including targeted capacity-building and consideration of preferential access to financing opportunities, which was further discussed during the September 2025 stakeholder meeting. Finally, during the December 2025 trainings, partners requested more practical guidance on ESS implementation. This was addressed through detailed training on ESS 1–9 and hands-on tools (e.g., screening checklists and ESMP templates). Overall, stakeholder feedback was effectively incorporated, demonstrating adaptive management, conflict avoidance, and strengthened trust in project implementation.
Remarks/Notes
N/A

F.6. ESS forward planning and lessons learned	
Are there any planned ESS activities for the next reporting period or lessons learned to share from this period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
Provide planned activities on environmental and social safeguards for the next reporting period	
For the next reporting period, the project will continue implementing ESS field screenings and selection of subprojects and Component 3 business plans, in line with the project ESMP thus ensuring compliance with FAO/GCF safeguard requirements. Site-specific ESMPs and ESS checklists will be prepared, reviewed, and approved for all new subprojects. Capacity-building activities will be carried out through ESS trainings and seminars for Community Landscape Management Groups (CLMGs), local stakeholders, and implementing partners, focusing on practical implementation of safeguard measures. Public hearings and consultations will continue to ensure stakeholder engagement and incorporation of community feedback, including participation of women and vulnerable groups. Disclosure and dissemination of safeguard documents, including ESMPs and GRM procedures, will be maintained at both national and local levels. Regular ESS monitoring of subprojects and business plan implementation will be conducted throughout the reporting period, including field visits and progress reviews to ensure compliance with safeguard standards. Monitoring will be carried out on an ongoing basis during key implementation stages (screening, planning, implementation, and post-implementation), with particular attention to environmental, social, and gender aspects. Lessons learned from the current period, particularly the need for stronger alignment between planning, capacity building, and implementation will be integrated into future activities to enhance effectiveness.	
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	
F.7. Grievance Redress Mechanism - confirmation & grievances	

Please indicate whether the project can confirm the following statement:

Fully functional and operational Grievance Redress Mechanisms are in place, have been communicated to and are accessible by all stakeholders applicable to this project

☒ The accredited entity confirms the statement above at project-level, AE-level, and GCF-level grievance mechanisms.

☐ The accredited entity does not confirm the statement above

Have there been any grievances received during the reporting period?

Yes ☐ No ☒

N/A

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

Capacity Building

Extensive trainings and ToT sessions were delivered for CLMG members, local authorities, and forestry and pasture specialists, engaging over 1,100 participants, including 38% women and 19% youth. All training modules integrated gender aspects, with specific sessions on women's participation, resource access, and gender-responsive natural resource management. While the project met the minimum 30% target for women's participation, their involvement was lower in technical forestry trainings due to sector-specific barriers.

Social Mobilization and Community Participation

Community mobilization activities reached more than 43,000 participants at the ayil level and led to the establishment of 12 CLMGs with at least 30% women and youth representation. A total of 351 focus group discussions and multiple consultations ensured the participation of women, youth, and vulnerable groups. Gender-responsive INRMCRPs were developed and approved in all 12 ayil aimaks, incorporating sex-disaggregated data and measures to enhance women's roles in decision-making and economic activities.

Policy and Technical Integration

Gender considerations were fully integrated into all key ToRs, methodologies, and guidelines, including INRMCRPs. This included policy analysis, monitoring systems, value chain work, and communication strategies, strengthening institutional frameworks, inclusive governance, and women's economic engagement in natural resource management.

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

Prepare communication material and organize information awareness campaigns to mobilize national stakeholders

Indicator	
Community awareness raising campaigns and communication materials in Kyrgyz and Russian languages introduced in line with the developed Gender equality and social inclusion mainstreaming communication strategy. Undertake gender awareness events among the project staff and relevant partners (at local and national levels) involved in the implementation at least once per year. Gender-responsive mobilization and communication channels will be developed to reach both women and men, including vulnerable groups (such as female-headed households, low-income families, unemployed).	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	100
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
Information and awareness-raising activities were conducted in Kyrgyz and Russian in a gender-sensitive format. Project information was disseminated through official letters, presentations, printed materials, and information boards in public spaces including local government offices, schools, and health centers. Digital channels were also utilized, including social media and messaging platforms. A dedicated women's WhatsApp group was established, reaching 152 women from target communities with regular project updates and participation opportunities. Communications were designed to reach women, men, youth, and vulnerable groups such as female-headed households and low-income families. A gender awareness session was held during the project and operational partners' 2025 programme meeting in March 2025, covering the CS-FOR Gender Action Plan, 2025 activities and indicators, and a dedicated session on Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA). A total of 36 participants attended, including 12 women, with 100% of the CS-FOR project team participating. In 2025, overall outreach across all information events, media, and social platforms reached approximately 548,000 people. All communication materials were developed in a gender-sensitive manner in line with the communication strategy. The project continues to apply the requirement of at least 30% participation of women and youth among beneficiaries across all outreach and communication activities.	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
Cumulative progress: Over the reporting period, gender-sensitive communication materials were developed and disseminated in line with the Communication Strategy. Communication outputs included informational videos, social media content, printed materials, and project merchandise designed to increase visibility of the project and raise awareness of climate change, sustainable natural resource management and carbon sequestration. Project social media platforms and digital communication channels were also established to support outreach and information sharing. These materials were actively disseminated through information events, meetings, trainings, public notice boards, social media platforms and messaging applications. Particular attention was given to reaching women, youth and vulnerable groups, including through a dedicated women's WhatsApp communication channel involving 152 women from target communities. The overall outreach through media coverage and communication activities reached approximately 1088,000 people, contributing to increased awareness of the project and opportunities for participation in sustainable natural resource management	
Budget	49,515
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	30 December 2025
Responsibility	

FAO, led by Communications specialist, in close collaboration with Gender Mainstreaming Specialist; ARIS, FS.	
Remarks/Notes	
The indicator is rated Green as activities under the GAP are progressing as planned and targets are being met. See Annex 6 - Section G for all the GAP activity report	
F.9. Gender Action Plan implementation review	
Is the gender expert for the project/programme engaged to support the implementation of the gender action plan? If engaged previously, please advise if the gender expert has been retained by the project/programme, including plans to engage another expert if a previously engaged expert has left the project/programme.	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>A Gender Specialist is actively engaged in the project and has been retained throughout the reporting period. The gender specialist provides continuous technical support across all components, including review of ToRs, methodologies, capacity-building activities, and monitoring processes.</i>	
Has the implementation of gender action plan/s being implemented according to Funding Activity Agreements and GCF's Updated Gender Policy? Please ensure that the budget is included in the reporting above if it was indicated in the approved or updated gender action plan.	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>FAA and GCF's Updated Gender Policy. Project activities, including trainings, field engagement, and capacity-building initiatives, are being carried out as planned, with funds used to support gender-responsive participation and ensure balanced inclusion of women and men. Regular monitoring ensures that expenditure aligns with the approved GAP and contributes to achieving the intended gender outcomes</i>	
Are the planned activities, targets, indicators, timelines, etc. on track during the reporting period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>Most of the planned activities, targets, and indicators are on track during the reporting period. Progress is being monitored regularly, and most milestones are being met according to the planned timelines.</i>	
Were there any revisions of the approved GAP during the reporting period? Please submit the updated GAP in Annex section of this APR and ensure that the updated GAP has details on each change.	Yes ☐ No ☒
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 project is on track to meet sex-disaggregated targets, with progress systematically tracked across activities. Despite the absence of a dedicated M&E specialist, the team ensures regular collection and reporting of sex-disaggregated data and promotes balanced participation of women and men.

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 ☐

While the project has not faced major challenges in implementing gender-related activities, it is important to keep in mind that cultural nuances and traditional gender stereotypes may cause resistance, particularly in rural areas. Additionally, the forestry sector is traditionally male dominated, which may also influence the integration of gender initiatives. These factors require careful attention, and to address them, continued awareness-raising and gender sensitization efforts are necessary. Engaging both men and women in these discussions and ensuring gender considerations are integrated into technical training can help mitigate these challenges.

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 ☐

Kerezbubu Subankulova: When One Woman's Energy Inspires a Whole Community In the Toguz-Torou district lives a woman whose presence has become an essential part of the CS-FOR project's activities. Kerezbubu Subankulova, a local resident, is not just a participant — she is a driving force behind community engagement and learning. From the very beginning of the project, Kerezbubu has actively participated in every activity. Her involvement is so valued that events often feel incomplete without her presence. During training sessions, especially Training of Trainers, she plays a unique role — helping translate complex concepts into simple, understandable ideas for other participants. What truly sets Kerezbubu apart is her ability to inspire. With her natural sense of humor and openness, she creates an atmosphere where people feel comfortable, engaged, and motivated to learn. Through her participation in focus group discussions across villages, she helped introduce and popularize new concepts related to climate change and natural resource management. One of the most memorable examples is how she turned the technical term "CS-FOR" into something relatable, humorously referring to herself as "Kerez-FOR". Today, in her community, she is even affectionately known as "Kerez-FOR" — a symbol of the project itself.

Provide planned activities on gender elements for the next reporting period

Gender considerations will continue to be integrated across the following priority areas in 2026. In scaling the implementation of INRMCRPs, at least 30% participation of women and youth will be ensured in community-level activities and CLMGs. All planning and implementation processes will continue to use sex-disaggregated data. Capacity development activities related to forest and pasture restoration, nursery management, and monitoring systems will include gender aspects, with a minimum of 30% participation of women. Trainings will also cover women's access to resources, leadership, and climate-resilient natural resource management. In forest nursery modernization and restoration activities, women's participation will be promoted, including their involvement in seedling production, nursery management, and related value chain opportunities. The project will continue working on credit lines and sustainable value chains using gender-sensitive approaches, including integrating gender into capacity-building activities (including financial literacy for women). However, it should be noted that introducing gender-sensitive credit conditions remain challenging, as financial institutions operate under their own requirements. Institutional strengthening efforts will continue by integrating gender into policies, guidelines, and monitoring systems, and by building the capacity of local authorities and partners to apply gender-responsive approaches in natural resource management.

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: APR 2025 - section G FP116_GHG-vf.docx File Name: EX-ACT_CR-FOR_2025-narrative.pdf File Name: EX-ACT_CS-FOR-2025.xlsx
Annex 2: Communication and visibility material
File Name: APR 2025 - section G FP116_Communication-vf.docx
Annex 3: List of grievances received
No annexes provided.
Annex 4: Procurement information
No annexes provided.
Annex 5: Updated implementation timetable for the Funded Activity for the following year
File Name: Updated implementation timetable 2025.docx
Annex 6: Updated Gender Assessment and/or Action Plan
File Name: APR 2025 - section F_vf - GAP activites - Annex 6.docx
Additional Annexes (if applicable)
File Name: CS-FOR - Gender and Social Inclusion Action Plan.pdf

