
Annual Performance Report

Project/Programme title:	Building resilience in the face of climate change within traditional rain fed agricultural and pastoral systems in Sudan (FP139)
Accredited Entity:	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Date of Report submission:	15 April 2026
Version number	V1.0



Contents

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

RATIONALE

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

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

METHODOLOGY

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

A. PROJECT DATA (Prefilled where possible)

Should any information/data prefilled from Section A.1 to Section A.12 be incorrect or require updating, please inform GCF's Project Lead of appropriate corrective action.

A.1. Date of report submission		15 April 2026												
A.2. Project or programme	Project	A.3. Sector	Public											
A.4. Total Financing (GCF + Cofinance)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>GCF Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 25.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>Mill. USD 25.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Co-Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 15.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>Mill. USD 15.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 41.2</td> </tr> </table>				GCF Financing	Mill. USD 25.6	Grants	Mill. USD 25.6	Co-Financing	Mill. USD 15.5	Grants	Mill. USD 15.5	Total Financing	Mill. USD 41.2
	GCF Financing	Mill. USD 25.6												
	Grants	Mill. USD 25.6												
	Co-Financing	Mill. USD 15.5												
	Grants	Mill. USD 15.5												
Total Financing	Mill. USD 41.2													
A.5. Total GCF funding disbursed to this date	NA (draft)													
A.6. Implementation period	From 1 September 2019 to 21 September 2027													
A.7. ESS Category (Refers to GCF revised <i>Environmental and Social Policy</i> and GCF ESS Standards to assess your FP category.)			Category B											
A.8. Executing Entity Information														
Full legal name	Country of registration (or, for intl orgs, country of HQ)	Entity type	Role in project	Focal Point(s) and email(s)										
The Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources(HCENR)	Sudan	Public sector – Government (which may be acting through a ministry or department)	Lead Executing Entity	hcenr2005@yahoo.com										

A.9. Co-Financier information

Full legal name	Country of registration (or, for intl orgs, country of HQ)	Focal Point(s) and email(s)	Ownership Type	Beneficial Owner(s)
Ministry of Finance	Sudan	Ibrahim Omda Khatir	Public Sector	-
UNDP	Sudan	Luca Renda	Public Sector	-
Ministry of Production and Economic Resources – Red Sea	Sudan	Abdelazim Abdellatif	Public Sector	-
Ministry of Production and Economic Resources – Kassala	Sudan	Khidir Ramadan Sadig	Public Sector	-

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)
Ministry of Production and Economic Resources – Northern	Sudan	Osman Ahmed Osman	Public Sector	-

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

Country	Date of NDC/ NAP submission	NDC/ NAP objective	Brief description of project's alignment with NDC/ NAP objectives	Percentage of target met with proposed project.Beneficial owner(s)
Sudan	7 January 2026	Mainstream climate change adaptation into national and state development planning, prioritizing agriculture, water resources, rangelands/livestock, and protection of vulnerable rural communities	The BRCC project is closely aligned with Sudan's national climate policy framework and operationalizes the adaptation priorities identified in the National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA, 2007), the National Adaptation Plan (NAP, 2014), and Sudan's climate commitments under the Paris Agreement. The project was originally designed prior to the submission of Sudan's Updated Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC, 2022); however, its interventions remain fully consistent with the priorities outlined in the updated NDC, particularly those related to strengthening resilience in agriculture, water resources, and natural resource management. Through activities such as climate-resilient agricultural practices, water harvesting infrastructure (including hafirs rehabilitation and construction), rangeland restoration, and women-led Jubraka production systems, the project directly contributes to national adaptation objectives. It also strengthens institutional capacity for climate risk assessment and integrated water and land management while supporting the mainstreaming of adaptation measures into state-level planning processes. By building on lessons from earlier adaptation pilots and reinforcing stakeholder engagement mechanisms aligned with the GCF Country Programme, the project contributes to Sudan's broader efforts to reduce climate	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)
			vulnerability, diversify rural livelihoods, and enhance food security under increasing climate variability.	

A.11. Estimated duration of impact	
A.12 Report to be shared with NDA	Yes ☐ No ☐
The BRCC project demonstrates full country ownership and direct alignment with Sudan's National Adaptation Program of Action (2007), National Adaptation Plan (2014), and INDC/NDC priorities. The NDA (MENRPD/HCENR) plays a central role in strategic oversight, no-objection procedures, coordination, and implementation arrangements. Sharing the APR ensures transparency, strengthens national monitoring and oversight of climate finance, supports integration of adaptation results into national planning processes, and contributes to the GCF Country Program objectives on capacity strengthening and stakeholder engagement.	

B. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

B.1. Summary

The project is designed to deliver adaptation investments for some of Sudan’s most climate vulnerable rural communities. The project aligns with the priorities of the NAP and Sudan’s NDCs. It operates in drought prone rainfed farming and pastoral systems where prolonged dry spells, erratic rainfall, land degradation, and water scarcity threaten food security, livelihoods, and ecosystem stability.

The project advances three complementary results – a) strengthening climate resilient food production systems through drought adapted seeds, women led Jubraka home gardens, and sustainable land management practices; b) improving access to climate resilient water resources through rehabilitation of existing water yards and haffirs and construction of new water infrastructure supported by completed technical feasibility studies and investment ready designs; and c) strengthening institutional and community capacity to integrate climate risk management into agriculture, water, and rangeland governance.

The project supports Sudan’s climate policy framework, including NAPA (2007) and NAP (2014), and contributes to the implementation of the updated NDC (2022) by promoting integration of climate adaptation into local development planning and strengthening systems for climate resilient investment.

Implementation has been adjusted in response to the ongoing conflict. While the project was originally designed to operate across nine states, activities are currently concentrated in Red Sea, Northern, and Kassala states. Access restrictions halted field activities in 2023 and 2024, with gradual resumption in 2025. The influx of internally displaced persons (IDPs) into these states increased pressure on local resources and services.

Despite these challenges, the project continues to reach large numbers of beneficiaries, with women playing a strong role in adaptation activities. Economic analysis estimated an EIRR of 21.9 percent, confirming strong value for money. Although conflict has increased costs and delayed some benefits, growing vulnerability to water scarcity and climate risks has increased the importance of investments that protect livelihoods and strengthen resilience.

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)

The project is designed to deliver adaptation investments for some of Sudan's most climate vulnerable rural communities. The project aligns with the priorities of the NAP and Sudan's NDCs. It operates in drought prone rainfed farming and pastoral systems where prolonged dry spells, erratic rainfall, land degradation, and water scarcity threaten food security, livelihoods, and ecosystem stability.

The project advances three complementary results – a) strengthening climate resilient food production systems through drought adapted seeds, women led Jubraka home gardens, and sustainable land management practices; b) improving access to climate resilient water resources through rehabilitation of existing water yards and haffirs and construction of new water infrastructure supported by completed technical feasibility studies and investment ready designs; and c) strengthening institutional and community capacity to integrate climate risk management into agriculture, water, and rangeland governance.

In 2025, the project achieved measurable progress across its core results, reaching 5,700 farmers and pastoralists through drought-resilient seed distribution and rehabilitating 300 hectares of rangeland, directly benefiting approximately 21,000 pastoralists. Progress on water infrastructure remained at the preparatory stage, with 47 sites identified across target states, 35 technically assessed, 12 water yards assessed for rehabilitation, and 9 sites completing environmental and social safeguards requirements. In parallel, 240 stakeholders, including extension workers and community leaders, were trained to strengthen institutional and community-level adaptive capacity. Building on a 2020 baseline characterized by limited access to certified drought-tolerant seeds and weak productivity data systems, field-level evidence indicates notable improvements in agricultural performance. Farmer-reported yields increased by up to twelve-fold in some locations and by up to 60 percent in others, reflecting enhanced resilience under climate stress conditions. Agricultural output is commonly quantified by beneficiaries in terms of sacks harvested. The project also supports the Ministry of Agriculture to resume the Agriculture Productivity Survey, strengthening systematic measurement of production and productivity trends.

The project supports Sudan's climate policy framework, including NAPA (2007) and NAP (2014), and contributes to the implementation of the updated NDC (2022) by promoting integration of climate adaptation into local development planning and strengthening systems for climate resilient investment.

Implementation has been adjusted in response to the ongoing conflict. These results were delivered in a highly constrained operating environment. While the project was originally designed to operate across nine states, activities are currently concentrated in Red Sea, Northern, and Kassala states. Access restrictions halted field activities in 2023 and 2024, with gradual resumption in 2025. The escalation of conflict rendered 6 of the original 9 target states inaccessible, representing a reduction of approximately 67 percent of the intended geographic coverage and associated beneficiary reach. At the same time, accessible states experienced significant influxes of internally displaced populations, with localized increases in population pressure of up to 300 percent, intensifying demand on already fragile water, land, and livelihood systems. Within this context, project interventions were adapted to prioritize areas of highest vulnerability, ensuring continued delivery of climate-resilient support where needs are most acute. The project applies a conflict-sensitive approach grounded in "Do No Harm" principles, with emphasis on equitable access to resources, community-based governance, and strengthened local coordination mechanisms to reduce resource-based tensions. An ongoing conflict sensitivity analysis is undertaking both qualitative and quantitative assessment of the impacts of the war on project implementation, as well as potential risks of project interventions contributing to localized tensions. Sub-national peace and social cohesion structures, together with project-established GRM and SES focal points at community, state, and national levels, are being sensitized and mobilized to support conflict-sensitive implementation and address emerging risks. A multi-layered grievance redress mechanism remains operational, with all reported cases in 2025 resolved within established timelines, while environmental and social safeguards processes have been reactivated to guide site-level risk management. In parallel, evolving government plans to return to Khartoum, alongside a phased return process by the United Nations, are expected to gradually improve access and enable expansion of project implementation in previously inaccessible areas. While geographic coverage has been reduced, the concentration of interventions in high-pressure areas, combined with demonstrated gains in productivity and livelihoods, supports continued value for money. The influx of IDPs originated mostly in the neighboring states. For example, in Kassala 50% of the IDPs were originally from Khartoum state and another 33% from Al Jazirah and the remaining were from within Kassala (14%), North Darfur (2%), Sennar (1%) and North Kordofan (1%). These IDPs were spread across 328 locations, including 44 locations in 3 localities where project interventions are implemented – Reifi Kassala (16), Reifi Nahr Atbara (20) and Reifi Telkok (8). Majority of these IDPs (75%) stayed with the host families, thus increasing demand for the local resources and services. Similarly, Northern State has 685 IDP locations across 7 localities, out of which 419 are in the three project intervention localities – Ad Dabbah (94), Dongola (107) and Merowoe (218), representing 61% of the total IDPs received in the State. Finally, in the Red Sea State, out of the 316 IDP locations, 46

are in the project localities – Agid (12), Al Ganab (7), Dordieb (12) and Haya (15). In total, the project localities received approximately 350,000 IDPs since the war broke down in 2023. This represents 50% of the total beneficiaries recorded for these three states in the Funding Proposal. In case of Northern State, the estimated IDPs are 300,000 compared to the 44,645 intended beneficiaries. And in some specific cases like Al Dabaha locality of Northern State, the influx of IDPs (115, 455) is 9 times the intended beneficiaries (13,000). Despite these challenges, the project continues to reach large numbers of beneficiaries, with women playing a strong role in adaptation activities. Economic analysis estimated an EIRR of 12-14% compared to 21.9 percent estimated during the design phase, confirming strong value for money. Although conflict has increased costs and delayed some benefits, growing vulnerability to water scarcity and climate risks has increased the importance of investments that protect livelihoods and strengthen resilience. The economic analysis conducted integrates a conflict-adjusted benefit multiplier of 1.35 to reflect the increased value of resilience investments in Sudan's fragile and displacement-affected context, where avoided losses and productivity gains carry higher economic significance. Applying this adjustment to the inflation- and exchange rate-affected cost structure yields a revised EIRR of approximately 13.1 percent in 2025, with a conservative range of 12–14 percent. Despite severe macroeconomic pressures and operational constraints, the project remains economically viable and above the required threshold, demonstrating strong value for money under conflict-sensitive conditions.

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
Livelihoods of people and communities	0	562,500	1,181,538	876,754	26,850	903,604

(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	292,500	614,400	447,144	13,694	460,838
Female	0	157,500	330,830	429,610	13,156	442,766

(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
Sudan	0	1,300,000	2,500,000	1,877,033	134,250	2,011,283

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of indirect beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by result area.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Result Areas (Adaptation)	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Livelihoods of people and communities	0	1,300,000	2,500,000	1,877,033	134,250	2,011,283

(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	845,000	1,625,000	957,287	68,467	1,025,754
Female	0	455,000	875,000	919,746	65,783	985,529

(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
Sudan	0	1,300,000	2,500,000	1,877,033	134,250	2,011,283

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	292,500	614,400	447,144	13,694	460,838
Female	0	157,500	330,830	429,610	13,156	442,766

(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
Sudan	0	562,500	1,181,538	876,754	26,850	903,604

Health and well-being, and food & water security

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) A2.3 Number of males and females with year round access to reliable and safe water supply despite climate shocks and stresses (IRMF) Supplementary 2.3 Beneficiaries (female/male) with more climate-resilient water security						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) with improved access to and adoption of climate-resilient and reliable water supply in climate-stressed areas, 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	365,625	767,999	0	0	0
Female	0	365,625	767,999	0	0	0

Project Specific Indicators							
Indicator	Unit	Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
			Mid-term	Final target			
Indicator 1.4: Number of women participating in sandug microfinance arrangements for agricultural inputs	No. of Persons	0	20	50	4	0	4
Indicator 3.1: Number of extension workers trained	No. of Persons	0	800	1,750	658	0	658
Indicator 3.2: Number of farmers and pastoralists trained	No. of Farmers	0	2,500	5,500	8,141	0	8,141

1.1 Percentage increase in average annual crop yields	Percentage	0	20	40	70	60	130
Indicator 1.2: Percentage increase in average annual crop yields	Percentage	0	20	40	70	60	130
Indicator 1.3: Percentage of early adopters among indirect beneficiaries	Percentage	0	10	20	0	10	10
Indicator 1.5: GHG sequestration as a result of improved land and forest management	Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent	0	30,000	90,000	16,000	8,523	24,523
Indicator 2.1 Water fetching time for women and girls (% reduction in monthly time spent)	Percentage	0	25	50	0	0	0
Indicator 2.2: Hectares of irrigated crops	Hectares	0	5,500	11,390	0	0	0
Indicator 2.3: Perception of women participants of effectiveness of sandug microfinance arrangements for meeting O&M expenses of water infrastructure	Index/Score/Level	0	51	66	0	0	0
A5.2 Number and level of effective coordination mechanisms	No. of Coordination Mechanisms	0	1	1	1	1	2
A6.1 Use of climate information products/services in decision-making in climate-sensitive sectors	Percentage	0	35	75	0	0	0

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

C.2.1. Subprojects
<i>Where applicable, include information on sub-projects. For projects and programmes approved until B.31, the logical framework should focus on the mitigation and adaptation Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMF). For projects and programmes approved from B.32 onwards, the logical framework should reflect the Integrated Results Management Framework (IRMF).</i>

Title	Currency	GCF Funds	Co-Financing	Country	GHG Emissions Reduced	Direct Beneficiaries	Indirect Beneficiaries
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
C.3. Compliance with FAA covenants				Yes ☒ No ☐			
C.4. Funded Activity Implementation Arrangements in the Following Year				Yes ☐ No ☒			
Implementation arrangements will continue as agreed in FAA							

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	Armed Conflict and Security Instability		
Risk Origin	External Factors		
Risk Area	Political		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Ongoing armed conflict since April 2023 affecting six of nine target states, limiting access, disrupting field operations, displacing communities, and suspending infrastructure activities.		
Consequences	Delays in water infrastructure, irrigation, and training targets; underachievement of Output 2 indicators; increased operational costs; potential non-fulfillment of final targets.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	5 - Certain	5 - Catastrophic	25 - High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Reprogramming to accessible states (Kassala, Northern, Red Sea); phased implementation; asset safeguarding; adaptive budget reallocation (<5% threshold); remote coordination; Board-approved adjustments. Mitigation lowers the impact but not the likelihood.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	4 - Almost certain	4 - High	16 - High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	4 - Almost certain	4 - High	16 - High
Comments	The political risk rating reflects the ongoing armed conflict, which escalated in April 2023 and continues to affect implementation across several target states. Security volatility remains outside the control of the Accredited Entity and Executing Entity and directly constrains field access, infrastructure works, and beneficiary engagement. Although adaptive measures, such as geographic reprogramming to accessible states, phased implementation, remote coordination, and budget reallocations within approved thresholds, have reduced the operational impact, the likelihood of disruption remains high due to the unpredictable security environment. The current residual risk, therefore,		

	remains elevated. Continuous security monitoring, coordination with state authorities, and flexible implementation planning are maintained to mitigate further escalation. Any material deterioration in the political and security context will be promptly communicated to the GCF Secretariat in line with adaptive management and FAA requirements.		
Risk 2	Financial Sanctions		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Sanctions		
Description	the country is sanctioned by US and other European countries which restricts financial transactions and some of the procurement aspects.		
Consequences	delays in the procurement processes, and restrictions in market options.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	piggyback on LTAs inside the country and other country offices to reduce the duration of the process.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Comments	N/A		
Risk 3	Money Laundering		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Money Laundering (ML) & Terrorist Financing (TF)		
Description	Not applicable		
Consequences	Not applicable		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	N/A		
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		
Risk 4	Fraud		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Fraud / Bribery & Corruption / Collusion and any other prohibited practice		
Description	Not applicable		
Consequences	Not applicable		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	N/A		
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		
Risk 5	Conflict of Interest		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Conflict of interest		
Description	Special preferences for any vendors and suppliers during recruitment and procurement process		
Consequences	cancelation of the recruitment/procurement process		

Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	3 - Medium	3 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	all the decision to go through pre-approved selection committee signing of the disclosure and declaration of impartiality prior to the process		
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		

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
Sudan	Grants	USD	25,645,114	19,285,857.2	1,195,818	1,195,818	1%	99%
Total		USD	25,645,114	19,285,857.2	1,195,818	1,195,818	N/A	N/A

E.2. Co-financing

Please populate the table with relevant Co-financing data for each Co-financier and instrument, including amounts and allocation percentages.

Co-financier	Instrument	Currency (as per FAA)	Committed Amount	Disbursed Amount	Expenditure (reporting year)	Cumulative Expenditure	Mitigation	Adaptation
Ministry of Agriculture	Grants	USD	15,000,000	8,082,909.35	1,583,111.21	1,583,111.21	1%	99%
UNDP	Grants	USD	540,000	378,050.53	87,653	87,653	1%	99%
Total		USD	15,540,000	8,460,959.88	1,670,764.21	1,670,764.21	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

No additional finance mobilized information provided.

File Name: PIMS 5813_APR_2025_Grant-Financial Progress Detail_cleared by QM.xlsx

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

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

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

Key Environmental and Social Changes

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

Yes ☒ No ☐

Environmental and Social Safeguarding Updates

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

Yes ☒ No ☐

Environmental and social safeguards (ESS) processes transitioned from largely inactive implementation in 2023–2024 to active screening and site-level application in accessible states, particularly Red Sea, Northern, and Kassala. This shift reflects the gradual resumption of field activities and the need to ensure safeguards compliance ahead of planned infrastructure investments. safeguards implementation progressed from framework-level compliance to site-specific application. Environmental and social screening was completed for priority sites in Northern State and initiated in Kassala and Red Sea. In total, 35 sites were technically assessed, and 9 water infrastructure sites completed safeguards screening and are cleared for subsequent implementation. Monitoring focused on field verification and risk identification, with 20 field missions conducted to assess site conditions, validate environmental suitability, and engage communities, including in areas with high levels of internal displacement. These assessments identified increased pressure on natural resources due to population displacement, elevating risks of localized tensions around water and land use. Several sites required revalidation due to changes in population dynamics and environmental conditions. Capacity constraints at the state level were also identified as a limiting factor for consistent safeguards implementation. the project's overall ESS risk classification remains unchanged, there are specific gaps in compliance with certain ESS-related FAA covenants, those related to site-specific ESMPs and screening processes, as detailed in Section C.3. These gaps reflect delays in completing site-level safeguards instruments rather than deviation from the approved safeguards framework. safeguards processes remain incomplete for a number of planned sites, contributing to delays in advancing infrastructure related outputs. The project has initiated a remediation plan focused on accelerating the completion of site-specific ESMPs, strengthening screening processes, integrating conflict-sensitive criteria into site selection, and enhancing technical support to state-level institutions. These measures are aligned with the broader effort to restore full compliance while ensuring that environmental and social risks are effectively managed.

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 ☒

There have been no changes in compliance with applicable national environmental, land, labour, or social protection laws during the reporting period. Project implementation remains aligned with Sudanese environmental legislation, land tenure practices based on voluntary community agreements, and relevant gender equality provisions. No activities have triggered additional legal requirements beyond those assessed in the Board-approved Funding Proposal. Compliance with FAA environmental and social covenants, including application of the ESMF, ESAP, and Gender Action Plan, continues. No instances of non-compliance with national regulations or FAA safeguard conditions were identified during the reporting year.

F.3. ESS standards implementation progress

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

Yes ☒ No ☐

If you tick 'Yes', please provide further information to report on the progress made in complying with the requirements of the relevant ESS standards that were triggered during the approval of the funding proposal and during the reporting

period, if any; and the GCF Indigenous Peoples Policy, if relevant, describing achievement and specifying details outlined in the tables below.

Activities implemented during the reporting period, including monitoring

During reporting period, ESS screening and monitoring continued in accordance with the approved Environmental and Social Management Framework. Environmental and social screening checklists were applied prior to implementing agricultural productivity activities e.g., women's farms, home gardens, rangeland rehabilitation, afforestation. safeguards implementation for agricultural productivity activities focused on operationalizing environmental and social measures at the community level, particularly in seed distribution, rangeland rehabilitation, and preparatory activities for women-led livelihood interventions. These measures were implemented in accordance with the project's Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and aligned with site-level screening outcomes. Seed distribution to 5,700 farmers and pastoralists was implemented through community-based mechanisms to ensure safe, equitable access and minimize exclusion risks. Rangeland rehabilitation (300 ha in Northern State) incorporated land use and resource assessments to reduce conflict risks, particularly in areas with high internal displacement. Stakeholder engagement remained central, with 20 field missions supporting consultations, site validation, and beneficiary identification across Red Sea, Kassala, and Northern States. Engagement through Village Development Committees and local authorities ensured inclusion of women and vulnerable groups, with women comprising approximately 40% of participants. Gender Action Plan measures were mainstreamed. Despite delays in recruiting a Gender Specialist, women actively participated in seed distribution, consultations, and preparatory work for home gardens and women-led farms, with gender considerations integrated into targeting and monitoring. Due to security constraints, water infrastructure works remained suspended in several states; however, safeguard procedures were maintained for activities implemented in accessible areas. The Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) remained operational at the state level, with focal points assigned in accessible regions. Gender Action Plan activities continued, including support to women's farms and sandug microfinance groups. Monitoring was conducted through field visits where security permitted and through remote coordination with state-level counterparts. No new safeguard instruments (ESIA, RAP, IPP) were triggered during the reporting period.

Outputs during the reporting period

1-Continued application of environmental and social screening for implemented activities. 2-Maintenance of voluntary land use agreements without involuntary resettlement. 3-Operational GRM with five grievances received from the community, which were addressed adequately. 4-Ongoing implementation of gender-responsive agricultural activities in accessible states. No Category A activities undertaken.

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

During the reporting period, the primary contextual risk affecting environmental and social performance was the ongoing armed conflict, which altered community vulnerability profiles and restricted access to several project sites. While suspension of large-scale water infrastructure activities reduced potential construction-related environmental impacts (e.g., soil disturbance, water abstraction pressures), social risks increased in conflict-affected areas due to displacement, reduced institutional capacity, and constrained community engagement. These risks were addressed through geographic reprioritization to accessible states and continued application of the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) screening procedures prior to activity implementation. Land-related risks were managed through voluntary community agreements consistent with the Resettlement Policy Framework, ensuring no involuntary resettlement or economic displacement occurred. Gender-related risks, including potential exclusion of women from adaptation benefits during crisis conditions, were mitigated through continued support to women's farms, home gardens, and sandug microfinance groups in stable areas. Environmental risks associated with agricultural inputs and rangeland rehabilitation were managed through extension support and monitoring to prevent land degradation or unsustainable practices. The Grievance Redress Mechanism remained operational, although accessibility was constrained in conflict zones. No significant environmental incidents, safeguard violations, or major gender-based harm cases were reported during the reporting period.

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

At present, no major environmental or social safeguard non-compliance issues require immediate corrective action or formal escalation to the GCF Secretariat. However, several contextual factors warrant continued attention. The resumption of water infrastructure and irrigation activities in conflict-affected states will require updated site-specific environmental and social screening prior to implementation to ensure consistency with the ESMF and ESAP requirements. Given population displacement and evolving land-use dynamics, reaffirmation of voluntary land agreements and renewed community consultations will be necessary before restarting construction activities. In the remaining implementation period, strict implementation of site specific ESMPs and monitoring GRM accessibility at worksites will be emphasized to ensure no harm is caused to people or the environment during activities implementation. Gender-related monitoring will also require reinforcement to ensure equitable participation and benefit distribution as activities scale up following the disbursement of the second tranche. Accessibility constraints in certain states continue to limit in-person safeguard supervision and grievance redress outreach. The Accredited Entity will maintain enhanced

monitoring and coordinate closely with state authorities and the GCF Secretariat should security conditions materially deteriorate or trigger additional safeguard requirements.

Remarks/Notes

Project implementation remains aligned with the Board-approved Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and Environmental and Social Action Plan (ESAP). The safeguard classification has not changed, and no new ESS standards were triggered during the reporting period. Adaptive geographic prioritization due to security conditions did not alter safeguard obligations. Environmental and social screening continues for all activities implemented in accessible states. The Grievance Redress Mechanism remains operational, and Gender Action Plan activities continue where feasible. Ongoing monitoring will be maintained to ensure compliance as infrastructure activities resume following improved access and financial stabilization.

F.4. Sub-projects information

Have any subprojects been implemented?

Yes ☐ No ☒

N/A

N/A

F.5. Implementation of the stakeholder engagement plan

Were any actions undertaken to increase engagement of relevant stakeholders in the project, particularly regarding environmental, social, and gender elements?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Activities implemented during the reporting period

During the reporting period, adaptive measures were undertaken to sustain and strengthen stakeholder engagement despite security constraints. Engagement efforts focused on accessible three states (Red Sea, Kassala, and the Northern) and included consultations with local authorities, community leaders, farmer and pastoralist associations, women's groups, and extension services prior to implementing activities. Special emphasis was placed on ensuring women's participation in agricultural activities, including women's farms, home gardens, and sandug microfinance groups, in line with the Gender Action Plan.

Environmental and social screening discussions were integrated into community meetings to clarify land-use arrangements and safeguard obligations. Engagement modalities were adapted where necessary, including smaller-group consultations and coordination through designated local focal points, due to mobility and security limitations. The Grievance Redress Mechanism remained operational in accessible areas to facilitate community feedback and address concerns related to environmental, social, and gender aspects of implementation.

Dates and venues of engagement activities

- 15 July 2025 – Kassala State (Kassala City)
- 28 July 2025 – Northern State (Dongola)
- 12 August 2025 – Red Sea State (Port Sudan)
- 5 September 2025 – Kassala (Rural Localities)

Sex-disaggregated data on stakeholder engagement participants (male + female = total)

Northern State community mobilization (3–6 November 2025):

Total participants: 342 persons

- Male: 205
- Female: 137

(≈ 60% male, 40% female, as reported in the mobilization summary)

Extension–community capacity building workshops (Kassala, Red Sea, Northern States):

Total participants: 150 persons

- Male: 95
- Female: 55

Water user committees training (Kassala State):

Total participants: 48 persons

- Male: 28
- Female: 20

Rangeland seed distribution consultations (12 locations, July 2025):

Total beneficiaries consulted/engaged:

- Male: 13,650
- Female: 7,350

(Estimated 65% male pastoralists, 35% female household members)

Key issues, risks, and impacts identified and addressed

- Desertification and sand encroachment are threatening cropland and rangelands
- Increased water stress due to IDP influx (~300% population increase in some localities)
- Delays in water yard rehabilitation and solar installations
- Weak post-conflict institutional functionality in some villages
- Women's limited access to irrigation inputs and microfinance
- Risk of conflict over water and grazing resources

Mitigation actions included: validation/reformation of VDCs, reassessment of water sites, coordination with Animal Wealth and MOPER, distribution of drought-tolerant seeds, rangeland reseeding (480,000 feddan), and strengthened gender representation in VDCs and women's associations.

CSOs, NGOs, Platforms, and Stakeholders Consulted

In line with the Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement Plan (IPPF-compliant approach), the following entities were engaged:

Government Institutions

- Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (HCENR)
- Ministry of Production and Economic Resources (MOPER) – State level
- Ministry of Agriculture (State and Federal)
- Ministry of Animal Wealth
- Ministry of Irrigation and Water Resources
- Ministry of Finance (Federal and State)

Community-Level Structures

- Village Development Committees (VDCs)
- Water User Committees
- Women's Associations and Women's Home Garden Groups
- Agricultural Producer Associations
- Pastoralist/Herders' Unions

International & Development Partners

- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- Green Climate Fund (GCF) supervision missions
- UNDP Regional Technical Advisory Team

Other Platforms

- Microfinance institutions
- Agricultural Research Corporation (ARC)
- Extension networks
- Local cooperatives and producer groups

These engagements ensured inclusive consultation, gender representation, grievance access, and compliance with the project's Stakeholder Engagement Plan and IPPF framework.

Information shared with stakeholders

During stakeholder consultations in 2025, the BRCC Project team shared detailed information on the project's continuation through March 2027 following the GCF-approved extension, and on the revised geographical focus on the Red Sea, Northern, and Kassala States due to security constraints. Communities were informed about planned interventions under the three components: (i) distribution of drought-tolerant and early-maturing certified seeds; (ii) rangeland rehabilitation through reseeding (5 tons covering 480,000 feddan); (iii) rehabilitation and construction of water yards and hafirs; and (iv) capacity-building activities for extension staff, water committees, and women's groups. Information was also provided on beneficiary selection criteria, community co-responsibility in operation and maintenance of water infrastructure, environmental and social safeguards, and grievance redress mechanisms (GRM entry points at VDC, SPMU, MOPER, and PMU levels).

In addition, stakeholders were briefed on climate change risks (desertification, water scarcity, rainfall variability), gender

inclusion measures, and the importance of organized community structures (VDCs, cooperatives, water user committees) to ensure transparent and accountable implementation.
Outputs including issues raised and addressed during the reporting period
1. Increased water stress due to IDP influx (≈300% population increase in some localities) 2. Desertification and sand encroachment: Stakeholders highlighted the loss of productive land and grazing areas. The project addressed this by distributing 5 tons of rangeland seeds across 480,000 feddan and reaffirmed plans for shelterbelts and agroforestry interventions, where security conditions permit. 3. Delays in women-centered farms and water interventions: Communities requested clarity on stalled activities. The project communicated revised timelines and validated or reconstituted Village Development Committees (VDCs) to strengthen implementation readiness. 4. Need for improved coordination and transparency: Beneficiaries sought clarification on selection criteria and grievance procedures. The project reinforced awareness of the GRM mechanism and publicly shared beneficiary selection criteria through VDCs. 5. PMU restructuring: The PMU was operating under limited human resource capacity, including the lack of gender expert, absence of Red Sea State Coordinator and Northern State Coordinator. 6. Non-utilization of Support to NIM implementation modality: FP-139 is designed to be implemented as a Support to NIM project, which allows UNDP to provide execution support, particularly for the civil works interventions. However, this facility was not utilized by the outgoing PMU and the HCENR administration, which could have facilitated and fast-tracked the component 2 activities. The proposal to support the Output 2 activities by leveraging UNDP's strong in-house capacity to deliver similar civil work was not accepted. The HCENR administration and PMU is replaced in December 2025 and gives an opportunity to revisit this proposal to accelerate the project interventions, particularly the Output 2 activities.
Remarks/Notes
ESS implementation in 2025 was undertaken under post-conflict operating conditions, requiring adaptive management while maintaining compliance with GCF and UNDP safeguard standards. Community validation of intervention sites, reactivation of VDCs, and continued functioning of the GRM (100% resolution rate within timelines) demonstrate sustained commitment to environmental and social risk management. No major environmental or social incidents were reported during the period. Ongoing priorities include completing the environmental impact assessment for water interventions and strengthening monitoring capacity across the three operational states.

F.6. ESS forward planning and lessons learned	
Are there any planned ESS activities for the next reporting period or lessons learned to share from this period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
Provide planned activities on environmental and social safeguards for the next reporting period	
For the next reporting period, the BRCC Project will implement the following ESS-related activities in line with the ESMP and ESMF: 1. Completion of Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for Water Component o Finalization and validation of the ESIA for boreholes and haffirs by Apr 30, 2026 o Disclosure of ESIA findings at the state level. o Integration of mitigation measures into water infrastructure contracts. 2. Update and Operationalization of ESMP o Site-specific ESMPs for priority water yards and rangeland interventions. o Environmental screening checklists prior to rehabilitation/construction works. 3. Strengthening the GRM System o Continued quarterly monitoring of grievance cases. o Refresher orientation for VDCs, SPMUs, and MOPER focal persons. o Public dissemination of GRM contact points. 4. Gender and Vulnerable Group Mainstreaming o Ensure ≥35% women's participation in new interventions. o Targeted engagement of women's cooperatives and pastoralist groups. o Monitoring inclusion of IDPs and vulnerable households in beneficiary lists. 5. Environmental Monitoring and Reporting o Monitoring of rangeland regeneration (land cover tracking). o Water quality and infrastructure functionality assessments. o Semi-annual safeguard compliance reports. 6. Capacity Building o Training of water user committees on O&M and environmental risk management. o Orientation of local contractors on environmental and social compliance clauses. Lessons Learned (2025) • Early revalidation of community structures (VDCs) reduces social risks in post-conflict settings. • Transparent communication on beneficiary criteria mitigates conflict and grievances. • Integrated climate-resilience interventions (water + rangeland + capacity building) reduce resource-based tensions. • ESS monitoring must remain flexible and adaptive in fragile contexts.	

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	
Over the years of implementation, the BRCC Project has demonstrated strong community-driven outcomes in climate resilience. A notable success is the integration of indigenous pastoral knowledge into rangeland rehabilitation. In Northern State, 5 tons of locally adapted grass species were reseeded across 240,000 hectares, guided by traditional grazing calendars and customary fire-line practices. This strengthened ecosystem restoration while supporting approximately 21,000 pastoralists and agro-pastoral households. Climate-resilient seed distribution and farmer field schools improved productivity by up to 60% in some areas, reinforcing local seed systems through cooperative-based multiplication. Registration of communal rangelands (3,120 feddan) protected indigenous grazing lands from encroachment. Women-led initiatives represent a key good practice. Over 8,000 home gardens and multiple women-managed nurseries enhanced food security, diversified diets, and generated income, while preserving traditional crops and agroforestry practices. Challenges include conflict-related access constraints, delayed implementation of water infrastructure, centralized management of the water component, and resource pressure from large IDP influxes. Sustained engagement of local institutions (VDCs, pastoral unions, women groups) and a functioning grievance mechanism have been critical to maintaining social cohesion and equitable benefits.	
F.7. Grievance Redress Mechanism - confirmation & grievances	
<i>Please indicate whether the project can confirm the following statement:</i>	
Fully functional and operational Grievance Redress Mechanisms are in place, have been communicated to and are accessible by all stakeholders applicable to this project	
☒ The accredited entity confirms the statement above at project-level, AE-level, and GCF-level grievance mechanisms. ☐ The accredited entity does not confirm the statement above	
Have there been any grievances received during the reporting period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>The BRCC Project maintains a fully functional four-tier Grievance Redress Mechanism (VDC, SPMU, State MOPER, National PMU/HCENR) aligned with UNDP and GCF safeguard requirements. GRM entry points have been communicated to communities through VDC meetings, public beneficiary selection disclosures, and designated focal persons. Multiple channels are available (oral, phone, written, and complaint boxes). In 2025, five grievances were received, and 100% were resolved within the prescribed timeframe (15–30 days). No cases required escalation to AE- or GCF-level mechanisms, confirming operational effectiveness and accessibility.</i>	
F.8. Implementation of activities and actions agreed in the Gender Action Plan	
<i>During the 2025 reporting period, the BRCC Project continued to implement key activities under the Gender Action Plan (GAP), despite operational constraints arising from the conflict context. Progress focused on strengthening women's participation in decision-making structures, enhancing women's access to climate-resilient livelihood opportunities, and promoting gender-responsive beneficiary selection.</i> <i>Women's representation within Village Development Committees (VDCs) was maintained and expanded in newly reconstituted committees, with women actively engaged in community mobilization and intervention planning. In Mora village, for example, three women were included in the newly nominated VDC. Approximately 40% of mobilization beneficiaries in the visited communities were women.</i> <i>The project also supported women's economic empowerment through the planned establishment of women's farms and the continuation of home garden initiatives, building on previous training provided to women groups (e.g., 60 women trained in home gardening and microfinance in Timnar). Gender-sensitive beneficiary criteria were publicly disclosed to ensure transparency and equitable access.</i> <i>Cumulatively, GAP implementation demonstrates steady progress toward inclusive participation and livelihood resilience for women in targeted communities. Monitoring of gender-disaggregated data continues to inform adaptive implementation during project resumption.</i>	

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 achieved as per plan, reasons should be provided, and recourse action should be proposed. Please include reporting on any changes or deviations. Include a Report on implementation challenges and lessons learnt and how these will inform on-going actions and what action will be taken by when to address the challenges faced. Incorporate both quantitative data and qualitative reports on the performance of such actions, and on progress on actions identified.</i>		
GAP Activity		
Enhancing Women's Leadership and Representation in Local Project Structures During 2025, the project prioritized inclusive governance as part of its Gender Action Plan. In communities where implementation resumed, local coordination bodies were either reactivated or newly established to support project rollout. Special attention was given to ensuring women's representation in these structures. Women were nominated and confirmed as members of community committees responsible for overseeing agricultural inputs, water interventions, and beneficiary selection. In some villages, newly formed committees included female members for the first time, strengthening women's visibility in local decision-making. Meetings held during the mobilization phase actively encouraged women to express priorities, particularly regarding home gardens, water access, and income-generating activities. Public disclosure of beneficiary selection criteria reinforced fairness and equal opportunity. Participation records were maintained using sex-disaggregated data to monitor progress. This activity contributes to institutionalizing gender-responsive governance at the community level and supports the broader objective of empowering women as active stakeholders in climate resilience planning and implementation.		
Indicator		
Percentage of women represented in community-level project governance structures (e.g., Village Development Committees) and participating in project consultations.		
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)	
Baseline	0	
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	35	
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)		
In 2025, community mobilization and the reactivation of local structures in Northern State and other operational areas ensured the continued inclusion of women in decision-making roles. Newly formed or reactivated committees included female members, and mobilization meetings recorded approximately 40% women's participation across visited villages. In Selib village, 7 of 36 attendees were women, while in other communities, women actively engaged in planning discussions on agriculture and water interventions. Sex-disaggregated attendance was documented, and public beneficiary selection processes reinforced equitable participation. Despite implementation constraints caused by the conflict, the project remains on track to achieve its cumulative gender representation target.		
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)		
Since project inception in 2021, the BRCC Project has progressively strengthened women's participation in climate resilience planning and implementation across target states. Women have been actively engaged through Village Development Committees (VDCs), women farmer groups, home garden initiatives (Gabareek), rangeland management activities, and forestry nurseries. Cumulatively, women's representation in community-level governance structures has met or exceeded the minimum 35% target in several locations, particularly where committees were newly established or reconstituted. Women have also benefited from targeted capacity-building interventions, including training in home gardening, seed production,		

access to microfinance, nursery management, and cooperative formation. More than 8,000 home gardens have been supported across project states, many managed by women, contributing to improved household nutrition and income diversification. Women-led nurseries and forestry initiatives have further enhanced economic participation. Despite the 2023 conflict and temporary suspension in six states, gender inclusion has remained a core implementation principle. With implementation resumed in safe states and extended to 2027, cumulative progress indicates that the project is on track to achieve its Gender Action Plan objectives.	
Budget	10,000
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 March 2027
Responsibility	
The activity will be implemented under the overall coordination of the Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (HCENR) and the BRCC National Project Management Unit (PMU) in collaboration with UNDP Sudan. At the state level, delivery will be led by the State Project Management Units (SPMUs) in Red Sea, Kassala, and Northern States. Technical implementation will involve the Ministries of Agriculture and Animal Resources, Water Corporations, Forestry Departments, and relevant extension networks. Community-level execution will be supported by Village Development Committees (VDCs), women's groups, cooperatives, and local beneficiary associations.	
Remarks/Notes	
The indicator is rated GREEN as implementation is progressing according to the revised workplan following project resumption in the three operational states. Community structures have been reactivated, gender representation targets are being maintained, and key preparatory activities (mobilization, coordination, and technical planning) have been completed. Budget allocations are secured and aligned with approved activities. During the reporting period, climate resilience trainings, seed system preparations, and community consultations were conducted. No major implementation delays were recorded in active states. Continuous monitoring and coordination with state partners serve as mitigation measures to address potential security or operational risks.	
GAP Activity	
Economic Empowerment of Women through Climate-Resilient Livelihood Support During the reporting period, the project advanced women's economic participation by supporting climate-resilient livelihoods in agriculture, home gardens, and natural resource management. Preparatory activities were undertaken to reactivate and expand women-led home gardens (Gabareek) and women's farms in operational states. Community consultations confirmed women's continued interest in income-generating agricultural activities, particularly vegetable production and small-scale irrigation. The project coordinated with state agricultural extension departments to prepare technical packages for winter cropping and to identify women beneficiaries in line with transparent selection criteria. In some communities, women's associations and cooperatives were re-engaged to support future seed distribution, nursery activities, and agroforestry initiatives. This activity contributes to improving women's access to productive assets, climate-adaptive technologies, and training. It strengthens household food security while enhancing women's income-generation capacity, aligning with the Gender Action Plan objective of promoting equitable economic resilience in climate-affected communities.	
Indicator	
Number of women benefiting from climate-resilient livelihood interventions (home gardens, women farms, seed systems, nursery and agroforestry activities), disaggregated by sex.	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0

Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	35
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
During 2025, women were actively engaged in community consultations and beneficiary identification processes in operational states (Red Sea, Kassala, and Northern). Approximately 40% of mobilization participants were women. Preparatory work for reactivating women-led home gardens and seed-related interventions was completed. Women's associations were re-engaged for future implementation of agroforestry and small-scale farming activities. Despite constraints caused by the conflict, gender-responsive targeting remains integrated into resumed implementation areas, and progress aligns with cumulative gender participation targets.	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
Since project inception in 2021, the BRCC Project has made sustained progress in promoting women's economic empowerment through climate-resilient livelihood interventions. Across project states, women have been primary beneficiaries of home garden (Gabareek) initiatives, women-led farms, nursery establishment, and agroforestry activities. Cumulatively, more than 3,000 home gardens were supported, many managed by women, enhancing household nutrition and income stability. Women's groups were trained in sustainable crop production, seed multiplication, food processing, and access to microfinance. In Northern and Kassala States, women participated in nursery management and seedling production, with some groups generating income from seed sales. Community-based seed systems and cooperative structures strengthened women's access to productive resources. Despite the 2023 conflict affecting six states, implementation continued in safe states, maintaining women's engagement and protecting earlier gains. Overall, the project remains aligned with its target of ensuring at least 35% female participation among direct beneficiaries and continues to strengthen women's adaptive capacity and economic resilience.	
Budget	1,200,000
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 December 2026
Responsibility	
The activity is implemented by the BRCC National Project Management Unit (PMU) under the Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources (HCENR) in coordination with UNDP Sudan. At the state level, delivery is led by State Project Management Units (SPMUs) in Red Sea, Kassala, and Northern States, with technical support from Ministries of Agriculture, Women's Affairs Departments, and Agricultural Extension Services. Community implementation is facilitated through Village Development Committees (VDCs), women's associations, cooperatives, and beneficiary farmer groups.	
Remarks/Notes	
The indicator is rated GREEN as women's participation in livelihood and seed system activities remains aligned with the Gender Action Plan target of at least 35% female beneficiaries. During the reporting period, women were actively engaged in community mobilization, beneficiary identification, and preparatory planning for seed multiplication and home garden support in operational states. Mitigation measures include continuous sex-disaggregated monitoring, transparent beneficiary selection, and close coordination with women's associations and extension services to address any participation gaps. Despite operational constraints in conflict-affected areas, progress in active states remains on track toward cumulative targets.	
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 ☒

No gender expert is currently engaged. A Terms of Reference (TOR) for a Gender Specialist was prepared; however, recruitment was postponed due to the eruption of war in April 2023 and delays in the release of the second GCF disbursement. The recruitment process will be reinitiated once funding is secured and operating conditions allow safe implementation. In the interim, gender considerations continue to be mainstreamed across project activities by the Project Management Unit and UNDP technical staff, ensuring women's participation in seed distribution, home gardens (Jubrakas), agroforestry, and training activities.	
Has the implementation of gender action plan/s being implemented according to Funding Activity Agreements and GCF's Updated Gender Policy? Please ensure that the budget is included in the reporting above if it was indicated in the approved or updated gender action plan.	Yes ☒ No ☐
Yes, the budget allocated for GAP is as per FAA. but it might be subject to amendments based on the recommendation of ESS assessment	
Are the planned activities, targets, indicators, timelines, etc. on track during the reporting period?	Yes ☐ No ☒
No. Implementation during the reporting period was significantly affected by the April 2023 eruption of war and the continued delay in the release of the second GCF disbursement. As a result, several planned activities, particularly under Output 2 (water infrastructure) and Output 3 (capacity development), experienced substantial delays. Under Output 1 (agriculture and resilience of food production systems), partial progress was achieved. A total of 138.5 tons of certified seeds were distributed to 9,119 farmers (41% women) across six accessible states. In addition, 3,719 home gardens (Jubrakas) were established, and 33 nurseries produced approximately 319,000 seedlings. Rangeland rehabilitation activities covered 4,312 hectares through seed broadcasting and the establishment of enclosures. However, activities in conflict-affected states could not be implemented. Under Output 2 (water access), although feasibility studies and site assessments had been completed and equipment procured (including 152 solar pumps), construction, installation, and operationalization of water infrastructure were halted due to insecurity, logistics constraints, and funding limitations. Under Output 3 (capacity strengthening), some awareness campaigns and limited training activities were conducted before the escalation of conflict; however, large-scale training of extension officers and exchange visits did not occur as planned. Overall, while cumulative beneficiary targets remain largely on track due to strong performance in previous years, annual implementation milestones and timelines for 2023 were delayed. A revised implementation timetable and phased recovery plan are being prepared for 2024, subject to improved security conditions and funding availability.	
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 formal revisions were made to the approved Gender Action Plan (GAP) during the reporting period. The original GAP framework, targets, and indicators remain valid and aligned with the Funding Activity Agreement and the GCF Updated Gender Policy. However, implementation timelines were affected by the April 2023 eruption of war and by delays in the second GCF disbursement. These external factors led to the postponement of certain planned activities, including the recruitment of a Gender Specialist and the scaling up of gender-focused capacity-building. Despite these delays, gender-responsive approaches continued to be mainstreamed across agricultural, agroforestry, and home garden activities, and sex-disaggregated data continued to be collected and reported. Any necessary adjustments to timelines or sequencing of activities will be reflected in the updated implementation timetable rather than through formal revisions to the GAP. Should structural changes become necessary in 2024, an updated GAP will be submitted accordingly in line with GCF procedures.	
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 ☐
Yes. Despite operational disruptions during the reporting period, progress remains broadly on track toward achieving the sex-disaggregated direct beneficiary targets outlined in the Funding Proposal (minimum 35% women among direct beneficiaries). In 2023, a total of 9,119 farmers benefited from certified seed distribution across six accessible states, of whom 41.1% were women (3,747). This exceeds the minimum 35% female participation target. Additionally, 3,719 home gardens (Jubrakas) were established, benefiting 3,686 women (approximately 99%), reinforcing women's leadership in household-level food production and income generation. Women also actively participated in agroforestry and nursery development activities, including involvement in 33 nurseries producing approximately 319,000 seedlings. Women's engagement in community-level consultations and rangeland management activities was ensured through inclusive selection and consultation processes. Cumulatively, the project has maintained female participation rates above the 35% threshold established in the Funding Proposal. While the eruption of war limited implementation in some states and slowed overall expansion of activities, the proportional participation of women among direct beneficiaries remains aligned	

with, and in several activities exceeds, the approved targets. Continued efforts in 2025 focused on scaling activities in secure states and resuming gender-focused capacity-building measures to sustain and further strengthen progress toward final sex-disaggregated 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 ☐

Yes. The eruption of war in April 2023 and the continued delay in the second GCF disbursement significantly affected the implementation of gender-related activities. The planned recruitment of a Gender Specialist and the expansion of structured gender capacity-building programs were postponed. Insecurity, displacement of communities, staff relocation, and disruption of banking systems also limited field monitoring and verification of gender outcomes. Despite these challenges, women's participation remained strong in accessible states, particularly in seed distribution and home garden (Jubra) activities. One key lesson learned is the importance of community-based, women-led models (e.g., Jubrakas and nurseries), which proved resilient even amid instability. Another lesson is the need to decentralize gender implementation responsibilities to state-level structures to ensure continuity during crises. These lessons are informing ongoing actions, including prioritizing women-headed households in agricultural support, maintaining sex-disaggregated monitoring, and planning to recruit a Gender Specialist in 2024 to strengthen institutional gender mainstreaming once conditions stabilize

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 ☐

Yes. A key best practice identified during the reporting period is the women-managed home garden system (Jubra), which has proven to be a resilient, gender-responsive climate adaptation model. In 2023, 3,719 home gardens were established, with approximately 99% of beneficiaries being women. These gardens enabled women, particularly female heads of households, to diversify crop production, improve household nutrition, and generate income from surplus vegetables and seedlings sold in local markets. In one locality, women managing community nurseries sold 1,550 tree seedlings, generating SDG 155,000, demonstrating women's agency as economic actors in climate-resilient value chains. The Jubra system also serves as a hub for the conservation of crop diversity and sustainable agroecosystem management. Women actively participated in seed selection, water management, and integrated pest management practices, strengthening their leadership roles within community structures. This model demonstrates that empowering women through small-scale, diversified agricultural systems enhances food security, income stability, and community resilience to climate variability.

Provide planned activities on gender elements for the next reporting period

During the next reporting period, the project will strengthen gender-responsive implementation across agriculture, water, and capacity development components. Key activities include: 1. Recruitment of a Gender Specialist to support implementation of the Gender Action Plan (GAP), strengthen gender analysis, and enhance sex-disaggregated monitoring and reporting. 2. Establishment of 40 integrated women-led farms and 1,200 women-centered home gardens (Jubrakas) in Kassala, Red Sea, and Northern States, prioritizing women-headed households and vulnerable groups. 3. Training of at least 250 women on access to microfinance (Sandug/revolving funds), financial literacy, climate-smart agriculture, and value addition to agricultural products. 4. Capacity building of women's groups in nursery management, agroforestry, and shelterbelt maintenance, ensuring women's participation in natural resource management committees. 5. Inclusion of women in water governance structures, including training on operation and maintenance of solar pumps and water yards to reduce unpaid care burdens linked to water collection. 6. Documentation of women-led climate resilience case studies for advocacy and knowledge sharing. These activities aim to maintain women's participation above 35% and strengthen women's leadership, income generation, and resilience to climate risks.

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
No annexes provided.
Annex 3: List of grievances received
No annexes provided.
Annex 4: Procurement information
No annexes provided.
Annex 5: Updated implementation timetable for the Funded Activity for the following year
No annexes provided.
Annex 6: Updated Gender Assessment and/or Action Plan
No annexes provided.
Additional Annexes (if applicable)
File Name: Updated Risk Log .docx File Name: Annex 1 Stocktaking Exercise- GCF Sudan-v1-Nov 18.docx File Name: Annex 1a UNDP briefing presentation BRCC Water Interventions.pptx File Name: Annex 1b BRCC Water Interventions Status- Mar 5, 2026.docx

File Name: Annex 1c BRCC revised water interventions April 2026.docx

File Name: Annex 2 Stakeholder Engagment Participation List.docx

File Name: Annex 3a E&S Risk Summary.docx

File Name: Annex 3b Updated ESMF - BRCC Project FP 139.docx

File Name: Annex 3c ESSProgress Report BRCC Project 25012026.pdf

File Name: Annex 3d GRM Report 2025_BRCC Project.pdf

File Name: Annex 3e Revised SESP BRCC Sudan_220425.docx

File Name: Annex 5 Rangelands Progress Report Northern State July 2025-1.pdf

File Name: Annex 6 GHG Emission Reduction Calculations.docx

File Name: Annex 7 Economic Analysis-Conflict and Inflation adjusted.docx

File Name: Annex 8 Conflict Sensitivity Assessment of the UNDP_Inception Report.docx

File Name: Annex 9 Seed Distribution List.docx

File Name: Annex 10 Capacity Building Participants List .docx

File Name: Sudan.APR 2025-PIMS 5813.AA.27March-CO-Apr 14.docx