
Annual Performance Report

Project/Programme title:	Blue Action Fund (BAF): GCF Ecosystem Based Adaptation Programme in the Western Indian Ocean (FP122)
Accredited Entity:	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW)
Date of Report submission:	18 July 2026
Version number	V2.0



Contents

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

RATIONALE

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

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

METHODOLOGY

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

A. PROJECT DATA (Prefilled where possible)														
Should any information/data prefilled from Section A.1 to Section A.12 be incorrect or require updating, please inform GCF's Project Lead of appropriate corrective action.														
A.1. Date of report submission		18 July 2026												
A.2. Project or programme	Project	A.3. Sector	Public											
A.4. Total Financing (GCF + Cofinance)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>GCF Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 34.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>Mill. EUR 30.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Co-Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 28.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>Mill. EUR 25.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 63.5</td> </tr> </table>				GCF Financing	Mill. USD 34.6	Grants	Mill. EUR 30.0	Co-Financing	Mill. USD 28.9	Grants	Mill. EUR 25.0	Total Financing	Mill. USD 63.5
	GCF Financing	Mill. USD 34.6												
	Grants	Mill. EUR 30.0												
	Co-Financing	Mill. USD 28.9												
	Grants	Mill. EUR 25.0												
Total Financing	Mill. USD 63.5													
A.5. Total GCF funding disbursed to this date	NA (draft)													
A.6. Implementation period	From NA to NA													
A.7. ESS Category (Refers to GCF revised <u>Environmental and Social Policy</u> and GCF ESS Standards to assess your FP category.)			Intermediation 2											
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)										
Blue Action Fund	Germany	Foundation/ Nature Conservation Trust Fund, based on German Foundation Law	Executing Entity, manages nine sub-projects implemented by international, regional, and local GOs	South Africa: Mr. Stuart Mangold Operational focal point Chief Policy Advisor, International Governance and Resource Mobilization, smangold@dffe.gov.za /Madagascar: Ms. Lovakanto Ravelomanana Director of the National Office for Climate Change Coordination B.P 3948, Rue Toto Radola - Antsahavola, Antananarivo, Madagascar lovakanto.rav@yahoo.com / Mozambique: Mr. Albano Manjate National Director, National Directorate of Climate Finance - Ministry of Planning and Development albanomanjate@gmail.com / Tanzania: Dr. Richard Muyungi Permanent Secretary Vice President's Office P.O. Box 2502, Dodoma, Tanzania/ Dr Freddy Manyika Principal Forest Officer, UNFCCC National Focal Point, kanizio.manyika@vpo.go.tz										

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)
German Ministry of Development and Economic Cooperation (BMZ)	Germany	Oliver Hoppe, Department for Environment: oliver.hoppe@bmz.bund.de	Government	German Government and Republic of Germany

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)
Madagascar	29 January 2024	1) gestion intégrée des zones côtières (p. 15); 2) La réduction de la dégradation des milieux côtiers (p. 15) & 3) Le développement durable d'écosystèmes(p. 15) ;	1) Renforcer les référentiels stratégiques, les schémas de gestion et les bases de connaissances sur la vulnérabilité et les réponses au changement climatique ; 2) Promotion de pratiques résilientes, de la valorisation durable des ressources, et renforcement de la protection des infrastructures littorales et côtier et les activités économiques; 3) Renforcement des capacités techniques, institutionnelles et opérationnelles sur la gestion intégrée des zones côtières; 4) Mettre à jour les bases de données et systèmes d'information sur les aléas climatiques et impacts sur les ...halieutiques; 5) Développement des systèmes de suivi et d'alerte précoce, renforcer les plans de restauration, la connectivité des habitats des écosystèmes littoraux, côtiers et marins; 6) Triplement de la superficie des aires marines protégées, mise à l'échelle des actions de conservation et de gestion participative durable des ressources littorales et côtières, renforcement des protections naturelles et réduction de la vulnérabilité des zones littorales, marines et côtières concernées par l'érosion côtière et du recul de la côte (2025: 4,300 km2	30%

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)
			MPA; Blue Action covers 4300 km2 (=30%)	
Mozambique	5 November 2025	1) Strengthening the Early Warning System (p. 20); 2) Increasing the resilience of agriculture and livestock (p. 21); 3) Increasing the resilience of fisheries (p. 21); 4) Planning and management of biodiversity and coastal ecosystems (p. 22); 5) Suitability of tourist areas and coastal zones development to reduce climate change impacts (p. 23)	• Transition to a resilient Blue Economy in the western Indian Ocean region; • Development of conservation and coastal protection practices; • Regeneration of mangroves and implementation of protective measures for seaweed and seagrass, corals and other breeding and feeding areas for fish • Development of tools for the integration of adaptation into the planning and budgeting process in fisheries; • Applying management practices that increase the adaptive capacity of ecosystems - 4.6.1.6.1.5; (linked to the national biodiversity strategy, target 10: By 2035, place at least 20% of ecosystems critically affected by climate change under adaptive ecosystem management) • Identification and replication of lessons and good practices on mitigation and adaptation (Target 10.3 of the National Biodiversity Strategy) • Establishment of cross-border conservation areas to maintain ecosystem functions and allow wildlife migrations • Reclassification and re-dimensioning of conservation areas, identifying areas at risk of biodiversity loss • Promotion of the survey of knowledge on the contribution of biodiversity to the increase in the carbon stock, with a view to mitigating and adapting to climate change (based on Target 15 of the National Biodiversity Strategy)	0%
South Africa	27 September 2021	1) Enhance ecosystem-based adaptation to heat and water stress, protecting South Africa's natural heritage, biodiversity and improving ecosystem functioning that underpins our cultural identity, food systems, human wellbeing	• Spatially targeted restoration initiatives in critical biodiversity areas and ecological support areas, especially strategic water source areas • Invasive alien plant clearing and management • Review ecological reserve determinations for surface and groundwater catchments • Expand conservation estate and protected area network	0%

Country	Date of NDC/ NAP submission	NDC/ NAP objective	Brief description of project's alignment with NDC/ NAP objectives	Percentage of target met with proposed project.Beneficial owner(s)
		and our tourism economy (p. 12)	Strengthen protected area management • Expand land and water stewardship programmes (SA: 1,072,716 km2 MPAs; BAF: 4060 km2)	
Tanzania	30 July 2021	Contributions will will verifiably reduce the impacts of sea level rise to the island and coastal communities, infrastructure and ecosystems including mangroves (p. 17)	1) Strengthening management of coastal and marine resources and monitoring systems. (p. 20); 2) Promoting sustainable livelihood diversification for coastal communities. (p. 20); 8) Enhancing area-based management systems for sustainable blue economy. (p. 20)	0%

A.11. Estimated duration of impact	
A.12 Report to be shared with NDA	Yes ☒ No ☐
29 May 2026 Not yet possible to generate a pdf of the report to send it out to the NDAs. GCF Secretariat was informed on 24 March 2026 about these technical problems. As soon as these are solved, KFW can send out the APR to the NDAs.	

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 programme has delivered measurable progress in strengthening climate-resilient coastal management across the Western Indian Ocean through ecosystem restoration, improved governance, and institutional capacity building. Management effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs) increased, new co-management structures were formalized, and restoration initiatives advanced across mangroves, coastal dunes, seagrass meadows, coral reefs, and riparian systems. Livelihood diversification and financial inclusion initiatives reduced pressure on vulnerable ecosystems while strengthening adaptive capacity.

At policy level, notable milestones include the Government of Tanzania’s commitment to expanded marine protection with its declaration of two new MPAs, and the designation of Maputo National Park as a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

The programme supported the 3rd Mozambique Marine Biodiversity Conference – opened by the President – reinforcing national dialogue on marine conservation and ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA).

All sub-projects shared lessons learned at a dedicated EbA session convened during the 13th WIOMSA Scientific Symposium (see summary in Annex 7), strengthening regional exchange and policy alignment.

The sub-projects and the programme underwent independent midterm technical evaluations, which confirmed their strategic relevance and progress toward outcomes, while identifying areas for improvement. In response, sub-project-level adjustments were agreed with implementing partners to strengthen effectiveness, sustainability, and monitoring frameworks (see examples in Annex 8).

Implementation has, however, been affected by significant external shocks. Multiple cyclones caused ecosystem damage and operational delays, particularly in Mozambique and Madagascar. Post-election unrest and related security constraints further disrupted field activities. In Madagascar, progress toward permanent MPA designation for the Barren Isles has been slowed by competing sectoral interests. Given these cumulative delays, the programme has submitted a request for a no-cost extension (2y) to consolidate results, complete delayed activities, and secure long-term impact.

In 2025, the programme achieved significant results across all three outputs. A total of 249,740 direct beneficiaries (50% female) were reached, representing 100% of the programme’s target, with direct beneficiaries accounting for 31%, 38%, 12%, and 21% of project area populations in Mozambique, Madagascar, South Africa, and Tanzania respectively. Of these, 103,880 people benefited from diversified, climate-resilient livelihood options (50% women), also exceeding the target. In terms of ecosystem protection, nine MPAs and LMMAs registered improved management effectiveness scores (METT), collectively covering 2,402,700 ha of coastal and marine ecosystems under more effective management. Active ecosystem restoration reached 2,655 ha across mangroves, seagrass, coral reefs, dune systems, and riparian ecosystems. 25,127 people (50% women) were reached by climate-related early warning systems. At the knowledge and institutional level, 612 institutions were engaged on EbA topics, 12 lessons learned publications were produced, and 5 contributions to national strategies were made across all four partner countries.

By end of 2025, the programme had cumulatively expended €16.1 million in GCF funds, approximately 54% of total. Total programme expenditure across all funding sources, including BMZ co-funding and grantee matc, reached €29.7 million cumulatively. At sub-project level, financial implementation progress ranges from 40% to 66%, reflecting varying paces of delivery influenced by external factors including cyclones, post-election unrest, and staffing constraints, as documented in the programme’s no-cost extension request.

The independent mid-term reviews conducted across all nine sub-projects identified a number of challenges related to environmental and social safeguards implementation, and sub-projects have been actively working to address these during the reporting period. Key areas of intensified effort include strengthening the accessibility and uptake of Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRMs), through community awareness campaigns, refresher trainings, dissemination in local languages, and the piloting of digital grievance tracking tools such as KoboToolbox. Several sub-projects recruited or are in the process of recruiting dedicated safeguards staff to ensure more systematic ESMS implementation. Security management was reinforced across sub-projects operating in contexts of political instability, with Security Management Plans developed and aligned with Emergency Response Plans. Human rights training was delivered to rangers, enforcement actors, and Community Fisheries Council members across multiple sub-projects. Environmental and Social Management Plans were updated to integrate emerging risks, including those related to extreme weather events, public health, and population movement. Across all nine sub-projects, all risks identified during the assessment phase continued to be managed through the systematic application of safeguard instruments, with no significant unresolved environmental or social issues reported during the period.

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)

Across the nine sub-projects, 2025 marked a year of meaningful change in the conditions that determine coastal communities' resilience to climate change. The programme's progress can be understood along four interconnected dimensions.

What has changed: Coastal and marine ecosystems across all four partner countries are now under more effective protection and management. Nine MPAs and LMMAs recorded improved management effectiveness scores (METT), collectively covering 2,402,700 ha. Over 2,655 ha of mangroves, seagrass meadows, coral reefs, dune systems, and riparian ecosystems are under active restoration. Physical boundaries of protected areas have been demarcated, zoning formalised, and no-take zones and temporary closures expanded and increasingly enforced.

Adaptation outcomes achieved: 249,740 direct beneficiaries (50% female) are now engaged in more climate-resilient ways of managing and depending on coastal ecosystems. Of these, 103,880 people have diversified their livelihoods through climate-smart agriculture, fisheries value chains, savings schemes, and enterprise development, reducing their dependence on vulnerable marine resources. 25,127 people (50% women) are now reached by climate-related early warning systems, strengthening their capacity to anticipate and respond to climate shocks.

How resilience has improved: Ecosystem-based adaptation measures have directly strengthened the natural buffers – mangroves, coral reefs, seagrass meadows – that protect coastal communities from storm surges, erosion, and fisheries decline. Improved fisheries governance, including community-defined rules, seasonal closures, and no-take zones, is beginning to show signs of resource recovery, reducing long-term climate vulnerability. Community savings groups and diversified income streams are building household-level financial resilience, enabling communities to absorb and recover from climate shocks such as cyclones.

Evidence of institutional and behavioural change: Significant institutional shifts are underway. In Tanzania, the government declared two new MPAs, reflecting a deepened national commitment to marine protection. Maputo National Park was designated a UNESCO World Heritage Site. Across the programme, 612 institutions have been engaged on EbA approaches, 5 contributions have been made to national strategies across all four partner countries, and 12 lessons learned publications have been produced and disseminated. At community level, behavioural change is evident in growing compliance with fisheries rules, increased participation of women in governance structures, and communities actively taking on roles as patrollers, monitors, and resource managers.

Across the nine sub-projects, progress under **Output 1 [Coastal Ecosystems are better protected & managed]** strengthened sustainable marine management through integrated governance, spatial protection, enforcement, ecosystem restoration, and resilient livelihoods. MPAs and LMMAs recorded improved management effectiveness, with formalised co-management structures, updated management plans, expanded no-take and recovery zones, and reinforced patrol and surveillance systems. Spatial demarcation, participatory zoning, and restoration measures reduced physical damage to sensitive ecosystems, while compliance awareness improved. Complementary livelihood and financial inclusion initiatives – particularly targeting women and vulnerable groups – diversified incomes through climate-smart agriculture, fisheries value-chain support, savings schemes, and enterprise development, reducing pressure on marine resources and reinforcing long-term ecosystem stewardship and resilience.

Regarding **Activity 1.1**, sustainable management of MPAs and LMMAs advanced through strengthened governance, enforcement, and adaptive planning. Management effectiveness improved, reflected in higher Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) and governance scores, updated management plans, and structured co-management arrangements formalised through gazetted councils, collaborative management areas, and revised fisheries management plans. Community-defined rules, no-take zones, and temporary closures were expanded and increasingly integrated into formal frameworks. Enforcement capacity was reinforced through patrols, surveillance infrastructure, Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), and training, alongside vessel inspections and licensing. Ecological and fisheries monitoring informed adaptive management and zoning. Progress toward new or expanded MPAs continued, supported by stakeholder consultations, financial sustainability planning, and institutional capacity building.

Regarding **Activity 1.2**, funding supported concrete measures to reduce physical damage to coastal and marine ecosystems through improved spatial planning, demarcation, and targeted restoration. Boundaries of MPAs, LMMAs, and community fisheries areas were digitally mapped, GPS-verified, and integrated into formal management plans, with marker buoys, anchors, and boundary signage installed or maintained. Participatory zoning processes defined no-take zones, recovery areas, coral protection sites, and temporary closures. Restoration efforts, including coral transplantation and climate-resilient infrastructure planning, were aligned with protected area frameworks. Compliance awareness was

strengthened through updated maps and communication tools, while technical and consultative processes reduced governance risks and supported long-term ecosystem protection.

Regarding **Activity 1.3**, measures to reduce pressure on coastal and marine ecosystems focused on strengthening community governance, expanding climate-resilient livelihoods, and improving financial inclusion. Community-based natural resource management committees (CBNRMCs) were formalised and linked to revenue-sharing mechanisms, while savings groups and eco-credit schemes scaled up to support enterprise development and adaptive capacity. Livelihood diversification included climate-smart agriculture, aquaculture, apiculture, seaweed farming, livestock, and small-scale businesses, supported by technical training, infrastructure, and market access initiatives. Women's economic empowerment and leadership were prioritised across sites. Mangrove restoration, sustainable fisheries practices, and value-chain improvements further aligned income generation with ecosystem stewardship and reduced dependence on vulnerable marine resources.

Across **Output 2**, ecosystem restoration progressed at scale across mangroves, riparian forests, dunes, seagrass meadows, and coral reefs. Nearly 1,000 hectares of mangrove, watershed, riparian, and dune systems were restored or rehabilitated through community-led planting, invasive species clearing, hydrological restoration, and stabilisation measures. Pilot seagrass restoration covered over 3 hectares, supported by technical manuals, management plans, and standardised monitoring protocols. Coral reef rehabilitation advanced through nursery expansion, transplantation of over 10,000 fragments, artificial reef deployment, and rubble stabilisation, despite cyclone-related losses. Spatial mapping, baseline surveys, and performance-based mechanisms strengthened planning and monitoring, while strong community participation – particularly of women and youth – supported long-term ecosystem stewardship and resilience.

Regarding **Activity 2.1**, mangrove and coastal forest restoration progressed through large-scale community-led planting, nursery rehabilitation, watershed recovery, and invasive species clearing. 970 hectares of mangroves and riparian forests were restored, with over one million propagules planted and survival rates improving through enhanced maintenance, hydrological restoration, and technical monitoring. Nursery capacity was rebuilt following cyclone damage, strengthening local seedling production. Restoration efforts were increasingly linked to payment-based performance mechanisms, savings groups, and livelihood initiatives to reinforce sustainability. Spatial mapping, remote sensing assessments, and baseline studies improved planning and monitoring. Community engagement – particularly of women – was central, supporting long-term stewardship and EbA outcomes.

Regarding **Activity 2.2**, seagrass rehabilitation progressed through restoration pilots, technical standardisation, and integration into co-management frameworks. In Mozambique, community-based restoration was formalised through partnership agreements, training, and development of a Seagrass Management Plan aligned with fisheries management structures. Pilot restoration covered approximately 3.2 hectares across sites, supported by trained community groups and technical manuals to guide species selection, planting methods, and monitoring. Cyclone-damaged plots were re-established to maintain progress. In Tanzania, a standardised seagrass monitoring protocol was finalised, and seagrass protection was incorporated into planned LMMA zoning, laying the groundwork for future restoration and strengthened long-term management of seagrass ecosystems.

Regarding **Activity 2.3**, rehabilitation of beach vegetation and dunes progressed across sites through pilot restoration, large-scale stabilisation, invasive species clearing, and establishment of spatial baselines. In Madagascar and South Africa, over 600 hectares of dunes and coastal areas were stabilised or cleared of invasive species, supported by cash-for-work schemes, youth training, and community participation, with strong involvement of women. Restoration techniques included indigenous planting, 'hammock structures' to promote natural regeneration, and biomass repurposing for livelihoods. Governance was strengthened through establishment of dune protection committees. In Mozambique and South Africa, pilot rehabilitation and high-resolution ecosystem mapping established technical and planning foundations to guide scaled implementation from 2026 onward.

Regarding **Activity 2.4**, coral reef restoration advanced across Madagascar and Tanzania despite climate-related setbacks. In Madagascar, cyclone damage to nurseries required re-establishment of infrastructure, with 15 new nursery trees installed hosting over 10,000 coral fragments; mid-water rope systems showed strong survival and growth. In Tanzania, restoration combined ecological assessments, site demarcation, artificial reef deployment, and reef stabilisation of rubble-dominated areas. Baseline surveys informed site selection, while no-take zones and seasonal closures were developed to reduce pressure on restoration sites. Standardised monitoring protocols and formal handover of operations strengthened technical consistency, with active community participation reinforcing local capacity and long-term stewardship.

Output 3 strengthened the enabling environment for EbA through awareness raising, institutional capacity building, regional exchange, and programme-level oversight. National recognition, media outreach, community resource centres, and public campaigns expanded understanding of EbA among agencies and coastal communities. Climate vulnerability assessments, early warning systems (EWS), and policy engagement supported integration of EbA into coastal planning, fisheries governance, and adaptation strategies, alongside progress on development of incentive mechanisms such as blue carbon and performance-based payments. Regional symposia, global conferences, exchange visits, and knowledge

products facilitated peer learning and policy alignment. Programme-level monitoring, midterm evaluations, and gender strengthening measures reinforced adaptive management, accountability, and inclusive implementation.

Regarding **Activity 3.1, awareness raising and capacity building on EbA** were advanced through national recognition, strategic communications, community platforms, and public campaigns. Maputo National Park's UNESCO World Heritage designation strengthened international visibility, while documentaries, media features, and radio broadcasts increased national outreach. Community Resource Hubs provided operational platforms for training and engagement on climate adaptation. Environmental events, school programmes, youth initiatives, and behaviour change campaigns promoted mangrove, seagrass, fisheries, and reef conservation. Participation in national exhibitions and policy dialogues enhanced government engagement, reinforcing institutional understanding of EbA approaches for climate-resilient coastal zone management.

Regarding **Activity 3.2, institutional capacity for climate risk assessment and integration of EbA into coastal management** was strengthened through vulnerability assessments, disaster risk reduction systems, policy engagement, and innovative finance mechanisms. Climate Change Vulnerability Assessments (CCVAs) informed local adaptation plans, fisheries management, and resilience programming across multiple countries. EWs were operationalised through community committees, SMS alerts, WhatsApp groups, and simulation exercises. Policy influence advanced through contributions to national adaptation plans, marine governance reforms, Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures (OECM) recognition, and conservation area gazettement. Blue carbon feasibility studies, biodiversity offset mechanisms, and performance-based payment schemes advanced in towards development of incentive frameworks, while national workshops and symposia enhanced inter-agency coordination and knowledge exchange.

Regarding **Activity 3.3, regional exchange on EbA** was strengthened through active participation in regional and global platforms, including the 13th WIOMSA Scientific Symposium, the UN Ocean Conference, FEBA meetings, and cross-border learning visits. Sub-projects presented technical results on mangrove restoration, coral reef resilience, co-management, CCVAs, and payment-based performance mechanisms. Exchange visits informed replication of by-laws, nursery establishment, and community governance improvements. Knowledge products included policy briefs, scientific publications, technical reports, videos, and online management tools. Engagement in national strategy discussions and international commitments enhanced policy alignment, visibility, and integration of EbA approaches into climate-resilient coastal zone management frameworks across the region.

Regarding **Activity 3.4 [Cross-Cutting Activities]**, all nine sub-projects completed independent midterm technical and financial evaluations. Identified gaps and performance challenges are being addressed through improvement plans agreed with Blue Action to strengthen effectiveness, impact, and sustainability (Annex 2). A programme-level midterm independent evaluation was also finalised and submitted to the GCF in early 2026. Sub-projects and Blue Action participated in the 13th WIOMSA Scientific Symposium, convening a joint session to share implementation lessons and emerging good practices (Annex 1). Blue Action and several partners also attended the UN Oceans Conference, co-hosting a side event in which the Tanzanian government announced two new MPAs in Pemba covering over 1,300 km². Blue Action additionally visited Wildtrust with other funders to discuss long-term MPA financing.

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 Multicounty, 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) 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
Ecosystem and ecosystem services	0	40,000	85,000	135,596	114,144	249,740

(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	20,000	42,500	67,798	57,072	124,870
Female	0	20,000	42,500	67,798	57,072	124,870

(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
Madagascar	0	4,000	8,500	20,851	20,319	41,170
Mozambique	0	18,800	40,500	46,974	45,066	92,040
South Africa	0	7,000	15,000	27,371	16,489	43,860
Tanzania	0	10,000	21,000	26,065	46,605	72,670

(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	400,000	1,000,000	0	0	0

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

Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Male	0	200,000	500,000	0	0	0
Female	0	200,000	500,000	0	0	0

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of indirect beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by Country.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Madagascar	0	40,000	100,000	0	0	0
Mozambique	0	188,000	470,000	0	0	0
South Africa	0	70,000	180,000	0	0	0
Tanzania	0	100,000	250,000	0	0	0

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	25,000	50,000	37,600	14,340	51,940
Female	0	25,000	50,000	37,600	14,340	51,940

(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
Madagascar	0	5,000	10,000	7,520	2,868	10,388
Mozambique	0	24,000	48,000	36,100	13,767	49,867
South Africa	0	8,500	17,000	12,780	4,875	17,655
Tanzania	0	12,500	25,000	18,800	7,170	25,970

(PMF) A7.2 Number of males and females reached by [or total geographic coverage of] climate related early warning systems and other risk reduction measures established/ strengthened (IRMF) Supplementary 2.4 Beneficiaries (female/male) covered by new or improved early warning systems						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) with increased capacity to anticipate, respond to, and act on climate-related early warnings, disaggregated by gender.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Male	0	5,000	100,000	926	11,152	12,078
Female	0	5,000	100,000	1,615	11,434	13,049

(PMF) A7.2 Number of males and females reached by [or total geographic coverage of] climate related early warning systems and other risk reduction measures established/ strengthened (IRMF) Supplementary 2.4 Beneficiaries (female/male) covered by new or improved early warning systems						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries with increased capacity to anticipate, respond to, and act on climate-related early warnings, disaggregated by country.						
Unit						Enter unit
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Mozambique	0	5,000	100,000	2,541	8,310	10,851
Madagascar	0	5,000	100,000	0	5,405	5,405
South Africa	0	0	0	0	8,871	8,871

Health and well-being, and food & water security

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) A2.1 Number of males and females benefiting from introduced health measures to respond to climate-sensitive diseases						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) with improved protection against climate-sensitive diseases and health emergencies, disaggregated by gender.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Male	0	0	30,000	28,700	7,140	35,840
Female	0	0	30,000	28,700	7,140	35,840

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	3,000	28,000	920,600	1,482,100	2,402,700

(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
Madagascar	0	750	7,000	430,000	0	430,000
Mozambique	0	750	7,000	84,600	353,200	437,800
South Africa	0	750	7,000	406,000	1,107,100	1,513,100
Tanzania	0	750	7,000	0	21,800	21,800

(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	3,000	28,000	920,600	1,482,100	2,402,700

Optional Co-Benefit Indicators

No indicators/questions defined.

Total number of established or strengthened institutional frameworks, policies, plans and coordination mechanisms to support climate-resilient and low-emission development					
Provide the total number of established or strengthened institutional frameworks, policies, plans and coordination mechanisms.					
Unit					No. of Items
Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
	Mid-term	Final target			
0	1	8	0	7	7

Total number of established or strengthened institutional frameworks, policies, plans and coordination mechanisms to support climate-resilient and low-emission development						
Provide the total number of established or strengthened institutional frameworks, policies, plans and coordination mechanisms, disaggregated by country.						
Unit						No. of Items
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Madagascar	0	0	1	0	1	1
Mozambique	0	1	3	0	3	3
South Africa	0	0	1	0	0	0
Tanzania	0	0	3	0	3	3

Total ecosystems placed under conservation activities (ha)					
Provide the total ecosystems placed under conservation activities (ha).					
Unit					Hectares
Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
	Mid-term	Final target			
0	3,000	28,000	920,600	1,482,100	2,402,700

Total ecosystems placed under conservation activities (ha)						
Provide the total ecosystems placed under conservation activities (ha), disaggregated by country.						
Unit						Hectares
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Madagascar	0	750	7,000	430,000	0	430,000

Mozambique	0	750	7,000	84,600	353,200	437,800
South Africa	0	750	7,000	406,000	1,107,100	1,513,100
Tanzania	0	750	7,000	0	21,800	21,800

Total ecosystems placed under conservation activities (ha)						
Provide the total ecosystems placed under conservation activities (ha), disaggregated by land type.						
Unit						Hectares
Disaggregation by: Land Type	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Coastal/marine ecosystems	0	3,000	28,000	920,600	1,482,100	2,402,700

Project Specific Indicators							
Indicator	Unit	Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
			Mid-term	Final target			
Lessons learned / best practices are documented and published in renowned regional and international media; number of local, national and international institutions with which lessons learned were disseminated and actively shared; Revision of national strategies resulting in higher importance of EbA approaches for climate-resilient coastal management	No. of Knowledge Products/Resources	0	0	2	0	17	17
Number and size of new marine and coastal protected areas; Number and size of protected areas with improved protection level and efficient management	Hectares	0	200,000	1,700,000	920,600	1,482,100	2,402,700
Size of marine and coastal ecosystems rehabilitated/restored	Hectares	0	3,000	25,000	880	1,775	2,655
A3.1 Number and value of physical assets made more resilient to climate variability and change, considering human benefits	No. of Items	0	10	40	5	9	14

(reported where applicable)							
A3.1 Number and value of physical assets made more resilient to climate variability and change, considering human benefits (reported where applicable)	No. of Communities	0	10	40	1	16	17

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
1.1 Improved sustainable management of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs)	63	4,715,083	8,000,000	58
1.2 Measures to reduce physical damage to coastal and marine ecosystems	57	526,676	4,000,000	13
1.3 Measures to reduce pressure and land-based stressors on coastal and marine ecosystems	66	4,000,000	4,000,000	100
2.1 Mangrove / forest reforestation	61	1,327,135	5,500,000	24
2.2 Seagrass rehabilitation	43	157,617	750,000	21
2.3 Rehabilitation of beach vegetation / dunes	45	74,171	750,000	9
2.4 Coral reef restoration	51	311,942	1,000,000	31
3.1 Awareness raising and capacity building of national / regional agencies on the relevance and options of using EbA measures for climate-resilient coastal zone management	63	776,557	1,000,000	77
3.2 Capacity building of national / regional agencies on climate risk assessment and how to include EbA measures in climate-resilient coastal zone management	54	1,261,199	1,500,000	84
3.3: Regional exchange of experiences and lessons learnt from the implementation of EbA measures and on how to make EbA an integral part of climate-resilient coastal zone management	41	235,419	1,000,000	23

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
3.4 Cross-Cutting Activities regarding Capacity Building and Knowledge Exchange (managed by BAF)	40	433,298	1,000,000	43

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
WildTrust: Protection and restoration of important ecosystems in uThukela Marine Protected Area, and associated Estuarine Functional Zones, reducing climate-related socio-ecological risk	EUR	3,575,000	2,925,000	South Africa	N/A	28,530	N/A
Peace Parks Foundation (PPF): Ecosystem-based Adaptation to climate change in Maputo Environmental Protection Area (MEPA):	EUR	3,253,122	2,661,646	Mozambique	N/A	9,700	N/A

Conserving and building resilience							
Blue Ventures: Increasing socio-ecological resilience to climate change in the Barren Isles through protection and restoration of key ecosystems and diversified livelihoods	EUR	2,874,342	2,351,734	Madagascar	N/A	4,738	N/A
WCS (Wildlife Conservation Society): Building a Blue Future for Ecosystems and People on the East African Coast	EUR	3,252,561	2,661,186	Mozambique	N/A	34,160	N/A
WWF: Elevating Ecosystem based Adaptation approaches in the Tsimanampesotse-Nosy Ve Androka Biosphere Reserve seascape	EUR	2,619,124	2,142,920	Madagascar	N/A	36,432	N/A
FFI (Fauna & Flora International): Increasing socio-ecological resilience through	EUR	3,155,438	2,581,722	Tanzania	N/A	25,830	N/A

community-led management of key coastal ecosystems in Pemba Channel, Tanzania							
WildTrust: Building socio-ecological resilience to climate change impacts by ecosystem-based adaptation approaches at iSimangaliso MPA	EUR	3,025,000	2,475,000	South Africa	N/A	15,330	N/A
RARE: Coastal Lifeline – A provincial approach to the empowerment of Fisher-Farmer Communities to adopt Nature-based Solutions in Mozambique	EUR	2,760,321	2,258,444	Mozambique	N/A	48,180	N/A
WCS (Wildlife Conservation Society): Strengthening the network of climate resilient ecosystems across the Pemba Channel coral reef climate refuge	EUR	2,750,000	2,250,000	Mozambique	N/A	46,840	N/A

C.3. Compliance with FAA covenants	Yes ☒ No ☐
Yes, the programme and all nine sub-projects compile with the legal requirements.	
C.4. Funded Activity Implementation Arrangements in the Following Year	Yes ☒ No ☐
The following change requests were communicated to GCF on 12/2/2026; GCF approval is still pending: • A request for a 24-month no-cost extension of the programme was submitted to GCF 12/02/2026 via PPMS. The request comes as a result of implementation delays across all nine sub-projects, which were confirmed by the independent technical mid-term reviews. Implementation has been affected by internal & external factors including staffing constraints, political instability, and severe weather events such as cyclones. • In parallel, a request was also submitted for a reallocation of Programme Budget funded through GCF Proceeds across components and sub-components to best reflect the aggregated and updated budget requirements of the nine sub-projects. We would like to ask GCF Secretary to take these requests as priority. As soon as the 9 sub-projects will know whether they will have additional implementation time available, they can adjust working plan, budgets, personnel staff planning etc for 2026/2027.	

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	.Risk of unidentified and unassessed risks and impacts
Risk Origin	Project Related
Risk Area	Environmental and Social
Risk Sub-area	N/A
Description	Social impacts associated with conservation & access restrictions may not be fully assessed/ managed if sub-project partners have limited experience and/or capacity to consistently apply ESMS processes. Common risks include livelihood impacts from spatial restrictions, exclusion of vulnerable or marginalised groups, inequitable benefit-sharing, & escalating grievances in resource-dependent communities. In several contexts, poverty, high reliance on natural resources, & existing social tensions increase sensitivity to even small changes in access or governance arrangements. Weak stakeholder mapping, limited baseline socio-economic data, or insufficient follow-up monitoring may allow emerging concerns to go undetected. Staff turnover, uneven safeguard experience, & implementation pressure can further affect consistency in applying procedures. The likelihood & severity of these risks are closely linked to the ESMS experience & operational capacity of implementing partners, including their ability not only to identify potential impacts but also to manage, document, monitor, & adapt mitigation measures effectively throughout sub-project cycles.
Consequences	If such risks are overlooked, sub-project activities may unintentionally restrict access to fisheries, mangrove forests or other resources critical for livelihoods and food security. This can reduce household income, increase vulnerability, and disproportionately affect women, poorer households, or marginalised users. Inadequate consultation or unclear benefit-sharing arrangements may generate tensions, formal complaints, or community resistance. Where enforcement is involved, insufficient safeguards or role clarity may heighten the risk of conflict incidents or human rights concerns. For implementing partners, these outcomes can translate into reputational damage, weakened stakeholder relationships, delays in implementation, and intensified donor or regulatory

	scrutiny. Addressing escalated grievances can require substantial time and financial resources. Over time, unresolved social impacts may undermine conservation objectives, reduce community cooperation, and compromise the long-term sustainability and scalability of sub-project results.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 6 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	Mitigation measures focus on strengthening ESMS competence and capacity to ensure risks are systematically identified, assessed, and managed. All sub-project partners must complete BAF ESMS development and review process prior to sub-project launch, including screening, risk categorization, and the mandatory development of an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) using BAF ESMP template. The ESMP sets out mitigation, monitoring, roles, responsibilities, and reporting requirements proportionate to identified risks. Blue Action's ESMS framework provides standardised procedures, templates, and minimum requirements to promote consistency and quality across sub-projects. Ongoing technical guidance, review feedback, and staff support help partners strengthen internal systems and progressively improve their ESMS competence. At sub-project level, mitigation includes appointment of safeguarding focal points, regular staff training, integration of gender and human rights considerations, documented stakeholder engagement processes, and accessible grievance mechanisms. These measures reduce the likelihood of risks being overlooked and support early identification and corrective management actions.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 2 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 2 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 2	Risk of inadequate stakeholder engagement and communication		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	This risk concerns insufficient, delayed, or ineffective engagement with affected communities, resource users, and local authorities during the design and implementation of conservation and access management measures. Recurring challenges include incomplete stakeholder mapping, limited inclusion of women and vulnerable groups, weak information dissemination, and language or literacy barriers. In some areas, historical mistrust of conservation authorities and legacy grievances heighten sensitivity to new interventions. The complexity of co-management arrangements and multiple implementing partners can create inconsistencies in messaging and expectations. Where engagement processes are not continuous, transparent, and well-documented, misunderstandings may arise regarding sub-project objectives, rights, responsibilities, and benefit-sharing arrangements. In geographically remote areas, physical access constraints further complicate consultation efforts. The likelihood of this risk materialising depends on the structure, frequency, and inclusiveness of engagement processes throughout implementation.		
Consequences	If stakeholder engagement is inadequate, affected communities may oppose conservation measures, leading to non-compliance with access restrictions, conflict, or disruption of sub-project activities. Poor communication can increase grievances and erode trust between implementing partners and local stakeholders. This may delay implementation, reduce effectiveness of outcomes, and increase reputational risk for the programme. In contexts where livelihoods are closely linked to marine resources, insufficient consultation can heighten perceptions of unfairness and exclusion, potentially escalating tensions. Weak engagement may also undermine the effectiveness of grievance mechanisms and reduce participation of women and vulnerable groups, limiting equitable benefit-sharing. Ultimately, inadequate stakeholder engagement can compromise both social acceptance and long-term sustainability of conservation measures		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The risk is mitigated through implementation of compulsory Stakeholder Engagement Plans (SEPs), structured consultation processes, inclusive participation mechanisms,		

	and operational Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRMs). Stakeholder mapping is conducted during full proposal development process and further refined during implementation to ensure representation of affected groups, including women and vulnerable populations. Blue Action provides SEP and SEP Register templates, which sub-projects are required to use to systematically document consultations, issues raised, and follow-up actions. Regular reporting to Blue Action strengthens oversight and consistency in engagement practices. Ongoing community meetings, transparent communication on access measures, and clear documentation of engagement processes enhance accountability and traceability. Capacity-building for local partners supports consistent messaging and conflict-sensitive engagement. These measures reduce the likelihood of conflict and misunderstanding by improving transparency, inclusiveness, and early identification of concerns, while grievance mechanisms enable timely resolution where issues arise.		
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		
Risk 3	Risk of safety, security and safeguarding incidents (incl. enforcement risks)		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	A key risk across the sub-projects relates to potential health, safety, and security incidents affecting staff, partners, community members, or law enforcement actors during implementation. Activities such as field patrols, marine operations, community engagement in remote areas, and small-scale infrastructure works involve occupational health and safety considerations, including travel risks, challenging terrain, weather exposure, and limited emergency response access in some locations. Where sub-projects collaborate with government law enforcement authorities in support of resource management, clear role definition, training, and oversight are important to ensure interactions with resource users are conducted appropriately and proportionately. In certain operating contexts, localised political tensions or instability may also influence security conditions. The likelihood and consequence of such incidents depend on site-specific factors, including remoteness and environmental exposure, as well as the effectiveness of safety procedures, coordination mechanisms, and context-appropriate security management measures in place.		
Consequences	If health, safety, and security risks are not adequately managed, incidents could result in injury, psychological stress, or in rare cases, loss of life affecting staff, community members, or enforcement personnel. Field patrols, marine operations, and work in remote areas may involve travel and environmental hazards, particularly where access to emergency services is limited. Where sub-projects coordinate with law enforcement, unclear roles or insufficient safeguards could increase the likelihood of tensions during interactions with resource users. In some contexts, localized political instability may temporarily influence operating conditions. Such incidents, even if isolated, may affect community confidence, require operational adjustments, or delay certain activities. Periods of insecurity or extreme weather may also necessitate temporary suspension of fieldwork. Proactive safety procedures, clear communication, and context-aware management are therefore essential to safeguard wellbeing and ensure continuity and sustainability of conservation efforts.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Mitigation measures focus on robust occupational health and safety (OHS) systems, safeguarding protocols, and context-specific security risk management. Prior to implementation, sub-projects conduct structured risk assessments to identify field, marine, enforcement, and country-level security risks, and apply proportionate mitigation measures that are reviewed regularly. At sub-project level, measures include OHS training, appropriate protective equipment, SOPs for patrols and fieldwork, safe vessel operation protocols, and emergency preparedness and evacuation plans. In higher-risk or politically unstable contexts, implementing partners are required to develop and implement dedicated Security Management Plans (SMPs), including periodic security		

	assessments, movement and communication protocols, and contingency planning. Where collaborating with law enforcement, clear role definitions, human rights safeguards, and oversight mechanisms are applied. Sub-projects must report any serious incident to Blue Action within 48 hours of becoming aware of it, triggering formal review and, where necessary, corrective action and follow-up reporting.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	During the reporting period, post-electoral unrest and demonstrations which turned violent in both Mozambique and Madagascar temporarily affected staff mobility, field deployment, and community-level activities in some operating areas. While sub-project sites were not always directly targeted, broader instability required precautionary suspension or rescheduling of activities and reinforced the need for strengthened security monitoring and contingency planning. These contextual developments are external to sub-project design but directly influence operational safety management and are therefore monitored under this risk category. (Please refer to the section on risk report incidents for more on the specifics of Mozambique's post-electoral issues).		
Risk 4	Risk of biodiversity & environmental impacts (incl. climate variability and extreme weather)		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	A key risk across the sub-projects is that activities may unintentionally result in biodiversity loss or environmental degradation, particularly in ecosystems already under pressure from climate variability and extreme weather. Interventions such as habitat restoration, small-scale infrastructure, coastal or marine management, and certain livelihood activities—including aquaculture, sustainable fisheries initiatives, or agricultural intensification—may cause unintended ecological impacts if not carefully designed, sited, and monitored. Potential risks include habitat alteration, water pollution, introduction of invasive species, species disturbance, and cumulative environmental effects. Climate-related stressors—such as drought, flooding, cyclones, storm surges, coral bleaching, shifting rainfall patterns, and sea-level rise—further increase uncertainty and may undermine conservation gains. In degraded or fragile ecosystems, even small-scale activities may have disproportionate consequences. The likelihood and consequence of these risks depend on local ecological sensitivity, climate exposure, and the effectiveness of environmental screening, technical design, and adaptive management throughout implementation.		
Consequences	If environmental and climate-related risks are not adequately managed, sub-project activities may lead to localised habitat disturbance or reduced ecological performance of certain interventions. Restoration efforts may experience setbacks following extreme weather events such as cyclones, flooding, or drought, requiring adjustments, additional support, or replanting. In some cases, activities may need to be temporarily paused during extreme weather periods to ensure safety and avoid further environmental stress, potentially affecting implementation timelines. Poorly sited infrastructure or livelihood activities could place unintended pressure on surrounding ecosystems if mitigation measures are insufficient. In marine and coastal areas, storms or coral bleaching may temporarily affect biodiversity recovery and fisheries productivity. While such impacts are generally manageable, repeated climate shocks or cumulative effects could slow the pace at which conservation outcomes are achieved.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	Mitigation measures focus on rigorous environmental screening, climate risk integration, and adaptive management. Sub-projects conduct baseline ecological assessments and apply the mitigation hierarchy to avoid, minimise, and restore potential impacts. Site selection and activity design consider ecosystem sensitivity, seasonal patterns, and exposure to hazards such as cyclones, flooding, drought, and sea-level rise. Climate variability is integrated into planning through resilient design standards and EbA approaches. Biodiversity monitoring systems enable early detection of unintended impacts or climate-related damage, allowing timely corrective action. Restoration efforts		

	prioritise locally appropriate species and techniques that enhance ecological resilience. Regular review of environmental performance and incorporation of lessons from extreme weather events support continuous improvement. Collaboration with relevant authorities and technical experts strengthens oversight. These measures reduce the likelihood of adverse impacts and limit their severity by improving preparedness, resilience, and adaptive response capacity.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	During the reporting period, repeated extreme weather events in Mozambique and Madagascar resulted in temporary damage to restoration sites and community-supported livelihood assets. For example, in Mozambique, cyclone-related impacts affected mangrove nurseries, aquaculture infrastructure, agricultural plots, and other small-scale livelihood investments, requiring replanting and replacement of damaged equipment. Similar weather-related disruptions in Madagascar affected restoration works and community assets, leading to seasonal rescheduling and technical adjustments. These impacts were caused by external climatic hazards rather than sub-project-induced environmental effects. Adaptive responses included deployment of contingency resources, redesigning certain interventions to better reflect seasonal risk patterns, and strengthened preparedness and monitoring measures. These developments reinforce the importance of integrating climate seasonality and disaster risk considerations into ongoing implementation and safeguard supervision. (Please refer to the section on risk report incidents for more on the extreme weather events.)		
Risk 5	Risk of economic displacement and livelihood impacts due to access restrictions		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	A key risk across the sub-projects relates to potential economic displacement or livelihood impacts arising from conservation-related access restrictions. Measures such as establishment or strengthening of marine protected areas, fisheries closures, no-take zones, seasonal bans, or revised resource use rules may affect communities that depend on natural resources for income and subsistence. In resource-dependent and economically vulnerable contexts, even temporary or partial restrictions may reduce access to fishing grounds, forests, or grazing areas. Where alternative livelihood options are limited, households may experience short-term income fluctuations or increased pressure on remaining accessible areas. The level of risk varies depending on the scale of restrictions, existing poverty levels, availability of alternative income sources, and the degree to which communities are involved in planning and decision-making processes.		
Consequences	If not carefully managed, and particularly if not implemented in a participatory and transparent manner, access restrictions may lead to temporary reductions in income or resource availability for affected households. This may disproportionately affect small-scale resource users or households with limited livelihood diversification options. In some cases, reduced access could shift pressure to other areas or resources. Where expectations are not clearly communicated, perceived inequities in the application of restrictions or distribution of benefits may give rise to concerns or grievances and reduce community support for conservation measures. Over time, if adaptive support measures are insufficient, economic strain could influence compliance with management rules. However, when restrictions are phased, well-communicated, and accompanied by livelihood support and co-management arrangements, impacts are generally manageable and can contribute to longer-term resource sustainability and improved economic resilience.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	4 - Almost certain	4 - High	16 - High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Mitigation measures focus on inclusive planning, phased implementation of restrictions, and livelihood support mechanisms. Blue Action provides a Process Framework template, which implementing partners are required to apply where access restrictions may affect resource-dependent communities. This framework guides participatory design of restrictions, identification of affected groups, and development of mitigation and benefit-sharing measures. Prior to introducing access limitations, sub-projects		

	conduct socio-economic assessments and stakeholder consultations to understand dependency levels and potential impacts. Restrictions are designed in consultation with communities and aligned with co-management structures where possible. Mitigation actions may include support for livelihood diversification (e.g., sustainable aquaculture, value-chain improvements, alternative income activities), capacity building, improved market access, and transitional support where needed. Transparent communication of rules and timelines helps manage expectations, while grievance mechanisms enable early resolution of concerns. Ongoing monitoring of livelihood impacts supports adaptive adjustments and helps strengthen resilience and sustainable income alternatives.		
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 6	Risk of exclusion or disproportionate impacts on women and vulnerable groups		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	A key risk across the sub-projects is the potential exclusion of, or disproportionate impacts on, women and vulnerable groups in the design and implementation of conservation and livelihood activities. Vulnerable groups may include women, youth, elderly persons, small-scale or informal resource users, low-income households, or socially marginalised groups. Barriers such as limited representation in decision-making structures, unequal access to information, literacy constraints, cultural norms, time burdens, and limited control over assets may reduce meaningful participation. Access restrictions, benefit-sharing arrangements, or livelihood support mechanisms may unintentionally favour more influential or better-connected stakeholders if inclusion is not proactively addressed. In resource-dependent and economically fragile contexts, existing gender inequalities and social hierarchies may increase the likelihood of uneven impacts. The level of risk depends on the inclusiveness of consultation processes, the availability of gender-disaggregated data, and the degree to which social inclusion is systematically integrated into sub-project planning and implementation.		
Consequences	If women or vulnerable groups are excluded from participation or disproportionately affected by sub-project interventions, this may lead to unequal access to sub-project benefits, reduced livelihood opportunities for these groups, and reinforcement of existing social or gender inequalities. Perceived unfairness in beneficiary selection, decision-making processes, or resource access restrictions may generate dissatisfaction within communities and increase the likelihood of grievances. In some contexts, exclusion may weaken trust between communities and implementing partners, reduce community cooperation with conservation measures, and undermine the effectiveness and sustainability of sub-project outcomes. Failure to adequately address inclusion risks may also require corrective actions or increased oversight to ensure compliance with ESMS and safeguard expectations.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Mitigation measures focus on proactive gender and social inclusion approaches. BAF provides gender guidance, which implementing partners are required to apply to ensure systematic integration of gender equality and inclusion considerations throughout sub-project design and implementation. Sub-projects conduct stakeholder mapping and socio-economic assessments to identify vulnerable groups and understand participation barriers. Consultation processes are designed to be inclusive, with attention to timing, language, accessibility, and, where appropriate, separate or targeted meetings to facilitate meaningful participation. Gender-disaggregated data are collected to monitor engagement, benefit distribution, and potential disparities. Mitigation actions may include support for women-led or youth-led livelihood initiatives, targeted capacity building for underrepresented groups, transparent beneficiary selection criteria, and clear communication of eligibility and benefits. Safeguarding and gender-sensitivity training for staff and partners strengthen awareness of exclusion risks. Accessible grievance mechanisms provide channels to raise concerns. These measures help		

	prevent disproportionate impacts and promote equitable participation and shared sub-project benefits.		
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 7	Risk of unintended impacts on cultural heritage and culturally significant sites		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	A key risk across the sub-projects is the potential for unintended impacts on tangible or intangible cultural heritage during implementation of conservation or livelihood activities. This may include disturbance to sacred sites, burial grounds, historically significant areas, or culturally important landscapes and seascapes. Small-scale infrastructure, restoration works, demarcation of protected areas, or changes in access and resource use may intersect with sites of cultural or spiritual significance. In some contexts, limited documentation of cultural heritage, weak consultation with traditional authorities, or lack of awareness among sub-project staff may increase the likelihood of unintentional impacts. Intangible heritage – such as customary practices, traditional ecological knowledge, or culturally embedded resource-use systems – may also be affected if not adequately considered. The level of risk varies depending on site sensitivity, the presence of formally or informally recognised heritage areas, and the degree of community engagement in planning processes.		
Consequences	If cultural heritage risks are not properly identified and managed, sub-project activities may unintentionally disturb culturally significant sites or affect traditional practices. Even localised impacts can be sensitive and may lead to community concern or reputational implications. Damage to sacred or historical sites could affect social cohesion and trust in sub-project partners. In cases where customary resource-use systems are not adequately considered, changes in access or governance arrangements may disrupt culturally embedded practices. Such impacts may reduce community support for conservation activities and require time and dialogue to resolve. While these risks are generally avoidable with appropriate planning and consultation, failure to address them may influence sub-project timelines and relationships with traditional leaders or local authorities.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	Mitigation measures focus on early identification and respectful management of cultural heritage considerations. Blue Action provides an Environmental and Social Code of Practice (ESCAP) template, which includes provisions on cultural heritage protection and chance-find procedures. Implementing partners are required to integrate these provisions into sub-project-level safeguard instruments and field guidance. Sub-projects conduct stakeholder consultations that include traditional leaders, elders, and relevant community representatives to identify culturally significant sites and practices. Where relevant, site screening and mapping processes aim to avoid physical disturbance of heritage areas. Mitigation actions may include adapting site selection, modifying activity design, establishing buffer zones, or implementing documented chance-find procedures during small-scale works. Clear communication and documentation of culturally sensitive areas guide field teams. Where customary systems are linked to resource governance, conservation measures are aligned with traditional practices where feasible. Grievance mechanisms provide channels to raise and address cultural heritage concerns promptly.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 8	Risk of ineffective or inaccessible grievance redress mechanisms (GRM)		
Risk Origin	Project Related		

Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	A key risk across the sub-projects is that GRMs may be ineffective, insufficiently accessible, or not trusted by affected stakeholders. Barriers may include limited awareness of available channels, language or literacy constraints, lack of confidentiality safeguards, unclear procedures, or weak follow-up and documentation. In remote or resource-dependent communities, physical access constraints or limited communication infrastructure may further restrict use. If grievance processes are not culturally appropriate or do not ensure protection from retaliation, vulnerable groups may be reluctant to raise concerns. In multi-partner or co-management contexts, unclear division of responsibilities may also create confusion about where complaints should be directed. The likelihood of this risk depends on the clarity, visibility, accessibility, and responsiveness of grievance systems, as well as the degree to which communities perceive them as fair and trustworthy.		
Consequences	If GRMs are not accessible or effective, concerns may go unreported or unresolved. Minor issues could escalate due to lack of timely response, potentially affecting community trust and perceptions of fairness. Vulnerable groups may remain unheard, and misunderstandings may persist longer than necessary. In some cases, unresolved grievances could reduce support for sub-project activities or slow implementation while issues are clarified. Without proper documentation and tracking, sub-projects may miss opportunities to identify recurring risks or improve safeguard measures. While such outcomes are generally manageable, ineffective grievance handling can weaken accountability and reduce the transparency that underpins strong community relationships and sustainable conservation outcomes.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Mitigation measures focus on establishing accessible, transparent, and responsive GRMs at sub-project level. Blue Action provides standardised GRM templates and minimum procedural requirements to ensure consistency across sub-projects. Implementing partners are required to document grievances systematically and report on them regularly, including timelines for acknowledgment and resolution. At sub-project level, clear procedures outline how complaints can be submitted, recorded, assessed, and resolved within defined timeframes. Multiple entry points—such as community focal points, written submissions, phone-based channels, or community meetings—are used to increase accessibility. Information about the mechanism is communicated during consultations and made available in accessible formats and local languages. Confidentiality safeguards and non-retaliation principles are emphasised to protect complainants. Defined roles and escalation pathways strengthen accountability. Regular review of grievance data supports trend analysis and adaptive management, reducing the likelihood of unresolved concerns and reinforcing transparency and trust.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 9	Risk of human rights impacts associated with enforcement activities and access restrictions		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	A key risk across the sub-projects relates to potential human rights concerns arising in connection with enforcement of conservation measures and implementation of access restrictions. Where sub-projects coordinate with government enforcement authorities, interactions with resource users during patrols or compliance checks require clear safeguards and role definition. In resource-dependent contexts, restrictions on access to land or marine areas may increase sensitivity, particularly where livelihoods are affected. Risks may include misunderstandings, perceived unfair treatment, or inadequate consideration of customary or traditional use rights if procedures are not clearly communicated and consistently applied. Limited training, unclear mandates, or weak oversight mechanisms may increase exposure. In areas with historical grievances		

	or socio-economic vulnerability, enforcement-related actions may require careful handling to maintain trust and transparency.		
Consequences	If not appropriately managed, enforcement activities or access restrictions may result in tensions between resource users and authorities. Individuals may feel unfairly treated during compliance checks or perceive restrictions as inconsistent or disproportionate. This could lead to formal complaints, increased grievances, or reluctance to comply with conservation measures. In some cases, confrontational situations may arise during patrols, requiring mediation or procedural clarification. Where customary rights are not clearly considered, communities may question the legitimacy of restrictions. Such situations may temporarily slow implementation, require additional dialogue, or necessitate adjustments to enforcement approaches. While serious incidents are not expected where safeguards are applied, even isolated concerns can influence community trust and cooperation. Proactive communication, oversight, and accessible GRMs are therefore essential to maintain confidence and ensure conservation measures are implemented fairly and consistently.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 4 - High	Severity 8 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Mitigation measures focus on clear role definition, transparency, and adherence to human rights principles. Sub-projects clarify that implementing partners do not exercise enforcement authority and define collaboration arrangements where working alongside government enforcement bodies. Where relevant, Blue Action may require submission and review of law enforcement SOPs to promote proportionality, accountability, and clarity of mandate. Training on codes of conduct, human rights awareness, and conflict-sensitive engagement is provided to relevant staff and partners. Transparent communication of access rules and decision-making processes helps manage expectations and reduce misunderstandings. Accessible GRMs allow concerns related to enforcement conduct or access restrictions to be raised and addressed in a timely manner. Serious incidents must be reported to Blue Action within 48 hours, triggering formal review, documentation, and, where necessary, agreed corrective actions.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 4 - High	Severity 8 - Medium High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 4 - High	Severity 8 - Medium High
Comments	In December 2025, a serious incident occurred within the Maputo National Park, Mozambique, in the landscape where the Peace Parks Foundation sub-project is implemented. A suspected poacher was fatally shot by a ranger of the National Administration of Conservation Areas (ANAC) – the Park Authority - during a law enforcement intervention. While the incident took place within the broader sub-project landscape, it arose from terrestrial law enforcement operations carried out by government authorities and was not linked to activities financed under the Blue Action sub-project. Nevertheless, the event resulted in community unrest, which sub-project implementing partners must be very mindful of. The incident is being formally investigated by the Public Prosecutor's Office. The case remains open and is being monitored by Blue Action through the ESMS serious incident management process. Further details are provided in the associated report in the Section Report Risk Incidents below.		
Risk 10	Risk of Prohibited Practices		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	As part of the Integrity Risk Area, there is a moderate risk of prohibited practices occurring in connection with sub-project implementation. Risks associated with prohibited practices include fraud, corruption, conflicts of interest, collusion, coercion, or obstruction, money laundering, or engagement with sanctioned parties. In multi-partner programmes, exposure may arise in procurement, financial management, or sub-granting processes if controls are not consistently applied.		
Consequences	If prohibited practices were to occur, this could result in misuse of funds, non-compliance with contractual requirements, or the need for corrective financial or operational measures. Allegations trigger internal review, additional documentation, or enhanced oversight to clarify facts and ensure appropriate response. In certain cases,		

	transactions or activities may require temporary pause while concerns are assessed. Even isolated allegations can require strengthened monitoring and reporting to maintain compliance and transparency. However, where early detection and response mechanisms function effectively, impacts can be contained and addressed through corrective action. Continued vigilance is therefore important to protect programme integrity and maintain stakeholder confidence.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Mitigation measures focus on structured due diligence, financial oversight, and clear reporting obligations. Blue Action applies a Financial and Organisational Due Diligence process assessing audit history, procurement systems, internal controls, conflict-of-interest policies, and fraud prevention measures. Sub-projects must apply documented financial procedures, adhere to procurement standards, implement a four-eyes principle for expenditure authorisation, and retain records for seven years. Semi-annual financial reporting and regular external financial reviews strengthen oversight. Sub-project-level grievances referencing integrity concerns are addressed through established mechanisms. These controls reduce the likelihood of misconduct and enable timely corrective action where needed.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	During the reporting period, four incidents related to perceived fraud, fairness in beneficiary selection, or alleged misuse of authority in local sub-project contexts. Overall, these cases were limited in scope, reviewed through the respective sub-project-level GRMs, and addressed through clarification and corrective follow-up actions such as dismissal of involved staff members by the implementing partners. They do not indicate systemic or programme-wide integrity weaknesses. Existing controls and reporting procedures continue to provide adequate safeguards and support the programme's medium residual integrity risk rating.		
Risk 11	Risk of Sexual Exploitation, Abuse, and Harassment (SEAH)		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	Gender & SEAH		
Description	There is a potential risk of Sexual Exploitation, Abuse, or Harassment (SEAH) occurring in connection with sub-project activities. SEAH refers to abuse of power or trust for sexual purposes and may arise in relationships between staff, partners, contractors, or community members. In community-based conservation settings – particularly in remote or resource-dependent contexts – power imbalances may increase exposure if safeguards are not clearly embedded.		
Consequences	If SEAH were to occur, this could cause direct harm to affected individuals and require prompt response, investigation, and reporting in line with safeguarding obligations. Allegations may necessitate temporary operational adjustments while concerns are assessed, and appropriate measures taken. Even isolated incidents could affect stakeholder confidence and require enhanced oversight including reporting to GCF. While no SEAH incidents were reported during the current period, maintaining strong preventive and response mechanisms remains essential to ensure protection of individuals, uphold accountability standards, and safeguard programme integrity.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	Mitigation measures focus on integrating SEAH prevention and response across institutional and programme levels. Blue Action has embedded SEAH into its Due Diligence process, requiring applicants to confirm that SEAH is addressed in their internal policies; where gaps exist, corrective steps are required before sub-project launch. SEAH has been incorporated into the Whistleblower Policy, Gender Guide (as a cross-cutting issue), and Grievance and Serious Incident reporting templates, including classification as a serious incident. Implementing partners must maintain safeguarding policies, provide confidential and accessible reporting channels, and report serious SEAH incidents to Blue Action without delay. Regular oversight and documentation strengthen accountability. The absence of reported SEAH cases during the period		

	suggests that preventive measures are functioning, while continued vigilance ensures preparedness should concerns arise.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	During the reporting period, no SEAH cases were recorded in the grievance register or as serious incidents. A small number of grievances raised requests to improve women's participation in meetings, decision-making processes, or beneficiary selection. None of these cases involved allegations of sexual misconduct, exploitation, or abuse. Nevertheless, SEAH remains a relevant integrity risk requiring continued preventive safeguards.		
Risk 12	Sanctions and Illicit Finance Risks		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Money Laundering (ML) & Terrorist Financing (TF)		
Description	There is a low risk of inadvertently engaging with individuals or entities subject to UN Security Council sanctions, or exposure to risks related to money laundering or terrorism financing. In practice, this risk is considered low within the Blue Action portfolio. Sub-projects are implemented through established conservation NGOs, with structured financial oversight and limited exposure to complex financial transactions. Nevertheless, compliance with international sanctions regimes and anti-money-laundering and counter-terrorism financing regulations requires Blue Action to maintain appropriate screening and oversight procedures. Even where the practical likelihood of exposure is low, these risks remain relevant from a compliance perspective given Blue Action's fiduciary responsibility in partner selection and international fund transfers.		
Consequences	If such a risk were to materialise, this could result in the need to suspend a transaction, review a partnership, or conduct additional verification before proceeding. In more serious circumstances, it could involve contractual or regulatory implications requiring notification to GCF, and if necessary, ending the sub-project. However, given the preventive controls in place and the profile of implementing partners, the likelihood of occurrence is considered very low. No such cases arose during the reporting period.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	4 - High	4 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	Mitigation measures are primarily preventive and embedded in partner selection and financial oversight processes. Prior to grant signature, BAF conducts terrorism and sanctions screening of leadership and governing bodies against relevant sanctions lists. Findings are documented and retained. Financial and organisational due diligence assesses audit history, financial stability, internal controls, and policies related to fraud and money laundering prevention. Implementing partners are required to sign a Declaration of Undertaking confirming that they have not been included in UN list of sanctions, EU, German Government, nor in any other list of sanctions, that they will immediately inform BAF if this situation occurs later. Implementing partners must apply documented financial procedures, procurement standards, expenditure authorisation controls, and retain records for seven years. Regular reporting and independent audits provide additional oversight. These measures significantly reduce already low likelihood of sanctions or illicit finance risks, ensuring compliance with international & GCF requirements.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	4 - High	4 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	4 - High	4 - Medium
Comments	No cases of sanctions breaches, money laundering, or terrorism financing concerns were identified during the reporting period. The primary exposure point lies at implementing partner selection and fund transfer stages, which are subject to formal due diligence and screening procedures.		
Risk 13	Sanctions not respected		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		

Risk Sub-area	Sanctions		
Description	no risk materialized		
Consequences	no risk materialized		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	compliance coveats in grant agreements; internal aareness rising & checks at BAF and NGO level		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 14	Conflict of interest		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	no risk materialized		
Consequences	no risk materialized		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	no scenario currently with conflict of interests		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Comments	N/A		

D.2. Report risk incidents

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

(this section is confidential)

E. FINANCIAL INFORMATION

E.1. GCF financing

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

Country	Instrument	Currency (as per FAA)	Committed Amount	Disbursed Amount	Expenditure (reporting year)	Cumulative Expenditure	Mitigation	Adaptation
South Africa	Grants	EUR	6,600,000	4,545,727	1,007,039	3,320,249	0%	100%
Mozambique	Grants	EUR	9,266,004	5,836,376	1,222,437	4,228,193	0%	100%
Madagascar	Grants	EUR	5,493,466	3,490,036	554,205	2,451,789	0%	100%
Tanzania	Grants	EUR	5,905,438	3,343,589	1,078,328	2,312,339	0%	100%
Total		EUR	27,264,908	17,215,728	3,862,009	12,312,570	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
BMZ (German Ministry of Economic Development and Cooperation)	Grants	EUR	25,000,000	25,000,000	5,404,127	13,537,406	0%	100%
Total		EUR	25,000,000	25,000,000	5,404,127	13,537,406	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

Institution Type <i>(public/private)</i>	Instrument	Currency	Cumulative Value	Final Target <i>(estimation)</i>
Private	Grants	EUR	14,162,298	14,162,298
Total		EUR	14,162,298	14,162,298

File Name: Grant-Financial-Progress-APR 2025.xlsx

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

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

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

Key Environmental and Social Changes

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

Yes ☐ No ☒

Environmental and Social Safeguarding Updates

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

Yes ☐ No ☒

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

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

Yes ☐ No ☒

F.3. ESS standards implementation progress

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

Yes ☒ No ☐

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

Activities implemented during the reporting period, including monitoring

All nine sub-projects have established and are implementing Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) and associated safeguard instruments in line with the Blue Action Fund's Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS). During the reporting period, sub-projects made substantive progress in implementing planned mitigation measures and management actions to address identified environmental, social, gender, health and safety, and human rights risks. Key areas of progress include the updating and operationalisation of Stakeholder Engagement Plans (SEPs) and Access Restriction Process Frameworks, the establishment, dissemination, and active use of culturally appropriate Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRMs), the development and implementation of occupational health and safety procedures, and the integration of gender-sensitive and inclusive approaches into sub-project design and delivery. Capacity building and training activities for sub-project staff, partners, community members, and enforcement actors – particularly on human rights, conflict resolution, safeguarding, and grievance handling – were also a central focus across multiple sub-projects. Implementation progress further included concrete actions to mitigate potential livelihood impacts linked to access restrictions through the rollout of alternative and supplementary livelihood activities, value chain support, savings groups (including MKUBAs and VLSAs, which are self-managed community savings and loan associations providing small loans and strengthening household financial resilience), and targeted assistance to vulnerable groups. Environmental management measures such as ecological and socio-economic baseline studies, environmental monitoring, invasive species prevention protocols, culturally sensitive chance-find procedures, and climate vulnerability assessments were undertaken or advanced across sub-projects. In most cases, risks identified during the initial screening and assessment phase continued to be adequately managed through the systematic application of safeguard instruments, with no significant unresolved environmental or social issues reported during the period. A detailed, sub-project-level overview of mitigation measures implemented, outputs achieved, and any pending issues is provided in Annex 9.

Outputs during the reporting period

refer to Annex 9

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

refer to Annex 9

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

refer to Annex 9

Remarks/Notes

refer to Annex 9

F.4. Sub-projects information

Have any subprojects been implemented?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Title of the sub-project	Protection and restoration of important ecosystems in uThukela Marine Protected Aarea, and associated Estuarine Functional Zones, reducing climate-related socio-ecological risk (Wildtrust) (South Africa)
ESS management plan/instrument in place	
Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP): The ESMP is the central safeguard document for a sub-project. It summarises the environmental and social risks and impacts identified during the assessment process and defines the mitigation and management measures required to address them. The ESMP also provides key contextual information about the sub-project and links to other safeguard instruments that support its implementation. It serves as the main reference for tracking environmental and social risk management throughout the sub-project lifecycle. Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP): The SEP outlines how the sub-project will identify, engage, and communicate with stakeholders, particularly people affected by sub-project activities. It describes the different stakeholder groups, the methods and channels for engagement, and the timing and frequency of consultations and information sharing. The SEP helps ensure that stakeholder perspectives are considered in sub-project design and implementation and that engagement remains an ongoing and transparent process. Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM): The GRM establishes a formal process through which sub-project-affected people and other stakeholders can submit complaints, concerns, or feedback related to the sub-project. It defines procedures for receiving, assessing, addressing, and documenting grievances, including timelines and responsibilities for resolution. The mechanism aims to ensure concerns are addressed in a timely and transparent manner and helps identify issues early so that corrective action can be taken when needed. Process Framework (PF): The Process Framework provides guidance for managing situations where conservation measures restrict access to natural resources. It outlines how potential social and economic impacts of access restrictions will be identified, assessed, and addressed in consultation with affected stakeholders. The framework also describes participatory processes for developing mitigation measures, including livelihood support or alternative activities, to reduce negative impacts on communities. Gender Action Plan (GAP): The Gender Action Plan describes how gender considerations will be integrated into sub-project activities to promote equitable participation and benefits. It identifies potential gender-related risks or barriers and outlines measures to ensure that women and other vulnerable groups can meaningfully participate in decision-making, access project opportunities, and benefit from sub-project outcomes. The GAP also defines responsibilities and monitoring actions to track progress on gender equality objectives.	
Stakeholder engagement plan in place	
The SEP for the Wildtrust sub-project in the uThukela MPA establishes a structured and continuous framework for engaging stakeholders throughout sub-project implementation. The SEP identifies and categorises stakeholders based on their level of interest, influence, and potential exposure to sub-project impacts. Key stakeholders include local coastal communities, traditional authorities, small-scale and recreational fishers, municipal and provincial government departments (including Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE) and Ezemvelo KwaZulu-Natal Wildlife (EKZNW), research institutions, civil society organisations, youth groups, and vulnerable populations who depend on marine resources for livelihoods. Engagement approaches are tailored according to stakeholder type and risk exposure. These include information disclosure, community meetings, targeted consultations, Informed Consultation and Participation (ICP) processes for potentially affected groups, governance liaison forums, and capacity-building workshops. Specific engagement activities implemented to date include consultations with traditional councils, small-scale fisheries co-management discussions, gender awareness sessions, youth skills development initiatives, environmental education activities, and ESMS-related workshops. The SEP functions as a living document and is publicly accessible. A stakeholder register records issues raised, commitments made, and follow-up actions. A formal GRM is operational and communicated through community structures, traditional leadership, and partner organisations. The mechanism allows confidential and gender-sensitive reporting and tracks resolution timelines for each grievance. Monitoring of engagement effectiveness is undertaken through attendance registers, meeting minutes, feedback forms, grievance logs, and periodic review of stakeholder concerns to ensure adaptive management and ongoing transparency.	
Activities/engagement conducted with Indigenous peoples	
N/A (No Indigenous Peoples)	

Title of the sub-project	Protection and restoration of important ecosystems in uThukela Marine Protected Aarea, and associated Estuarine Functional Zones, reducing climate-related socio-ecological risk (Wildtrust) (South Africa)
Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during this reporting period	
Please refer to Annex 9.	
Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention	
None	
Title of the sub-project	Ecosystem-based Adaptation to climate change in Maputo Environmental Protection Area (MEPA): Conserving and building resilience (Peace Parks Foundation) (Mozambique)
ESS management plan/instrument in place	
Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP): The ESMP is the central safeguard document for a sub-project. It summarises the environmental and social risks and impacts identified during the assessment process and defines the mitigation and management measures required to address them. The ESMP also provides key contextual information about the sub-project and links to other safeguard instruments that support its implementation. It serves as the main reference for tracking environmental and social risk management throughout the sub-project lifecycle. Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP): The SEP outlines how the sub-project will identify, engage, and communicate with stakeholders, particularly people affected by sub-project activities. It describes stakeholder groups, engagement methods, and consultation processes. The plan ensures that stakeholder perspectives are incorporated into sub-project design and implementation and that communication and consultation continue throughout the sub-project. Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM): The GRM establishes a formal process through which sub-project-affected people and other stakeholders can submit complaints, concerns, or feedback related to the sub-project. It defines procedures for receiving, assessing, addressing, and documenting grievances, including timelines and responsibilities for resolution. The mechanism helps ensure concerns are addressed transparently and in a timely manner. Process Framework (PF): The PF guides how sub-projects manage situations where conservation measures restrict access to natural resources. It outlines how potential social and economic impacts will be identified and addressed in consultation with affected stakeholders and describes participatory processes for developing mitigation measures such as livelihood support. Gender Action Plan (GAP): The GAP sets out actions to promote gender equity in sub-project design and implementation. It identifies gender-related barriers or risks and defines measures to ensure that women and other vulnerable groups can participate meaningfully, benefit from sub-project activities, and access opportunities created by the sub-project. Environmental and Social Code of Practice (ESCAP): The ESCAP provides environmental, health and safety procedures for small-scale construction or infrastructure activities within a sub-project. It outlines practical measures to minimise impacts such as soil disturbance, pollution, waste generation, and risks to workers or nearby communities. It is typically applied by sub-project staff and contractors implementing civil works. Security Management Plan (SMP): The SMP outlines procedures to manage security risks associated with sub-project operations. It defines roles, responsibilities, and protocols for ensuring the safety of sub-project staff, partners, and community members while minimising risks of harm or conflict. The plan may include procedures for risk assessment, incident response, and coordination with relevant authorities. Law Enforcement Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs): Law Enforcement SOPs describe operational procedures for personnel involved in enforcement activities such as patrols, inspections, or arrests. They set standards for conduct, use of authority, and reporting, and aim to ensure that enforcement actions are carried out safely, consistently, and in line with legal and human rights obligations. Human–Wildlife Conflict (HWC) Management Strategy: The HWC Management Strategy outlines measures to prevent, mitigate, and respond to conflicts between wildlife and local communities. It includes monitoring systems, community awareness activities, reporting procedures, and mitigation measures such as deterrents, improved livestock protection, or	

Title of the sub-project	Protection and restoration of important ecosystems in uThukela Marine Protected Area, and associated Estuarine Functional Zones, reducing climate-related socio-ecological risk (Wildtrust) (South Africa)
compensation mechanisms where applicable. The strategy aims to reduce risks to livelihoods while supporting conservation objectives.	
Stakeholder engagement plan in place	
The SEP for the sub-project provides a structured framework for engagement in the context of ecosystem restoration, strengthened protected area management, climate adaptation measures and livelihood support interventions within the Maputo Environmental Protection Area. Given the sub-project's focus on conservation management, fisheries governance and community-based livelihood activities, the SEP formalises participatory processes to address potential implications related to resource access, land use, and benefit sharing. It builds on Peace Parks' existing co-management partnership with ANAC and established community engagement platforms. The SEP identifies and analyses stakeholders based on potential impact, interest and influence. Sub-project Affected People include communities in Machangulo, Zitundo, Messevene and Inhaca, Traditional Leaders, CBNRMCs, CCPs, women and youth groups, and vulnerable households. Interested parties include ANAC, district and provincial authorities, sectoral ministries, civil society organisations, research institutions and private sector stakeholders. Vulnerable groups – including women, youth, elderly persons, persons with disabilities and female-headed households – are prioritised for targeted engagement. Engagement approaches are proportionate to risk and include information sharing, consultation and Informed Consultation and Participation (ICP) for directly affected communities. Methods include community meetings, focus group discussions, participatory assessments, gender and fisheries analyses, and structured governance committees. The SEP is a living document supported by a Stakeholder Register tracking issues, commitments and follow-up actions. A sub-project-level GRM, accessible in Portuguese and Changana, is operational and overseen through established sub-project governance structures.	
Activities/engagement conducted with Indigenous peoples	
N/A (No Indigenous Peoples)	
Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during this reporting period	
Please refer to Annex 9.	
Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention	
None	
Title of the sub-project	Increasing socio-ecological resilience to climate change in the Barren Isles through protection and restoration of key ecosystems and diversified livelihoods (Blue Ventures) (Madagascar)
ESS management plan/instrument in place	
Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP): The ESMP is the central safeguard document for a sub-project. It summarises the environmental and social risks and impacts identified during the assessment process and defines the mitigation and management measures required to address them. The ESMP also provides key contextual information about the sub-project and links to other safeguard instruments that support its implementation. It serves as the main reference for tracking environmental and social risk management throughout the sub-project lifecycle. Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP): The SEP outlines how the sub-project will identify, engage, and communicate with stakeholders, particularly people affected by sub-project activities. It describes stakeholder groups, engagement methods, and consultation processes. The plan ensures that stakeholder perspectives are incorporated into sub-project design and implementation and that communication and consultation continue throughout the sub-project. Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM): The GRM establishes a formal process through which sub-project-affected people and other stakeholders can submit complaints, concerns, or feedback related to the sub-project. It defines procedures for receiving, assessing, addressing, and documenting grievances, including timelines and responsibilities for resolution. The mechanism helps ensure concerns are addressed transparently and in a timely manner.	

Title of the sub-project	Protection and restoration of important ecosystems in uThukela Marine Protected Area, and associated Estuarine Functional Zones, reducing climate-related socio-ecological risk (Wildtrust) (South Africa)
Process Framework (PF): The PF guides how sub-projects manage situations where conservation measures restrict access to natural resources. It outlines how potential social and economic impacts will be identified and addressed in consultation with affected stakeholders and describes participatory processes for developing mitigation measures such as livelihood support. Gender Action Plan (GAP): The GAP sets out actions to promote gender equity in sub-project design and implementation. It identifies gender-related barriers or risks and defines measures to ensure that women and other vulnerable groups can participate meaningfully, benefit from sub-project activities, and access opportunities created by the sub-project.	
Stakeholder engagement plan in place	
The SEP for the sub-project is closely linked to the establishment and long-term management of the Barren Isles MPA under IUCN Category VI (allows sustainable use of natural resources while ensuring the long-term conservation of biodiversity), implemented through collaborative co-management between the sub-project lead, Blue Ventures, and the Vezo Miray Nosy Barren (VMNB) Association. Engagement focuses on fisheries access regulation, no-take zones, mangrove restoration, ecological monitoring and livelihood diversification for climate-vulnerable Vezo communities. A central governance instrument is the Dina, a locally developed and court-recognised customary convention that defines resource-use rules, access rights, sanctions for non-compliance, and community surveillance procedures. In the Barren Isles, the Dina formalises fisheries management measures agreed through participatory processes (e.g. gear restrictions, closed seasons, spatial limits) and provides the legal basis for enforcement by community patrol officers (Akio Kary) in coordination with state authorities. The SEP supports consultation, validation and periodic reinforcement of the Dina to ensure legitimacy and compliance. Primary stakeholders include approximately 2,000 small-scale fishers and their households across 30 villages within and adjacent to the MPA, including migrant and seasonal Vezo groups. VMNB, composed of elected fisher representatives, plays a central role in fisheries management, data collection and conflict resolution. Other stakeholders include regional fisheries authorities, the Ministry of Environment, communes, Fokontany leaders (elected or appointed heads of the fokontany, the lowest administrative unit in Madagascar's government structure), Vondron'Olona Ifotony (locally recognised community-based natural resource management associations responsible for mangrove management), and industrial fishing representatives. Given the potential impacts of access restrictions and enforcement, the SEP applies Informed Consultation and Participation (ICP) for directly affected fishers. Engagement includes village assemblies, gender-segregated focus groups, participatory validation of MPA management plans, and fisheries data feedback meetings. A multi-tier GRM builds on Dina-based mediation structures and administrative channels, with defined escalation pathways and safeguarding oversight.	
Activities/engagement conducted with Indigenous peoples	
N/A (No Indigenous Peoples)	
Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during this reporting period	
Please refer to Annex 9.	
Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention	
None	
Title of the sub-project	Building a Blue Future for Ecosystems and People on the East African Coast (WCS Mozambique)
ESS management plan/instrument in place	
Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP): The ESMP is the central safeguard document for a sub-project. It summarises the environmental and social risks and impacts identified during the assessment process and defines the mitigation and management measures required to address them. The ESMP also provides key contextual information about the sub-project and links to other safeguard instruments that support its implementation. It serves as the main reference for tracking environmental and social risk management throughout the sub-project lifecycle.	

Title of the sub-project	Protection and restoration of important ecosystems in uThukela Marine Protected Area, and associated Estuarine Functional Zones, reducing climate-related socio-ecological risk (Wildtrust) (South Africa)
	Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP): The SEP outlines how the sub-project will identify, engage, and communicate with stakeholders, particularly people affected by sub-project activities. It describes stakeholder groups, engagement methods, and consultation processes. The plan ensures that stakeholder perspectives are incorporated into sub-project design and implementation and that communication and consultation continue throughout the sub-project. Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM): The GRM establishes a formal process through which sub-project-affected people and other stakeholders can submit complaints, concerns, or feedback related to the sub-project. It defines procedures for receiving, assessing, addressing, and documenting grievances, including timelines and responsibilities for resolution. The mechanism helps ensure concerns are addressed transparently and in a timely manner. Process Framework (PF): The PF guides how sub-projects manage situations where conservation measures restrict access to natural resources. It outlines how potential social and economic impacts will be identified and addressed in consultation with affected stakeholders and describes participatory processes for developing mitigation measures such as livelihood support. Gender Action Plan (GAP): The GAP sets out actions to promote gender equity in sub-project design and implementation. It identifies gender-related barriers or risks and defines measures to ensure that women and other vulnerable groups can participate meaningfully, benefit from sub-project activities, and access opportunities created by the sub-project. Environmental and Social Code of Practice (ESCAP): The ESCAP provides environmental, health and safety procedures for small-scale construction or infrastructure activities within a sub-project. It outlines practical measures to minimise impacts such as soil disturbance, pollution, waste generation, and risks to workers or nearby communities. It is typically applied by sub-project staff and contractors implementing civil works. Security Management Plan (SMP): The SMP outlines procedures to manage security risks associated with sub-project operations. It defines roles, responsibilities, and protocols for ensuring the safety of sub-project staff, partners, and community members while minimising risks of harm or conflict. The plan may include procedures for risk assessment, incident response, and coordination with relevant authorities. Chance Find Procedure (CFP): The CFP establishes the steps to be followed if cultural heritage or archaeological materials are unexpectedly discovered during sub-project activities, particularly during construction or earthworks. It outlines responsibilities for stopping work, securing the site, notifying relevant authorities, and ensuring that appropriate assessment and consultation take place before activities resume. The procedure helps protect cultural heritage resources while ensuring that sub-project implementation complies with applicable legal and safeguard requirements.
	Stakeholder engagement plan in place
	The SEP for the WCS Mozambique sub-project guides stakeholder engagement in the context of strengthening community-based fisheries management, supporting LMMAs, biodiversity conservation, and climate adaptation across coastal districts in northern Mozambique. The sub-project operates in areas where coastal communities depend heavily on small-scale fisheries and mangrove resources, and where co-management arrangements with government are central to sustainable resource governance. The SEP is aligned with national legislation and Blue Action Fund ESMS requirements. Primary stakeholders include small-scale fishers, CCPs, village leadership structures, women's groups engaged in fisheries value chains, youth groups, and vulnerable households reliant on marine and coastal resources. Government stakeholders include district and provincial fisheries authorities, conservation agencies, maritime administration and relevant ministries. Civil society partners and research institutions involved in ecological monitoring and fisheries data collection are also engaged. Given the potential implications of fisheries management measures (e.g. spatial closures, gear restrictions, enforcement strengthening), the SEP applies meaningful consultation and Informed Consultation and Participation (ICP) processes for directly affected communities. Engagement methods include village assemblies, CCP meetings, participatory fisheries planning workshops, gender-focused consultations, ecological and catch data feedback sessions, and district-level coordination meetings. The SEP functions as a living document and includes a stakeholder register to track engagement activities, concerns raised and follow-up actions. A sub-project-level GRM is operational, accessible in local languages, and integrated with existing community and government conflict-resolution structures. Monitoring includes documentation of consultations, gender-disaggregated participation data, and periodic review of stakeholder feedback to support adaptive management.

Title of the sub-project	Protection and restoration of important ecosystems in uThukela Marine Protected Aarea, and associated Estuarine Functional Zones, reducing climate-related socio-ecological risk (Wildtrust) (South Africa)
Activities/engagement conducted with Indigenous peoples	
N/A (No Indigenous Peoples)	
Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during this reporting period	
Please refer to Annex 9.	
Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention	
None	
Title of the sub-project	Elevating Ecosystem based Adaptation approaches in the Tsimanampesotse-Nosy Ve Androka Biosphere Reserve seascape (WWF Madagascar)
ESS management plan/instrument in place	
Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP): The ESMP is the central safeguard document for a sub-project. It summarises the environmental and social risks and impacts identified during the assessment process and defines the mitigation and management measures required to address them. The ESMP also provides key contextual information about the sub-project and links to other safeguard instruments that support its implementation. It serves as the main reference for tracking environmental and social risk management throughout the sub-project lifecycle. Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP): The SEP outlines how the sub-project will identify, engage, and communicate with stakeholders, particularly people affected by sub-project activities. It describes stakeholder groups, engagement methods, and consultation processes. The plan ensures that stakeholder perspectives are incorporated into sub-project design and implementation and that communication and consultation continue throughout the sub-project. Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM): The GRM establishes a formal process through which sub-project-affected people and other stakeholders can submit complaints, concerns, or feedback related to the sub-project. It defines procedures for receiving, assessing, addressing, and documenting grievances, including timelines and responsibilities for resolution. The mechanism helps ensure concerns are addressed transparently and in a timely manner. Process Framework (PF): The PF guides how sub-projects manage situations where conservation measures restrict access to natural resources. It outlines how potential social and economic impacts will be identified and addressed in consultation with affected stakeholders and describes participatory processes for developing mitigation measures such as livelihood support. Gender Action Plan (GAP): The GAP sets out actions to promote gender equity in sub-project design and implementation. It identifies gender-related barriers or risks and defines measures to ensure that women and other vulnerable groups can participate meaningfully, benefit from sub-project activities, and access opportunities created by the sub-project.	
Stakeholder engagement plan in place	
The SEP guides engagement in the context of strengthening Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs), supporting Nosy Ve-Androka MPA governance, ecosystem restoration, climate-resilient livelihoods (e.g. fisheries value chains, seaweed farming, livestock), and integration of EbA into Biosphere Reserve management. Given existing and potential resource access restrictions linked to MPAs, LMMAs and temporary fisheries closures, the SEP structures consultation, benefit-sharing dialogue and mitigation planning with affected communities. Primary stakeholders include fishing and farming households within the Biosphere Reserve, LMMA federations (e.g. MIHARI platform members), community-based organisations, traditional authorities, Fokontany representatives (a Fokontany is the lowest administrative unit in Madagascar's government structure), women and youth associations, and climate migrants from inland areas. Government stakeholders include regional and district authorities, Direction Régionale de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable, Direction Régionale de la Pêche et de l'Économie Bleue), Madagascar National Parks, and sectoral ministries. consortium partners – (Catholic Relief Services and the Centre de Développement du Diocèse – and	

Title of the sub-project	Protection and restoration of important ecosystems in uThukela Marine Protected Aarea, and associated Estuarine Functional Zones, reducing climate-related socio-ecological risk (Wildtrust) (South Africa)
regional technical actors are engaged in implementation and coordination. The SEP applies differentiated engagement approaches, including Informed Consultation and Participation (ICP) for livelihood and governance interventions for communities affected by conservation zoning or access restrictions. Consultations are conducted through fokonolona assemblies (traditional community meetings involving all adult members of the village), bilateral institutional meetings, and targeted sessions for women, youth and vulnerable groups. Due to cultural norms limiting women's participation in plenary discussions, the sub-project applies separate consultation formats to ensure meaningful inclusion. A sub-project-level GRM, accessible through multiple channels (telephone, email, written submission), is operational and publicly disclosed. Stakeholder engagement is documented through registers and semi-annual reviews, with adaptive updates reflecting evolving governance, LMMA legal frameworks and partnership commitments.	
Activities/engagement conducted with Indigenous peoples	
N/A (No Indigenous Peoples)	
Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during this reporting period	
Please refer to Annex 9.	
Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention	
None	
Title of the sub-project	Increasing socio-ecological resilience through community-led management of key coastal ecosystems in Pemba Channel, Tanzania (Fauna & Flora)
ESS management plan/instrument in place	
Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP): The ESMP is the central safeguard document for a sub-project. It summarises the environmental and social risks and impacts identified during the assessment process and defines the mitigation and management measures required to address them. The ESMP also provides key contextual information about the sub-project and links to other safeguard instruments that support its implementation. It serves as the main reference for tracking environmental and social risk management throughout the sub-project lifecycle. Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP): The SEP outlines how the sub-project will identify, engage, and communicate with stakeholders, particularly people affected by sub-project activities. It describes stakeholder groups, engagement methods, and consultation processes. The plan ensures that stakeholder perspectives are incorporated into sub-project design and implementation and that communication and consultation continue throughout the sub-project. Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM): The GRM establishes a formal process through which sub-project-affected people and other stakeholders can submit complaints, concerns, or feedback related to the sub-project. It defines procedures for receiving, assessing, addressing, and documenting grievances, including timelines and responsibilities for resolution. The mechanism helps ensure concerns are addressed transparently and in a timely manner. Process Framework (PF): The PF guides how sub-projects manage situations where conservation measures restrict access to natural resources. It outlines how potential social and economic impacts will be identified and addressed in consultation with affected stakeholders and describes participatory processes for developing mitigation measures such as livelihood support. Gender Action Plan (GAP): The GAP sets out actions to promote gender equity in sub-project design and implementation. It identifies gender-related barriers or risks and defines measures to ensure that women and other vulnerable groups can participate meaningfully, benefit from sub-project activities, and access opportunities created by the sub-project.	
Stakeholder engagement plan in place	

Title of the sub-project	Protection and restoration of important ecosystems in uThukela Marine Protected Area, and associated Estuarine Functional Zones, reducing climate-related socio-ecological risk (Wildtrust) (South Africa)
The SEP guides stakeholder engagement in the context of strengthening CFMAs, Community Management Groups, Beach Management Units (BMUs) and Shehia Fisheries Committees (SFCs), alongside mangrove restoration, formalisation of by-laws, enhanced fisheries enforcement and establishment of eco-credit groups (MKUBA). Given that sub-project activities include spatial management measures, fisheries restrictions and enforcement strengthening in Pemba and Tanga-Mkinga, the SEP structures inclusive consultation and decision-making processes with directly affected coastal communities. Primary stakeholders include shallow-water and near-shore fishers, migrant fishers, boat owners, seaweed farmers and buyers, mangrove users, and marine product processors. Community institutions (SFCs in Pemba, BMUs and Village Natural Resource Committees (VNRCs) in Tanga-Mkinga) play a central role in co-management design and implementation. Government stakeholders include district and regional fisheries authorities and conservation agencies. Civil society organisations, research institutions and media are engaged as interested parties. For activities involving fisheries closures, gear restrictions or formalised by-laws, the SEP applies structured, iterative consultation processes that ensure affected communities are engaged prior to finalising management measures. This includes participatory resource mapping, community meetings convened through Shehia and village leadership, technical workshops, socio-economic surveys and feedback sessions on monitoring results. Adequate time is provided for community-level deliberation and adaptation of measures. Particular attention is given to women resource users (e.g. seaweed farmers, foot fishers—people who collect marine resources on foot in shallow intertidal areas during low tide—, processors), climate-vulnerable livelihoods and young men involved in illegal fishing practices, recognising potential disproportionate impacts from enforcement and access regulation. Separate meetings and targeted outreach are applied where necessary. A multi-level GRM is operational at both community and sub-project level, accessible verbally, in writing and anonymously, with documented resolution procedures and monitoring.	
Activities/engagement conducted with Indigenous peoples	
N/A (No Indigenous Peoples)	
Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during this reporting period	
Please refer to Annex 9.	
Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention	
None	
Title of the sub-project	Building socio-ecological resilience to climate change impacts by ecosystem-based adaptation approaches at iSimangaliso MPA (Wildtrust) (South Africa)
ESS management plan/instrument in place	
Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP): The ESMP is the central safeguard document for a sub-project. It summarises the environmental and social risks and impacts identified during the assessment process and defines the mitigation and management measures required to address them. The ESMP also provides key contextual information about the sub-project and links to other safeguard instruments that support its implementation. It serves as the main reference for tracking environmental and social risk management throughout the sub-project lifecycle. Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP): The SEP outlines how the sub-project will identify, engage, and communicate with stakeholders, particularly people affected by sub-project activities. It describes stakeholder groups, engagement methods, and consultation processes. The plan ensures that stakeholder perspectives are incorporated into sub-project design and implementation and that communication and consultation continue throughout the sub-project. Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM): The GRM establishes a formal process through which sub-project-affected people and other stakeholders can submit complaints, concerns, or feedback related to the sub-project. It defines procedures for receiving, assessing, addressing, and documenting grievances, including timelines and responsibilities for resolution. The mechanism helps ensure concerns are addressed transparently and in a timely manner. Process Framework (PF): The PF guides how sub-projects manage situations where conservation measures restrict access to natural resources. It outlines how potential social and economic impacts will be identified and addressed in	

Title of the sub-project	Protection and restoration of important ecosystems in uThukela Marine Protected Area, and associated Estuarine Functional Zones, reducing climate-related socio-ecological risk (Wildtrust) (South Africa)
consultation with affected stakeholders and describes participatory processes for developing mitigation measures such as livelihood support. Gender Action Plan (GAP): The GAP sets out actions to promote gender equity in sub-project design and implementation. It identifies gender-related barriers or risks and defines measures to ensure that women and other vulnerable groups can participate meaningfully, benefit from sub-project activities, and access opportunities created by the sub-project.	
Stakeholder engagement plan in place	
The SEP for the iSimangaliso MPA sub-project structures engagement in the context of strengthened MPA enforcement, co-management of marine subsistence fisheries, climate-smart agriculture, restoration activities, youth employment (YES programme), and the establishment of Community Resource Hubs. Given the sub-project's support to improved enforcement capacity and implementation of the MPA Management Plan, the SEP places particular emphasis on engagement with communities potentially affected by access restrictions to estuarine, marine and beach resources. Primary stakeholders include subsistence and small-scale fishers, traditional leadership, households in five primary and associated secondary communities, women and youth groups, and vulnerable households dependent on natural resources. Institutional stakeholders include iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority, Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife, the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment, the KwaZulu-Natal Department of Economic Development, Tourism and Environmental Affairs, and local municipalities. For stakeholders potentially affected by strengthened enforcement or zoning clarity, the SEP applies structured, iterative consultation processes that involve early disclosure of sub-project information, community workshops on MPA zonation and boundaries, participatory mapping, and co-management committee establishment. A formal MPA Stakeholder Forum and a Climate Resilience Governance Liaison Forum provide multi-stakeholder coordination platforms. A facilitated partnership-building and dialogue process supports trust-building between park authorities and traditional leadership. Targeted engagement measures address vulnerable groups, including separate consultations for women, youth-focused engagement through hubs and training programmes, and accessible grievance channels. A multi-channel GRM is operational, publicly disclosed in isiZulu and English, and accessible via community hubs, traditional councils, email and in-person submission. Engagement activities are documented in a stakeholder register and reviewed regularly to support adaptive management and institutional coordination.	
Activities/engagement conducted with Indigenous peoples	
N/A (No Indigenous Peoples)	
Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during this reporting period	
Please refer to Annex 9.	
Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention	
None	
Title of the sub-project	Coastal Lifeline – A provincial approach to the empowerment of Fisher-Farmer Communities to adopt Nature-based Solutions in Mozambique (Rare) (Mozambique)
ESS management plan/instrument in place	
Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP): The ESMP is the central safeguard document for a sub-project. It summarises the environmental and social risks and impacts identified during the assessment process and defines the mitigation and management measures required to address them. The ESMP also provides key contextual information about the sub-project and links to other safeguard instruments that support its implementation. It serves as the main reference for tracking environmental and social risk management throughout the sub-project lifecycle. Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP): The SEP outlines how the sub-project will identify, engage, and communicate with stakeholders, particularly people affected by sub-project activities. It describes stakeholder groups, engagement	

Title of the sub-project	Protection and restoration of important ecosystems in uThukela Marine Protected Aarea, and associated Estuarine Functional Zones, reducing climate-related socio-ecological risk (Wildtrust) (South Africa)
	methods, and consultation processes. The plan ensures that stakeholder perspectives are incorporated into sub-project design and implementation and that communication and consultation continue throughout the sub-project. Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM): The GRM establishes a formal process through which sub-project-affected people and other stakeholders can submit complaints, concerns, or feedback related to the sub-project. It defines procedures for receiving, assessing, addressing, and documenting grievances, including timelines and responsibilities for resolution. The mechanism helps ensure concerns are addressed transparently and in a timely manner. Process Framework (PF): The PF guides how sub-projects manage situations where conservation measures restrict access to natural resources. It outlines how potential social and economic impacts will be identified and addressed in consultation with affected stakeholders and describes participatory processes for developing mitigation measures such as livelihood support. Gender Action Plan (GAP): The GAP sets out actions to promote gender equity in sub-project design and implementation. It identifies gender-related barriers or risks and defines measures to ensure that women and other vulnerable groups can participate meaningfully, benefit from sub-project activities, and access opportunities created by the sub-project. Environmental and Social Code of Practice (ESCOP): The ESCOP provides environmental, health and safety procedures for small-scale construction or infrastructure activities within a sub-project. It outlines practical measures to minimise impacts such as soil disturbance, pollution, waste generation, and risks to workers or nearby communities. It is typically applied by sub-project staff and contractors implementing civil works. Security Management Plan (SMP): The SMP outlines procedures to manage security risks associated with sub-project operations. It defines roles, responsibilities, and protocols for ensuring the safety of sub-project staff, partners, and community members while minimising risks of harm or conflict. The plan may include procedures for risk assessment, incident response, and coordination with relevant authorities. Chance Find Procedure (CFP): The CFP establishes the steps to be followed if cultural heritage or archaeological materials are unexpectedly discovered during sub-project activities, particularly during construction or earthworks. It outlines responsibilities for stopping work, securing the site, notifying relevant authorities, and ensuring that appropriate assessment and consultation take place before activities resume. The procedure helps sub-protect cultural heritage resources while ensuring that sub-project implementation complies with applicable legal and safeguard requirements.
Stakeholder engagement plan in place	
	The SEP structures stakeholder engagement in the context of strengthening (CMFA+R), reinforcing (CCPs), promoting EbA, mangrove restoration, climate-resilient livelihoods, savings groups, and value-chain development across four districts in Nampula Province. Given high levels of poverty, food insecurity, displacement from Cabo Delgado, and pressure on fisheries and forestry resources, the SEP applies a conflict-sensitive and locally embedded engagement approach, aligned with national legislation. Primary stakeholders include fisher and farmer households, CCPs, CBNRMCs, savings and loan associations, women's groups, youth groups, traditional leaders and district authorities (District Service for Economic Activities and District Service for Planning and Infrastructure). National institutions such as the Ministry of the Sea, Inland Waters and Fisheries, the National Fisheries Administration and the Ministry of Land and Environment are engaged in relation to fisheries governance, mangrove restoration and regulatory compliance. An Advisory Committee and Steering Committee provide structured oversight, with community representation included at advisory level. Given potential impacts related to fisheries management measures, mangrove protection, alternative livelihood transitions and enforcement strengthening (e.g. beach seine ban), the SEP applies structured, iterative consultation processes with affected households, traditional leaders and CCPs. Methods include community walks, focus group discussions, household surveys (over 1,100 respondents), value chain analyses, bilateral government consultations and public meetings in local language (Makhuwa). Particular attention is given to vulnerable groups, including women, Internally Displaced Peoples, youth, female-headed households and persons with disabilities. Engagement includes separate small-group discussions where needed, land-rights awareness for women, and gender-sensitive facilitation. A multi-stage GRM, accessible in Portuguese and Makhuwa, is operational, with grievance boxes, local disclosure and alignment with p sub-project codes of conduct. Stakeholder engagement activities are recorded in a stakeholder register and reviewed annually through Sub-Project Steering Committee oversight and community-based monitoring mechanisms.

Title of the sub-project	Protection and restoration of important ecosystems in uThukela Marine Protected Aarea, and associated Estuarine Functional Zones, reducing climate-related socio-ecological risk (Wildtrust) (South Africa)
Activities/engagement conducted with Indigenous peoples	
N/A (No Indigenous Peoples)	
Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during this reporting period	
Please refer to Annex 9.	
Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention	
none	
Title of the sub-project	Strengthening the network of climate resilient ecosystems across the Pemba Channel coral reef climate refuge (WCS Tanzania)
ESS management plan/instrument in place	
Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP): The ESMP is the central safeguard document for a sub-project. It summarises the environmental and social risks and impacts identified during the assessment process and defines the mitigation and management measures required to address them. The ESMP also provides key contextual information about the sub-project and links to other safeguard instruments that support its implementation. It serves as the main reference for tracking environmental and social risk management throughout the sub-project lifecycle. Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP): The SEP outlines how the sub-project will identify, engage, and communicate with stakeholders, particularly people affected by sub-project activities. It describes stakeholder groups, engagement methods, and consultation processes. The plan ensures that stakeholder perspectives are incorporated into sub-project design and implementation and that communication and consultation continue throughout the sub-project. Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM): The GRM establishes a formal process through which sub-project-affected people and other stakeholders can submit complaints, concerns, or feedback related to the sub-project. It defines procedures for receiving, assessing, addressing, and documenting grievances, including timelines and responsibilities for resolution. The mechanism helps ensure concerns are addressed transparently and in a timely manner. Process Framework (PF): The PF guides how sub-projects manage situations where conservation measures restrict access to natural resources. It outlines how potential social and economic impacts will be identified and addressed in consultation with affected stakeholders and describes participatory processes for developing mitigation measures such as livelihood support. Gender Action Plan (GAP): The GAP sets out actions to promote gender equity in sub-project design and implementation. It identifies gender-related barriers or risks and defines measures to ensure that women and other vulnerable groups can participate meaningfully, benefit from sub-project activities, and access opportunities created by the sub-project. Environmental and Social Code of Practice (ESCOP): The ESCOP provides environmental, health and safety procedures for small-scale construction or infrastructure activities within a sub-project. It outlines practical measures to minimise impacts such as soil disturbance, pollution, waste generation, and risks to workers or nearby communities. It is typically applied by sub-project staff and contractors implementing civil works. Chance Find Procedure (CFP): The CFP establishes the steps to be followed if cultural heritage or archaeological materials are unexpectedly discovered during sub-project activities, particularly during construction or earthworks. It outlines responsibilities for stopping work, securing the site, notifying relevant authorities, and ensuring that appropriate assessment and consultation take place before activities resume. The procedure helps protect cultural heritage resources while ensuring that sub-project implementation complies with applicable legal and safeguard requirements.	
Stakeholder engagement plan in place	

Title of the sub-project	Protection and restoration of important ecosystems in uThukela Marine Protected Area, and associated Estuarine Functional Zones, reducing climate-related socio-ecological risk (Wildtrust) (South Africa)
The SEP structures stakeholder engagement across mainland Tanzania (Tanga) and Zanzibar (Pemba) in support of strengthened community-based marine resource governance within the Pemba Channel coral reef climate refuge. The sub-project operates through legally recognised collaborative management structures – BMUs, CFMAs and Village Liaison Committees (VLCs) in Tanga, and SFCs and Collaborative Management Groups in Pemba – working in coordination with relevant government authorities including the Marine Parks and Reserves Unit, Department of Fisheries Development and Marine Resources, and Department of Marine Conservation. Sub-project activities include participatory baseline assessments, identification of conservation priorities, development and formalisation of by-laws, strengthened monitoring and enforcement systems, and support for diversified income activities such as aquaculture, beekeeping and seaweed farming. Stakeholder identification covers 56 organisational stakeholders across 10 groups in Tanga and 46 organisational stakeholders across 10 groups in Pemba, including national and local government, civil society organisations, research institutions, private sector actors (including boat and gear owners), financial institutions, media, and multiple marine resource user groups. Given potential impacts from fisheries restrictions, enforcement strengthening and by-law formalisation, structured and iterative consultation processes are applied with directly affected groups. The participatory planning cycle includes baseline surveys, community validation workshops, identification of SMART objectives, management measure development, participatory monitoring and annual adaptive review. Particular attention is given to vulnerable groups, including artisanal and small-scale fishers, women processors, migrant fishers and illegal resource users. These groups are engaged closely to support meaningful participation in decision-making processes. A sub-project-level GRM is operational, accessible in Kiswahili and English, and applies a graded resolution procedure with defined escalation levels. Stakeholder engagement activities are recorded in an electronic stakeholder register, including KoboToolbox-based reporting, and reviewed regularly to support adaptive management.	
Activities/engagement conducted with Indigenous peoples	
N/A (No Indigenous Peoples)	
Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during this reporting period	
Please refer to Annex 9.	
Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention	
none	

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, all nine sub-projects implemented their Stakeholder Engagement Plans (SEPs) in line with sub-project commitments and ESMS requirements. As detailed in Annex 10, a broad range of engagement activities were conducted, including community consultations, awareness-raising events, technical coordination meetings, training sessions, exchange visits, and participatory monitoring activities. These engagements aimed to ensure meaningful participation, transparent information sharing, and structured feedback from affected communities, local authorities, traditional leaders, and other relevant stakeholders. Across the nine sub-projects, stakeholder engagement activities reached an estimated 49,858 individuals, including 21,446 women and 24,412 men. This total also includes 4,000 radio listeners whose gender is unknown. Overall, the results reflect substantial outreach and continued efforts to promote inclusive, gender-responsive engagement. Stakeholder feedback informed sub-project implementation, adaptive management decisions, governance strengthening processes, and the dissemination and use of grievance and complaints mechanisms. Further details on activities, dates and locations of engagements, sex-disaggregated data, information shared with stakeholders, and documented outputs per sub-project are provided in Annex 10.	

Dates and venues of engagement activities
Please refer to Annex 10
Sex-disaggregated data on stakeholder engagement participants (male + female = total)
Please refer to Annex 10
Information shared with stakeholders
Please refer to Annex 10
Outputs including issues raised and addressed during the reporting period
Please refer to Annex 10
Remarks/Notes
Please refer to Annex 10

F.6. ESS forward planning and lessons learned	
Are there any planned ESS activities for the next reporting period or lessons learned to share from this period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
Provide planned activities on environmental and social safeguards for the next reporting period	
During the next reporting period, all nine sub-projects will continue implementing planned Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) measures to ensure compliance with applicable Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) standards, including provisions related to stakeholder engagement, access restrictions, community health and safety, occupational health and safety, gender equality, and vulnerable groups. Planned actions include updates to safeguard instruments, strengthening of GRM, delivery of human rights and Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) trainings, implementation of security and enforcement risk mitigation measures, climate resilience and ecosystem-based adaptation measures , and continued livelihood support linked to access restrictions. Monitoring of ESS compliance will continue through routine supervision, safeguard reporting, grievance tracking, and stakeholder feedback mechanisms. In addition, forward planning will integrate lessons from the reporting period, including systematic consideration of electoral cycles and political transitions in annual work planning, strengthened inter-ministerial engagement where regulatory approvals are required, enhanced contingency planning for climate-exposed livelihood and restoration investments, and continued emphasis on participatory, practice-based capacity-building approaches in low-literacy contexts. For a comprehensive selection of planned activities, please refer to Annex 11.	
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	
1) Implementation in Mozambique was affected by significant political and security instability, including prolonged post-electoral unrest, localised insurgent activity, and associated movement restrictions. While sub-project sites were not always directly impacted, national insecurity disrupted field operations, delayed timelines, and constrained government engagement. To mitigate these, the 3 Mozambican sub-projects strengthened security risk management as a core operational function, implementing security management plans, risk analyses, and fieldwork SOPs to guide staff deployment and activity sequencing. Daily monitoring, contingency planning, adaptive scheduling, and enhanced communication and trust-building with communities enabled continuity of implementation under volatile conditions. 2) In South Africa, a dedicated partnership-building process between Wildtrust, iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority and rural communities has successfully mitigated deeply rooted legacy issues. Through trust-based dialogues and sensitive reconciliation, this process created a model for how conservation organisations and local institutions can recover trust. A recent success is the agreed draft Memorandum of Agreement between Wildtrust and the Park Authority, which sets out how they will cooperate while holding each other accountable. Strengthened through a workshop with traditional leaders from nine communities, which revitalised communication and trust amongst local communities, this laid the foundation for more inclusive and durable conservation and climate resilience.	
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 ☐ <i>In 2025, a total of 566 grievances were recorded across the nine sub-projects (see Annex 3). Of these, 561 were addressed and closed within the reporting period, while five grievances submitted late in 2025 remained open with pending follow-up actions. The volume of cases indicates that GRMs are accessible and actively used rather than signalling an increase in programme-level safeguard risk severity. A significant proportion (213 cases) are related to human-wildlife conflicts (HWC) and were submitted in the context of the Peace Parks Foundation sub-project, through the Maputo National Parks' park-level GRM, which is aligned with and shared with the sub-project-level GRM. Other grievances primarily concerned fisheries access restrictions, zonation boundaries, beneficiary selection for livelihood support, information sharing, and interactions with patrol or enforcement actors. The majority were resolved within established timeframes, with no cases indicating systemic non-compliance. Responses included clarification of regulations, verification of beneficiary lists, targeted community meetings, and structured dialogue with complainants. Grievance data were periodically analysed in sub-project coordination meetings, informing adaptive management measures such as strengthened communication on access rules, improved dissemination of complaint channels, and adjustments to enforcement approaches. Overall, grievance handling contributed to strengthened accountability and social risk management during the reporting period.</i>	
F.8. Implementation of activities and actions agreed in the Gender Action Plan	
2025 GAP implementation progressed across all projects & focussed on increasing women's participation in governance, strengthening economic opportunities, and integrating gender considerations into EbA activities, consistently ensuring gender-balanced participation in consultations, training, and community engagement, while collecting gender-disaggregated data to track progress. Women increasingly participated in local governance, including fisheries & co-management bodies, and community monitoring initiatives. Improvements include women's representation and leadership, increased participation in decision-making and elections to community management positions. Capacity-building activities also targeted women's empowerment and leadership, addressing financial literacy, entrepreneurship, sustainable resource management, and gender awareness, including specific sessions on gender equality and gender-based violence prevention. These efforts aimed to strengthen women and enable more equitable participation in community governance and adaptation planning. Sub-projects also supported women's economic resilience through livelihood/ enterprise initiatives. Women participated strongly in savings / loan groups, eco-credit schemes, and small business development linked to sustainable fisheries, agriculture & coastal restoration activities. In several sub-projects, women constituted the majority of participants in savings groups / livelihood initiatives. Overall, implementation of GAPs is on pace and has contributed to more inclusive community governance, improved livelihood opportunities for women, and greater recognition of women's roles in climate resilience and coastal resource management.	
Are there GAP implementation activities or progress to report for this period?	
Yes ☒ No ☐ <i>Summary on Activities and Actions agreed in the Gender Action Plan (max. 200 words)</i> <i>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</i>	

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	
Output 1, Activity (i): Formation of self-help groups from women in order to increase their voice in the definition of support measures to local communities in protected areas (project planning). The programme supports women's meaningful participation in community consultation and planning processes related to the management of MPAs, LMMAs, and associated livelihood and adaptation measures. Activities aim to ensure that women's priorities, knowledge, and needs are systematically integrated into sub-project design and implementation. Across the sub-projects, women are encouraged and supported to participate in community meetings, consultations, vulnerability assessments, and planning workshops that inform fisheries management plans, co-management arrangements, ecosystem restoration activities, and climate adaptation strategies. Sub-projects also facilitate the formation or strengthening of women's groups, savings and livelihood groups, and leadership networks that enable women to collectively articulate priorities and engage in decision-making processes. These activities are complemented by targeted capacity-building initiatives, including leadership training, financial literacy, and awareness sessions on marine governance and resource management. By strengthening women's confidence, organisational capacity, and representation in community forums, the programme aims to ensure that women's perspectives influence the definition of locally appropriate conservation measures, livelihood interventions, and ecosystem-based adaptation actions in and around protected areas.	
Indicator	
Participation of women or women self-help groups in workshops defining support measures (in %)	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	50
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
Across the nine sub-projects, significant progress was made in strengthening women's voice in community planning and consultation processes, ensuring consistently women's participation in consultations related to fisheries management plans, MPA design, ecosystem restoration, and climate adaptation strategies. Women participated in village-level consultations on fisheries access restrictions, validation meetings on management actions, workshops establishing Collaborative Management Areas for community fisheries governance, participatory resource mapping exercises, and climate change vulnerability assessment consultations to identify locally appropriate ecosystem-based adaptation measures. E.g., community consultations supporting the designation of two new MCAs in Pemba (WCS Tanzania sub-project) engaged > 4,000 community members (43% women); 41% women involved in Fauna & Flora-led community consultations on access restrictions through the Shehia Fisheries Committees. In Madagascar, of consultations participants for the establishment of temporary reserves in the Blue Ventures sub-project include 51% women. In Mozambique, 75% women engaged with community governance platforms through CCVA processes and related planning workshops. In South Africa, workshops to plan restoration measures for dunes / riparian vegetation involved 55-60% women. On average across sub-projects, women constitute 40–45% of participants in consultative processes such as consultations for new MPA proposals and community-managed areas, fisheries regulation discussions, access restriction consultations, and management planning processes.	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
Estimated programme-wide average: 40-45% women participants in consultation processes	

Budget	2,500,000
Currency	EUR
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 August 2027
Responsibility	
GAP implementation is carried out by all consortium members of all nine sub-projects.	
Remarks/Notes	
Despite this progress, women's participation in consultative processes remains constrained in some contexts by cultural norms that have traditionally limited women's involvement in fisheries governance, as well as by time constraints linked to household responsibilities. Sub-projects have therefore taken deliberate steps to create more inclusive participation spaces, including targeted outreach to women and facilitation approaches designed to encourage their active engagement in community consultations and planning processes. Budget comprises all output 1 activities. The activity is evolving as expected and targets are on pace to be achieved. The implementation of this activity will continue until the end of the sub-projects.	
GAP Activity	
Direct support to women to increase their role in the participatory co-management of marine protected areas and locally managed marine areas. The programme promotes the active participation of women in the governance and management of MPAs and LMMAs. Activities focus on strengthening women's roles in community-based co-management structures that contribute to the sustainable management of coastal and marine ecosystems. Across the sub-projects, women are supported to participate in fisheries committees, co-management bodies, and other local governance structures responsible for developing and implementing management measures, such as fisheries regulations, zoning rules, and ecosystem restoration activities. The programme also promotes women's representation in community resource management groups and decision-making platforms that link communities with protected area authorities. In addition, sub-projects support women's involvement in practical management functions, including community-based monitoring of fisheries and marine ecosystems, data collection, and participation in stewardship initiatives. Targeted capacity-building activities help strengthen women's ability to engage effectively in these roles, including training in marine resource governance, monitoring techniques, leadership, and participatory management processes. Through these interventions, the programme seeks to reduce gender barriers in marine resource governance and ensure that women play a more visible and influential role in the management of coastal ecosystems. Increasing women's participation in co-management structures contributes to more inclusive decision-making, strengthens community ownership of conservation measures, and supports the long-term sustainability of protected areas.	
Indicator	
Significant increase of women in the management of the protected areas (in % women participation)	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	40
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	

Progress in strengthening women's participation in the co-management of MPAs and LMMAs includes governance engagement, monitoring roles, and targeted capacity building. Several sub-projects reported increases in % of women participating in community-based natural resource management and fisheries governance structures. In some sites, women were elected or nominated to local co-management bodies such as community coastal committees (e.g. CBNRMCs, SFCs, CMA structures) contributing to improved gender representation in decision-making. Sub-projects also supported women's participation in management-related functions contributing directly to co-management systems. In Tanzania, women represent 49% members in fisher and forestry management committees (FFI sub-project), 69% of trained fish catch recorders; while a fisherwomen leadership learning network engaged 150 women, supporting peer learning and leadership development among fisher women. In Mozambique, capacity-building workshops by the RARE sub-project reached 187 women. Based on available gender-disaggregated figures across all sub-projects, 46% women participate in community-based marine resource governance structures. While progress in strengthening women's roles in governance structures continued 2025, increasing women's representation in governance bodies remains gradual in some contexts due to persistent gender norms and structural barriers. Furthermore, some governance-related activities experienced delays due to administrative processes, government restructuring, or security challenges, which slowed the formal establishment of co-management platforms.

Cumulative progress update (Entire period)

Average women participation in community-based marine resource governance structures in 2025 is estimated at 45% across all nine sub-projects.

Budget	2,500,000
Currency	EUR
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 August 2027

Responsibility

GAP implementation is carried out by all consortium members of all nine sub-projects.

Remarks/Notes

Budget comprises all activities under output 1.
While some of the sub-project-level activities under this output have experienced some delays, across the programme the activity is progressing. The implementation of this activity will continue until the end of the sub-projects.

GAP Activity

Women working in fisheries and fish processing are trained in the reduction of post-harvest losses and improved fish processing: specific training measures, suitable in time/location/extent for the situation and availability of women

The programme supports women working in fisheries and fish processing to reduce post-harvest losses and improve the quality and value of fish products through targeted training and capacity-building activities. These interventions address key constraints faced by women in coastal fisheries value chains, where women are often responsible for fish processing and marketing but have limited access to technical training, infrastructure, and organised market structures.

Sub-projects implement training on improved fish handling, hygienic processing methods, drying and smoking techniques, storage practices, and basic value-addition. In several locations, these trainings are linked to the establishment or strengthening of cooperatives, women's processing groups, or community fisheries committees, enabling women to apply improved techniques collectively and access better market opportunities. Activities are designed to ensure accessibility for women by organising trainings at appropriate times and locations and by working through existing community structures such as fisheries committees and local cooperatives.

By strengthening women's technical skills in fish processing and post-harvest handling, the programme aims to reduce losses along the fisheries value chain, improve product quality, and increase income opportunities for women. These activities contribute both to women's economic empowerment and to more efficient and sustainable use of fisheries resources in coastal communities.

Indicator	
Women participate in respective trainings (in %)	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	50
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
In 2025, several sub-projects implemented training and capacity-building activities aimed at improving fish processing practices and reducing post-harvest losses among women working in fisheries value chains. For example, in Madagascar (Blue Ventures sub-project), training and cooperative strengthening activities supported large numbers of women involved in fish processing and fisheries value chains. As examples, through the WWF sub-project in Madagascar, 350 women were involved in cooperatives for fish processing (71%), while 308 women were supported in octopus fisheries activities (58%). In Mozambique (WCS sub-project), training activities linked to newly established CCPs reached 228 committee members, including 89 women (39%), supporting women's participation not only in fisheries governance but in related value chain activities. Also in Mozambique, the RARE and Peace Parks sub-projects involved and trained over 250 community members on aquaculture, of which 78%-83% are women. Overall, the activities implemented in 2025 expanded women's participation in fisheries value chains and strengthened their technical capacity in post-harvest fisheries activities. In South Africa, the iSimangaliso sub-project recruited and trained community members to be part of a fisheries monitoring programme, 61% of whom are women. Average participation of women in respective trainings was between 50% both in 2024 and in 2025.	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
Average participation of women in respective trainings was between 45% in 2025. Some challenges have been experienced in specific sub-project activities, which made it difficult to reach individual activity targets, such as for example in RARE sub-project's initiatives to train female fish buyers, fishers and CCPs members on digital data collection methods to improve their business management, understand their personal catch and income, and use collated production data for their community-based decision making and monitoring of the impact of managed areas on local livelihoods. Due to low literacy rates, the initial target for the proportion of women participants to be trained was not met. Therefore, more men were added to the training target groups. On the whole, however, the activity is evolving positively. The implementation of this activity will continue until the end of the sub-projects.	
Budget	2,500,000
Currency	EUR
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 August 2027
Responsibility	
GAP implementation is carried out by all consortium members of all nine sub-projects.	
Remarks/Notes	
Budget comprises all activities under output 1.	
GAP Activity	
Creation of income alternatives, with special consideration of income opportunities for women in the production and supply chains	

The programme supports the creation of alternative and sustainable livelihood opportunities for coastal communities, with a particular focus on strengthening women's economic participation in marine and coastal value chains. These activities aim to reduce pressure on marine resources while improving household resilience and income security for women.

Across the sub-projects, targeted measures are implemented to enable women to access and develop income-generating opportunities linked to sustainable fisheries, aquaculture, coastal agriculture, and other nature-based livelihoods. Interventions include the establishment and strengthening of women's savings and loan groups, support to women-led cooperatives, business skills training, development of business plans, and provision of seed funding or equipment to support small enterprises. In several locations, sub-projects also facilitate women's participation in specific value chains such as fish processing and marketing, seaweed or octopus value chains, aquaculture, and other sustainable production activities.

These activities are designed to address structural barriers faced by women in accessing financial resources, markets, and technical support. By strengthening women's economic capacity and supporting women-led livelihood initiatives, the programme aims to diversify household income sources, improve financial independence for women, and contribute to more resilient coastal economies while promoting sustainable use of marine and coastal ecosystems.

Indicator

No. of Measures supporting sustainable livelihoods targeting exclusively women, ranging from saving clubs, business plan development to seed funding

Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	12

Annual progress update (Reporting Period)

2025, 31 measures supporting sustainable livelihoods targeting either exclusively women or at minimum 50% women have started implementation (out of a planned 32 measures) -see Annex 7.

2025 measures include the establishment and strengthening of savings and credit groups, which provide women with access to loans and financial literacy training. In Tanzania (WCS/FFI sub-project), MKUBA savings and credit groups supported by the programme involved 2,208 members (70% women), enabling women to invest in small businesses and diversify household income sources. In Mozambique, 84 of 107 community members who received loans to start their businesses (PPF sub-project) are women. In Mozambique (WCS sub-project), 70% of Livelihood Club members are women. In South Africa (Wildtrust – iSimangaliso sub-project), women's peer-support groups continued operating microenterprises such as poultry production, catering, and sewing, providing income diversification opportunities for women in coastal communities. These examples illustrate how women's participation in sustainable production and supply chains were supported, strengthening their economic resilience.

One planned tourism-related activity in uThukela MPA (Wildtrust sub-project) was discontinued post midterm evaluation - for focusing on initiatives with a greater likelihood of impact.

On average across all nine sub-projects, women constitute 67% of all participants and targeted beneficiaries of livelihoods initiatives.

Cumulative progress update (Entire period)

In 2025, 31 out of 32 planned measures supporting sustainable livelihoods targeting either exclusively women or at minimum 50% women have started implementation. Across the programme, women represented 67% of participants in livelihoods activities. Please refer to Annex 6a for an overview.

Budget	2,500,000
Currency	EUR
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 August 2027

Responsibility

GAP implementation is carried out by all consortium members of all nine sub-projects.

Remarks/Notes

Budget comprises all activities under output 1.
The activity is evolving as expected and targets have already been met and surpassed. The implementation of this activity will nonetheless continue until the end of the sub-projects.

GAP Activity

- (i) Community-based management of the selection of suitable sites and rehabilitation activities: Formation of self-help groups from women in order to increase their voice and to have an active role in the selection of suitable sites and rehabilitation activities
- (ii) Projects including nursery management and seedling production will actively integrate women in the planning and execution, identifying possible income generation opportunities for women.

- (i) Community-based management of the selection of suitable sites and rehabilitation activities: Formation of self-help groups from women in order to increase their voice and to have an active role in the selection of suitable sites and rehabilitation activities
- (ii) Projects including nursery management and seedling production will actively integrate women in the planning and execution, identifying possible income generation opportunities for women.

The programme supports the active participation of women in ecosystem restoration activities associated with marine and coastal conservation, particularly in the selection of restoration sites and the implementation of rehabilitation measures. Sub-projects promote inclusive community-based management approaches by encouraging women to participate in decision-making processes that determine where and how restoration activities such as mangrove restoration, coastal vegetation rehabilitation, or other EbA interventions are carried out.

To strengthen women's role in these processes, sub-projects facilitate the formation or engagement of women's groups and ensure that women are actively involved in community consultations and planning workshops related to site selection and restoration design. These participatory processes enable women to contribute local knowledge on ecosystem conditions, resource use patterns, and livelihood needs, helping to ensure that restoration interventions are socially appropriate and environmentally effective.

In addition, sub-projects actively involve women in practical restoration activities, including nursery management and seedling production. Women are trained in nursery establishment, seed collection, seedling propagation, and restoration techniques. These activities can also create income opportunities through the production and supply of seedlings or through employment in restoration initiatives. By strengthening women's participation across the planning and implementation stages of ecosystem restoration, the programme promotes more inclusive natural resource management while supporting women's economic empowerment.

Indicator

Participation of women or women self-help groups in workshops defining site selection and rehabilitation measures & participation of women in nursery management and seedling production (in %)

Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	50

Annual progress update (Reporting Period)

In 2025, several sub-projects reported strong participation of women in ecosystem restoration planning and implementation activities, with approximately 52% female participation on average across all sub-project restoration activities.

For example, in Madagascar (WWF sub-project), women represented 55% of 1,331 participants in watershed restoration activities during the reporting period. Women also accounted for 55% of 2,274 participants in sand dune stabilisation activities, and 65% of participants in mangrove restoration activities. In Mozambique, women were also

actively engaged in mangrove restoration initiatives. Under the RARE sub-project, 53% of 316 participants involved in mangrove restoration groups were women. The WCS Mozambique sub-project reported particularly strong participation, with women representing 70% of 1,770 participants involved in mangrove nursery management and restoration training activities and 54% of 68 participants involved in tree planting of non-mangrove species aimed at reducing pressure on mangrove ecosystems. In South Africa, restoration employment programmes also ensured gender-balanced participation. Under the Wildtrust iSimangaliso sub-project, women represented 51% of restoration jobs in mangrove and dune rehabilitation activities.

Overall, the results demonstrate sustained progress toward ensuring that women play an active role in both restoration planning and implementation activities across programme sites.

Cumulative progress update (Entire period)

Estimated programme-wide average: 52% women participants in restoration planning and implementation activities.

Budget	150,000
Currency	EUR
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 August 2027

Responsibility

GAP implementation is carried out by all consortium members of all nine sub-projects.

Remarks/Notes

Budget comprises all activities under output 2.

Restoration activities are still ongoing and will likely continue until the sub-projects are completed.

GAP Activity

Capacity building on the local level will be highly gender-sensitive: for this purpose, a consultancy specialized in gender-sensitive Programme design will screen BAF's procedures, templates and evaluation processes and propose additional indicators and options to further strengthen gender aspects to increase benefits for women in BAF's project cycle.

A consultancy was hired to assist with development of the Blue Action Gender Guidance for sub-projects. Blue Action continues to monitor and support sub-projects with gender topics.

Indicator

No. of Consultancy for Results and products to be available and to be used by BAF in order to adapt its project cycle to further strengthen gender aspects

Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	1

Annual progress update (Reporting Period)

Blue Action continues to monitor and support sub-projects with gender topics

Cumulative progress update (Entire period)

Blue Action continues to monitor and support sub-projects with gender topics.	
Budget	28,000
Currency	EUR
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 August 2027
Responsibility	
Blue Action Fund	
Remarks/Notes	
no remarks	
GAP Activity	
GAP Output 3 Activity (ii) Formation of women self-help groups which receive specific training in marine and coastal resource management, including sustainable fishery management and fish processing. The programme strengthens women's participation in training and capacity-building activities related to marine and coastal resource management. Across the nine sub-projects, women are engaged through existing community structures such as fisheries committees, community resource management groups, savings and credit groups, producer organisations, and other local platforms involved in coastal resource management and livelihood activities. Through these platforms, women receive targeted training on sustainable fisheries management, EbA, coastal ecosystem restoration, and fisheries-related value chains. Training activities also address complementary topics such as financial literacy, entrepreneurship, climate-smart agriculture, leadership, and governance of community resource management institutions. Many sub-projects combine technical training with peer-learning exchanges, mentorship, and leadership development to strengthen women's participation in decision-making processes related to marine and coastal resource management. By building women's technical skills and confidence to participate in community institutions and livelihood initiatives, the programme contributes to more inclusive governance of coastal resources while also supporting women's economic opportunities.	
Indicator	
Participation of women in respective trainings / workshops (in %)	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	50
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
In 2025, sub-projects across the programme continued to implement a wide range of training activities targeting women involved in marine and coastal resource management and related livelihood sectors. On average across the nine sub-projects, women represented 52% of participants in the trainings and workshops. In Mozambique (WCS sub-project), training activities delivered through livelihood clubs and VSLAs strengthened women's capacity to engage in coastal livelihood and resource management activities. Women represented majority of participants in trainings, which covered financial management, group governance, and sustainable livelihood practices linked to coastal ecosystems. In the RARE sub-project in Mozambique, leadership and governance trainings delivered to members of community fisheries structures focused on topics such as fisheries management, advocacy,	

financial literacy, and gender-based violence awareness. Women represented more than half of the participants in these trainings, helping strengthen their role in community fisheries governance. In Madagascar (WWF sub-project), training activities related to mangrove restoration and coastal ecosystem management also recorded strong female participation, with women representing more than half of trainees in nursery management and planting techniques. These examples demonstrate continued progress toward ensuring women's active participation in knowledge exchange and capacity-building activities related to marine and coastal resource management across programme sites.	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
Approximately 52% of participants in trainings and workshops were women, across the nine sub-projects.	
Budget	0
Currency	EUR
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 August 2027
Responsibility	
GAP implementation is carried out by all consortium members of all nine sub-projects.	
Remarks/Notes	
Budget is included in the other activities of Output 3. The activity is evolving as expected and targets have already been met. The implementation of this activity will nonetheless continue until the end of the sub-projects.	

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>Gender expertise is ensured through dedicated gender staff, trained focal points, and external specialists. Several partners have internal gender experts or programme staff responsible for overseeing GAP implementation (e.g., gender specialists within implementing NGOs, community liaison officers, or programme managers focused on women's empowerment). Others are supported by external gender consultants who provide technical guidance, training, and support GAPs update and implementation. Gender responsibilities are also embedded within ESMS and monitoring teams, ensuring continuous oversight. This combination of in-house expertise, designated staff roles, and external advisory support ensures sustained leadership and technical capacity for gender integration on the ground.</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>Implementation of GAPs across the nine sub-projects is consistent with the requirements set out in the Funding Activity Agreements and the GCF Updated Gender Policy. Each sub-project has integrated gender considerations into sub-project design, implementation, and monitoring through dedicated institutional arrangements, technical expertise, and targeted capacity building. Gender expertise at field level is ensured through gender specialists, ESMS teams, trained focal points, and external consultants supporting implementing partners. Staff and partners receive regular training on gender equality, gender mainstreaming, and inclusive engagement approaches. Trainings are delivered through workshops, ESMS safeguard trainings, and specialised gender sessions, ensuring that field teams have the capacity to apply gender-responsive approaches in sub-project activities and community engagement. GAP implementation is monitored through sub-project MEAL systems, regular internal coordination meetings, and periodic reviews of activities and indicators. Sub-project teams track progress against GAP indicators and integrate gender considerations into work planning and reporting. Updates on GAP implementation, including challenges and adjustments, are reported to Blue Action Fund on a biannual basis and discussed during sub-project coordination events to support learning and adaptive management. Gender-related activities and capacity building are financed through sub-project budgets allocated within sub-project workplans, including funding for gender expertise, training, community engagement, and monitoring activities.</i>	

Gender-based violence (GBV) risks are addressed through the ESMS, which requires sub-projects to assess gender-related risks, identify vulnerable groups, ensure inclusive consultations, and establish GRMs.	
Are the planned activities, targets, indicators, timelines, etc. on track during the reporting period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
During the reporting period, the planned activities under the programme's GAP were broadly on track, with most activities progressing as planned and several indicators meeting or approaching their targets. Across the programme, gender-responsive activities continued to be integrated into community-based resource management, ecosystem restoration, capacity building, and livelihood development initiatives. Under Output 1, progress was made in strengthening women's participation in community planning processes, co-management structures, fisheries value chains, and alternative livelihood initiatives. By 2025, 31 out of 32 planned livelihood measures targeting women or ensuring at least 50% women participation had started implementation, and women represented on average 67% of participants and beneficiaries of livelihood activities across the nine sub-projects. Training activities related to fisheries management and fish processing also continued across several sub-projects, with female participation generally meeting or approaching the programme target of more than 50% women trainees. Under Output 2, women participated actively in ecosystem rehabilitation activities such as mangrove restoration, watershed reforestation, dune stabilisation, and tree planting. In several cases, women accounted for the majority of participants in restoration activities and related trainings, demonstrating strong engagement in both planning and implementation of ecosystem-based adaptation measures. Under Output 3, capacity-building activities on marine and coastal resource management, fisheries governance, and ecosystem restoration continued across the programme. Many sub-projects reported female participation at or above the 50% target, particularly in trainings related to community governance, mangrove restoration, and coastal ecosystem management. Some challenges remain, including literacy barriers, socio-cultural constraints affecting women's mobility and participation in certain activities, and the physically demanding nature of some restoration work. However, overall implementation during the reporting period indicates that the programme remains largely on track to achieve its gender-related targets and timelines.	
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 ☒
no revisions in 2025	
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 indicate that the programme is on track to contribute to meeting the gender-disaggregated targets for direct beneficiaries outlined in the funding proposal. Across the nine sub-projects, women consistently represent a substantial share of participants in programme activities related to coastal resource management, ecosystem restoration, capacity building, and livelihood development. Under Output 1, women's participation in participative governance and decision-making processes is on track to reach 50% and within livelihoods initiatives, women already constitute 67% of beneficiaries. Under Output 2, women participated actively in ecosystem restoration activities such as mangrove restoration, watershed reforestation, dune stabilisation, and tree planting (52% of participants). Under Output 3, capacity-building activities related to marine and coastal resource management, fisheries governance, and EbA also reported substantial participation of women (52%) in trainings delivered through community institutions and livelihood groups. While some activities still report lower participation rates due to socio-cultural constraints, literacy barriers, or the physically demanding nature of certain tasks, the overall results demonstrate steady progress toward achieving the programme's gender-disaggregated beneficiary targets.	
Has the project/programme experienced any implementation challenges that affect gender-related activities? If yes, please include lessons learnt and how they are informing ongoing actions.	Yes ☒ No ☐

Several sub-projects reported challenges affecting gender-related activities, though generating useful lessons that are informing ongoing actions. A recurring challenge relates to socio-cultural norms and household responsibilities, which can limit women's participation in activities. Some sub-projects reported that women's participation in training or exchange visits was constrained by domestic workloads or by travel restrictions for several days away from home. Similarly, in some communities, fisheries and coastal resource management are traditionally perceived as male domains, which can reduce women's participation in governance structures or technical activities. Literacy and language barriers were also reported, particularly in Mozambique and Tanzania, where some training materials and technical concepts were difficult for participants to fully grasp. In response, sub-projects have increasingly adapted training approaches by using visual tools, practical demonstrations, and locally translated materials. In restoration activities, physically demanding working conditions, such as planting mangroves in challenging environments, have sometimes limited women's participation or required adjustments in task allocation and safety measures. Lessons learned include importance of tailoring training formats to women's needs, scheduling activities at convenient times, strengthening women's leadership within community groups, and providing targeted mentoring and capacity-building. These measures are being incorporated into ongoing sub-project implementation to support more inclusive participation.

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 ☐

Please refer to Annex 6b for a collection of gender highlights and first-hand testimonies from the sub-projects.

Provide planned activities on gender elements for the next reporting period

Across the nine sub-projects, the programme plans to continue strengthening gender equity through activities that promote women's participation in natural resource governance, access to livelihoods, and leadership development. Planned actions include community awareness campaigns on gender equality, human rights, and social inclusion, as well as the celebration of International Women's Day and other outreach initiatives designed to promote women's roles in conservation and community development. Several sub-projects will prioritise women's participation in marine and coastal resource governance by supporting women's engagement in co-management committees, fisheries management planning, and participatory mapping of marine resources. Capacity-building activities will include leadership training, mentoring, and targeted workshops to strengthen women's decision-making roles in community governance structures and disaster risk management committees. Economic empowerment will also remain a key focus. Sub-projects plan to expand women's access to income-generating opportunities through training in entrepreneurship, financial management, aquaculture, beekeeping, fisheries value chains, and other sustainable livelihood activities. Several initiatives will strengthen women's access to micro-credit, savings groups, and eco-credit schemes, while supporting women-led enterprises and producer groups. Additional activities will promote women's participation in ecosystem restoration, monitoring, and climate adaptation initiatives, alongside gender-sensitive training for sub-project staff and partners to strengthen gender mainstreaming across programme implementation.

G. ANNEXES (UPLOADED)
Annex 1: GHG emission reduction calculation methodology (for projects reporting GHG emission reductions) and details on the calculations of the annual and cumulative value.
No annexes provided.
Annex 2: Communication and visibility material
File Name: Annex 2 - Comms & Visibility Material.pdf
Annex 3: List of grievances received
File Name: Annex 3 - Grievance Registry.xlsx
Annex 4: Procurement information
File Name: Annex 4 - Procurements over 100K.docx
Annex 5: Updated implementation timetable for the Funded Activity for the following year
File Name: Annex 5 - Updated Implementation Timetable & Planned Activities for 2026.docx
Annex 6: Updated Gender Assessment and/or Action Plan
File Name: Annex 6a - Livelihood Measures Women.docx File Name: Annex 6b - Gender Highlights.docx
Additional Annexes (if applicable)
File Name: Annex 7 - Reporting WIOMSA Symposium.docx File Name: Annex 8 - Post MTR sub-project adjustments.docx File Name: Annex 9 - ESMS Implementation sub-projects.docx File Name: Annex 10 - Stakeholder Engagements.xlsx

File Name: Annex 11 - Planned ESMS Activities.docx