
Annual Performance Report

Project/Programme title:	Inclusive Green Financing Initiative (IGREENFIN I): Greening Agricultural Banks & the Financial Sector to Foster Climate Resilient, Low Emission Smallholder Agriculture in the Great Green Wall (GGW) countries - Phase I (FP183)
Accredited Entity:	International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
Date of Report submission:	14 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			14 April 2026	
A.2. Project or programme	Project	A.3. Sector	Public	
A.4. Total Financing (GCF + Cofinance)	GCF Financing		Mill. USD 120.5	
	Grants		Mill. EUR 30.4	
	SeniorLoans		Mill. EUR 74.0	
	Co-Financing		Mill. USD 84.3	
	Grants		Mill. EUR 41.0	
	SeniorLoans		Mill. EUR 32.1	
	Total Financing		Mill. USD 204.9	
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 <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)
Ministry of Economy and Finance	Cote d'Ivoire	National Government Entity	Executing entity	Minister: Bruno Koné (since January 23, 2026) Email (Cabinet): minagri.cabinet@agriculture.gouv.ci Phone: (+225) 27 20 21 43 03 Address: 01 BP 12243 Abidjan 01, Côte d'Ivoire Additional Secretariat Lines: Minister's Secretariat: (+225) 20 21 42 38 Director of Cabinet's Secretariat: (+225) 20 22 81 35 / (+225) 20 21 41 94 Fax: (+225) 20 21 36 10
Ministry of Agriculture, Hydro-Agricultural Development and Mechanization	Burkina Faso	National Government Entity	Executing entity	Name: Adama Touré Role: Director of Policy Formulation Email: adatoure18@yahoo.fr Phone: (+226) 78 54 13 18 Address: Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso
Ministry of Agriculture	Ghana	National Government Entity	Executing entity	Minister: Hon. Bryan Acheampong; and Email: info@mofa.gov.gh Phone: (+233) 302 666 567 / (+233) 302 668 245 / (+233) 302 676 193
Ministry of Agriculture	Mali	National Government Entity	Executing entity	Minister Modibo Keita; minagri@agriculture.gouv.ml or through the Cabinet at cab.minagri@agriculture.gouv.ml; and Official phone numbers include (+223) 20 22 36 46, 20 22 27 30, and 20 22 24 87

Full legal name	Country of registration (or, for intl orgs, country of HQ)	Entity type	Role in project	Focal Point(s) and email(s)
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Equipment of Senegal	Senegal	National Government Entity	Executing entity	Point of Contact: Abdourahmane SENE Email: asene@ita.sn (senegalcommerce.sec.gouv.sn)
International Fund for Agricultural Development	Italy	International Organization (UN Agency)	Executing entity	Pierre-Yves Guedez; p.guedez@ifad.org; Phone Number +39 3346459426

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)
IFAD	Italy	Pierre Yves Guedez	IFI	IFAD
AfDB Grant	Cote d'Ivoire	Shakil Beedassy	IFI	AfDB
ISDB	Saudi Arabia	Daouda Ben Oumar Ndiaye	IsDB	IsDB
Banque Agricole du Burkina Faso	Burkina Faso	Mahama Koungana	Crédits agricoles	Burkina Faso
Banque Agricole du Senegal	Senegal	Fatma Fall Dièye	Crédits agricoles	Senegal
Banque Agricole du Mali	Mali	Badara Aliou COULIBALY	Crédits agricoles	Mali
BNI Côte d'Ivoire	Cote d'Ivoire	Jean François BROU	Crédits agricoles	Cote d'Ivoire
ARB APEX Bank	Ghana	Alex Kwasi Awuah	Crédits agricoles	Ghana

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)
Burkina Faso	28 September 2015	An unconditional pledge to reduce emissions by 6.6% below business-as-usual levels by 2030, with a further 11.6% reduction conditional upon international support. Includes interim pledges for 2020 and 2025. In the section on adaptation,	IGREENFIN I has high potential to contribute to targets in two main sectors: Agriculture, forestry and other land use	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)
		actions proposed would reduce emissions by a further 36.95%, taking the total reductions up to a potential 55.15% below business-as-usual levels. Key sectors targeted water resources, agriculture, livestock and fisheries, transport, energy, land use and forestry	(AFOLU) and Energy.	
Cote d'Ivoire	22 September 2015	28% reduction from business-as-usual (BAU) by 2030 in energy, transport, waste, agriculture and land use. Adaptation sectors targeted water resources, agriculture, livestock and fisheries, coastal zones, energy, land use and forestry.	, IGREENFIN I has high potential to contribute to targets in two main sectors: Agriculture, forestry and other land use (AFOLU) and Energy	0%
Ghana	23 September 2015	Unconditional pledge to lower its GHG emissions by 15% relative to a BAU scenario emission of 73.95MtCO ₂ e by 2030. An additional 30% emission reduction is attainable on condition that external support is made available to Ghana to cover the full cost of implementing mitigation action (finance, technology transfer, capacity-building). With this external support, a total emission reduction of 45% below the BAU emission levels can be achieved by 2030, with energy and AFOLU offering the largest sources of emission reduction potential.	IGREENFIN I has high potential to contribute to targets in two main sectors: Agriculture, forestry and other land use (AFOLU) and Energy.	0%
Mali	29 September 2015	Commits to reducing emissions by 29% for agriculture, 31% for energy and 21% for forests and land use, each by 2030, and in comparison, to a BAU scenario. This is an average reduction of 27%. This is conditional upon international support, although around 40% of this can be met unconditionally. Includes a section on adaptation, though only for the period 2015-2020.	IGREENFIN I has high potential to contribute to targets in two main sectors: Agriculture, forestry and other land use (AFOLU) and Energy.	0%
Senegal	26 September 2015	An unconditional reduction in emissions of 5% by 2030, compared to BAU levels, with interim targets of 3% by 2020 and 5% by 2025. Accompanied by a conditional target, subject to international financial support, of 7% by 2020, 15% by 2025 and 21% by 2030, compared to BAU levels. Includes a section on adaptation, as well as information on potential obstacles. Sectors are, Transport, water resources, agriculture, livestock and fisheries, coastal zones, energy, land use and forestry.	, IGREENFIN I has high potential to contribute to targets in two main sectors: Agriculture, forestry and other land use (AFOLU) and Energy.	0%

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

B. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

B.1. Summary

In 2025, only FP183 Component 3 is under implementation.

Under component 3, the Great Green Wall (GGW) Regional Support Programme (RSP) strengthened the institutional systems required for GGW countries to plan, implement, and monitor climate resilience efforts more effectively. It helped improve coordination, expand access to knowledge and prepare the region to scale proven solutions that support climate-vulnerable communities.

Important progress was made in regional knowledge management. Five countries, namely Senegal, Mauritania, Chad, Burkina Faso, and Eritrea, completed the first comprehensive mapping of climate resilience and land restoration initiatives financed by major climate funds. With the deployment of national Knowledge Management Specialists and the development of an integrated regional strategy, countries now have clearer visibility of ongoing investments and improved access to reliable information. This is helping institutions identify approaches that show strong potential for replication and informs evidence-based decision making.

The programme strengthened the regional innovation ecosystem by initiating partnerships with CIFOR-ICRAF K4GGWA Innovation Facility, the FAO Office of Innovation, and other key institutions in digital agriculture and climate technology. Preparatory efforts advanced country readiness for adopting digital solutions, laying the groundwork for broader implementation to enhance land management and climate-resilient value chains.

Governance and delivery capacity improved significantly. The Regional unit was established in Dakar, and national specialists were deployed across several countries. This strengthened coordination, monitoring, and engagement with national authorities and other GGW programmes. An accomplishment was the operationalization of a joint GCF and GEF results framework that brings together more than USD 21 million in climate finance. This unified system has improved transparency and alignment across the countries and has provided Regional unit with consistent ways to track progress.

While early coordination challenges emerged in such a diverse regional context, the programme’s achievements in 2025 laid the groundwork for scaling climate resilience and land restoration across the GGW region.

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)

Activities under Components 1 and 2, covering Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali, and Senegal, remain under post-approval processes and have not yet started, while Component 3—the Great Green Wall (GGW) Regional Support Programme RSP—is currently under implementation

Component 3: Catalyzing Knowledge, Innovation, and Governance for Climate Resilience in the GGW

Component 3 represents the GCF's dedicated support to the GGW RSP, implemented by IFAD as the Executing Entity. Through this partnership, GCF resources play a central role in advancing the objectives of the GGW initiative by financing regional public goods that cannot be delivered through country-level investments alone. IFAD centrally manages all activities under a unified regional framework, with no direct disbursements to participating countries. This modality ensures consistent oversight, coherence across countries, and full alignment with GCF standards.

The RSP is jointly financed by the GCF and the Global Environment Facility (GEF), mobilizing more than USD 21 million in climate finance, including USD 8.9 million from the GEF. GCF's contribution remains pivotal in enabling a structured regional platform for knowledge management, innovation, and coordination across 11 GGW countries. By strengthening institutional linkages and facilitating systematic learning, the programme supports GCF strategic priorities on climate resilience, land restoration, and sustainable livelihoods for vulnerable communities across the Sahel.

In 2025, the RSP delivered concrete institutional and operational advances that strengthened the foundations for coordinated climate action across the GGW region. Progress in **regional knowledge management and peer learning** included the first systematic mapping of climate adaptation, resilience, and land restoration investments in five priority countries—Senegal, Mauritania, Chad, Burkina Faso, and Eritrea—covering GCF-, GEF-, and Adaptation Fund-financed projects. Dedicated national specialists improved engagement with government focal points and regional institutions, while an integrated knowledge and communication strategy was finalized to support structured learning and policy relevance.

Advances in **innovation and digital transformation** focused on ecosystem building rather than pilots. Strategic partnerships were initiated with leading innovation actors, and preparatory work progressed for regionally coordinated innovation grants to support digital solutions for climate adaptation and land management.

At the same time, **governance and delivery capacity** were substantially strengthened through the establishment a fully staffed Regional Support Unit was established in Dakar, reinforcing governance, coordination, and delivery capacity across the programme. National Knowledge Management Specialists deployed in participating countries now provide targeted technical support, strengthening engagement with national partners and improving monitoring and reporting. Together, this structure has enhanced cross-country learning and increased the visibility and coherence of GCF-supported interventions. The programme also operationalized a joint GCF–GEF results framework consolidating more than USD 21 million in climate finance, creating a unified system for planning and reporting that improves transparency and strategic alignment across the Great Green Wall region.

Output 3.1: Enhanced Knowledge Management and Peer Learning

During the reporting period, the RSP made substantive progress in addressing long-standing challenges related to fragmented knowledge, limited access to evidence, and weak learning linkages across the Great Green Wall region. A key milestone was the initiation of national inventories mapping climate adaptation, resilience, and land restoration projects, together with associated knowledge products and data assets. By the end of the period, Senegal, Mauritania, Chad, Burkina Faso, and Eritrea had launched systematic mapping of GCF-, GEF-, and Adaptation Fund-supported interventions.

The deployment of National Knowledge Management Specialists has significantly strengthened engagement with national focal points, GGW agencies, and sectoral ministries. These specialists are supporting the identification of key institutional entry points and coordination mechanisms across government, regional bodies, and technical partners, including the PAAGGW, the UNCCD GGW Accelerator, FAO and CIFOR-ICRAF. Consolidation of country-level inventories is underway under the guidance of the Regional Knowledge Management Specialist, supported by a dedicated consultant who will also lead a comprehensive regional knowledge baseline and needs assessment in 2026.

An integrated knowledge and communication strategy has been developed and shared across the RSP team. The strategy articulates a structured six-step approach that links knowledge management, monitoring, evaluation, learning, communication, and coordination. This framework is designed to shift the focus from ad hoc information sharing toward systematic learning and uptake, ensuring that knowledge, evidence and lessons generated by projects inform policy

dialogue, investment decisions, and future programming at national and regional levels. The strategy will be further refined following completion of the regional knowledge baseline and needs assessment.

Peer learning has been strengthened through RSP-supported joint knowledge management sessions held during the Annual GGW Residential Seminar, co-organized with the GGW Accelerator and regional partners. These exchanges are contributing to a more unified regional approach to knowledge sharing and reinforcing collaboration among countries and institutions.

Foundational work is now being completed to support the establishment of a regional knowledge center, the launch of thematic communities of practice, and the development of targeted knowledge products. Informed by consultations and the forthcoming knowledge baseline, these mechanisms will enable replication and scaling of effective practices and support evidence-based policy formulation and investment in adaptation/land restoration planning across the Great Green Wall

Output 3.2: Innovation and Digital Transformation Technologies Mapped, and Ecosystem Built

Innovation and digital transformation are central to the RSP's strategy for strengthening climate resilience and sustainability across the Great Green Wall landscape. While the region has generated a substantial body of studies, manuals, and project outputs, much of this knowledge remains underutilized. In response, the RSP is prioritizing the creation of an enabling ecosystem that supports the uptake of digital solutions, innovation partnerships, and data-driven decision-making.

During the reporting period, direct field implementation under this output had not yet commenced; however, significant preparatory work was undertaken. Initial consultations were held with the FAO Office of Innovation to explore collaboration on digital transformation and innovation support, with early agreements anticipated in 2026.

The RSP has initiated engagement with the CIFOR-ICRAF, FAO and other innovation actors to lay the foundations for a regional digital ecosystem. Planning is underway for regular technical convenings, innovation brokering sessions, and matchmaking activities aimed at connecting solution providers, end users, policymakers, and regulators. Recruitment of a Regional Innovation Specialist is ongoing and will further strengthen technical leadership and coordination under this output.

Through complementary GEF financing, targeted innovation grants and capacity-building initiatives are being designed for farmers, land users, cooperatives, MSMEs, and private sector actors. OSS will serve as the executing entity for this innovation grant window, with roles and responsibilities to be formalized through a Memorandum of Understanding with IFAD. These investments will support the piloting and scaling of precision agriculture tools, remote sensing applications, smart grids, and other digital innovations critical to climate adaptation, land restoration, and sustainable natural resource management in the Sahel.

Output 3.3: Support Unit and Governance

The reporting period marked important progress in strengthening the governance and operational backbone of the RSP. The recruitment of a Senior Regional Coordinator in October 2025 was followed by the onboarding of Regional Knowledge Management and M&E Specialists in November, significantly reinforcing regional coordination capacity based in Dakar.

At country level, Knowledge Management Specialists have been deployed in Senegal, Burkina Faso, Eritrea, Chad, and Mauritania. Recruitment is ongoing in Nigeria, Mali, Djibouti, and Ethiopia, while activities in Sudan remain suspended due to the ongoing conflict. Parallel discussions are underway with the UNCCD GGW Accelerator and the Pan-African Agency of the GGW to appoint Regional Liaison Officers and further strengthen institutional coordination.

Progress has also been made in formalizing governance arrangements. Ongoing consultations with regional partners, including the PAAGGW and national ministries, are paving the way for the first Regional Consultative Meeting and the operationalization of a Regional Advisory Committee, both scheduled to take place during GGW Week in February 2026. These mechanisms are designed to enhance regional ownership, transparency, strategic guidance, and alignment with continental GGW priorities.

A robust monitoring, evaluation, and learning system is under development to track progress against RSP objectives and results. The Terms of Reference for a comprehensive impact assessment have been finalized, with a call for proposals planned for early 2026. The selected contractor will design the impact assessment framework, establish a Year 1 baseline, produce periodic evaluation reports, and conduct a midterm impact assessment in Year 3. Findings will be systematically integrated into the RSP's monitoring and evaluation system to support adaptive management and continuous learning.

Coordination and Complementarity: GEF and GCF

A significant achievement during the reporting period was the development of a joint results framework consolidating more than USD 21 million in climate finance from the GCF and GEF. This harmonized framework provides a consistent basis for planning, monitoring, and reporting, enabling countries and partners to track climate actions more transparently and identify high-impact resilience strategies and best practices.

At national level, this approach has been reinforced through clearer governance arrangements, designation of lead institutions, and the establishment of national steering committees. Supported by technical partners including UNEP, OSS, and FAO, these structures are strengthening coordination, accountability, and alignment with national development and climate priorities. This coordinated approach represents a practical operationalization of GCF–GEF complementarity at regional scale, reducing transaction costs for countries while improving coherence, predictability, and strategic use of climate finance across the Great Green Wall.

C.2. Performance against the Funding Proposal Logical Framework Indicators

For each of the indicators please report only the 'annual value' for the reporting year; this means reporting solely the values achieved from January 1st, 2025, to December 31st, 2025. The "cumulative value" will automatically be updated by the system by aggregating reported annual values since project FAA effectiveness.

Please ensure that targets are clearly defined and reported using the following categories:

- *Midterm Target: The results to be achieved by the midpoint of implementation.*
- *Final Target: The results to be achieved by the conclusion of project or programme implementation.*
- *Lifetime Target: The total results expected over the entire operational period of the project or programme.*

Note that the baseline, midterm, final and lifetime targets will be prefilled based on your previous Annual Performance Report and/or Funding Proposal. It is imperative that you carefully review, verify and update where relevant.

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

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

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

Should any prefilled information/data in the Logical Framework be incorrect or require updating, please inform GCF's Project Lead for appropriate corrective action.

GCF Outcome Level: Standardized Indicators

PMF/IRMF Results Management Framework

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) M1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO ₂ eq) reduced as a result of GCF-funded projects/programmes (IRMF) Core 1 Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered						
Provide the total GHG emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered (tCO ₂ eq) as a result of GCF support.						
Unit					Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent	
Baseline	Target			Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value <i>(automatically calculated)</i>
	Mid-term	Final target	Lifetime			
0	2,490,000	5,270,048	5,637,184	0	0	0

(PMF) M1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO ₂ eq) reduced as a result of GCF-funded projects/programmes
(IRMF) Core 1 Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered
Provide the total GHG emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered (tCO ₂ eq), disaggregated by Country.

(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	94,500	189,300	0	0	0
Female	0	94,500	189,300	0	0	0

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by Country.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Burkina Faso	0	0	80,000	0	0	0
Mali	0	0	40,000	0	0	0
Ghana	0	0	155,000	0	0	0
Cote d'Ivoire	0	0	53,600	0	0	0
Senegal	0	0	50,000	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 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	0	2,494,000	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	0	1,247,000	0	0	0
Female	0	0	1,247,000	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
Burkina Faso	0	0	330,000	0	0	0
Cote d'Ivoire	0	0	294,800	0	0	0
Ghana	0	0	930,000	0	0	0
Mali	0	0	440,000	0	0	0
Senegal	0	0	500,000	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	623,500	1,247,000	0	0	0
Female	0	623,500	1,247,000	0	0	0

(PMF) A8.1 Number of males and females made aware of climate threats and related appropriate responses						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) made aware of climate threats and related appropriate responses, 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	94,500	189,600	0	0	0
Female	0	94,500	189,600	0	0	0

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	125,000	250,000	0	0	0	

Project Specific Indicators							
Indicator	Unit	Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
			Mid-term	Final target			
M4.1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO ₂ eq) reduced or avoided (including increased removals) - forest and land use	Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent	0	2,490,000	4,998,000	0	0	0
A1.2 Number of males and females benefiting from the adoption of diversified, climate resilient livelihood	No. of Persons	0	1,247,000	2,494,000	0	0	0

options (including fisheries, agriculture, tourism, etc.)							
Number of food secure households (in areas/periods at risk of climate change impacts)	No. of Households	0	189,000	378,600	0	0	0
M1.1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (t CO ₂ eq) reduced or avoided -	Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent	0	0	272,048	0	0	0
A2.2 Total Number of food secure households (in areas/periods at risk of climate change impacts)	No. of Households	0	189,000	378,600	0	0	0
A2.2 Female Number of food secure households (in areas/periods at risk of climate change impacts)	No. of Households	0	94,500	189,300	0	0	0
M6.2 No. of Households, and individuals (males and females) with improved access to low-emission energy sources	No. of Households	0	189,300	378,600	0	0	0

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
1.1.1. Establish Green Financing Facility (revolving lending facility) - window 1 (adaptation)	0	0	49,314,000	0
1.1.2. Establish Green Financing Facility (revolving lending facility) window 2 (mitigation) – Pillar 2,3,5	0	0	24,657,000	0
1.1.3: Technical assistance to set up the Establish Green Financing Facility with the (windows 1 and 2)	0	0	410,950	0
2.1.1: Capacity building on understanding climate risks and integration into business plans "	0	0	1,627,782	0
2.1.2: Capacity building on green bankable Business Plan development	0	0	1,232,850	0

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
2.1.3: Training of FOs, MSMEs and cooperatives to implement financed business plans for results	0	0	1,150,660	0
2.1.4 Support FOs and MSMEs led by women and youth for increased participation	0	0	821,900	0
2. 1..5 Provide technical assistance on green lending and climate risk management	0	0	1,232,850	0
2.1.6. Provide technical assistance to enhance governance and management of loan products, fill the green lines policy gap and ensure use.	0	0	1,027,375	0
2.1.7. Develop a package of tools and instruments including ESMS to assess business plans	0	0	1,191,755	0
2.1.8: Conduct awareness-raising and training on climate resilient agriculture	0	0	821,900	0
2.2.1 Technical support to Central Banks through studies and policies to improve institutional and regulatory framework, standards and ESG benchmarks on climate risk management and green finance for agriculture.	0	0	575,330	0
2.2.2 Organize high-level round table events and exchanges on green finance	0	0	986,280	0
2.2.3: Organize South-South and triangular cooperation visit tour for experience sharing	0	0	493,140	0
2.2.4: Knowledge management and information sharing	0	0	1,232,850	0
2.2.5 Organize annual Sahel- & GGW Award event	0	0	986,280	0
2.2.6: Organize events to replenish the SAHEL- & GGW AWARD	0	0	254,789	0
2.2.7: Develop application protocols and framework and organize events to replenish the Sahel and GGW Award	0	0	164,380	0
2.2.8: Enroll women and youth entrepreneurs to compete for the Sahel Award.	0	0	815,917	0
2.2.9 Impact assessment	0	0	1,679,810	0
3.1.1.Establish a knowledge platform	0	0	36,986	0

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
3.1.2 Developing a knowledge and communication strategy and plan	0	0	98,628	0
3.1.3 Creating a knowledge center	0	0	431,498	0
3.1.4: Creating a communities of practice	0	0	744,641	0
3.1.5 Knowledge products on lessons learned, scalable practices and policy recommendations	0	0	739,710	0
3.1.6: Organize peer-based knowledge exchanges	0	0	4,241,004	0
3.1.7: Enhance coordination and programming at country level	0	0	325,472	0
3.2.1 Build a digital and innovation ecosystem	0	0	542,454	0
3.2.2 Create a digital marketplace	0	0	102,738	0
3.2.3 Identify new opportunities for investing in climate innovation in the GGW	0	0	36,986	0
3.3.1. Establish Support Unit to support the implementation of all activities under Component 3	5	99,665.65	4,214,374	2
3.3.2.Ensure governance of RSP is operational with the recruited staff	0	0	34,520	0
3.3.4. Conduct impact evaluations that can be attributed to the interventions of the program	3	0	328,760	0
3.3.3. Establish the M&E System to assess the progress against the targets & objectives	3	14,820.09	345,198	4

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
Component 3 - GCF GGW	EUR	12,222,967	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Regional Support Programme [							
IGREENFIN I [Components 1 and 2]	EUR	14,721,518	13,791,398	Burkina Faso	N/A	N/A	N/A
IGREENFIN I [Components 1 and 2]	EUR	20,411,587	15,024,248	Ghana	N/A	N/A	N/A
IGREENFIN I [Components 1 and 2]	EUR	14,721,517	14,202,348	Mali	N/A	N/A	N/A
IGREENFIN I [Components 1 and 2]	EUR	20,411,587	15,024,248	Senegal	N/A	N/A	N/A
GREENFIN I [Components 1 and 2]	EUR	20,411,588	15,024,248	Cote d'Ivoire	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 ☒			

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	Foreign Exchange (FX) Risk		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Financial		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Foreign exchange risk arises when IFAD loans denominated in euros are on-lent to final borrowers in local currency, creating exposure to currency fluctuations during repayment. In the IGREENFIN I programme, this risk is limited for Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal because all four countries belong to the WAEMU zone, where the FCFA is fixed at a stable exchange rate of EUR 1 to 655.957 FCFA. This peg significantly reduces short-term volatility, though long-term reforms to the FCFA could introduce uncertainty. The primary FX risk emerges in Ghana, where the Ghanaian cedi is subject to periodic macroeconomic instability and external shocks. This volatility may erode the value of repayments relative to euro-denominated obligations. The root cause is the structural difference between currency regimes: WAEMU's fixed-rate system ensures stability, whereas Ghana operates a floating currency influenced by domestic and global conditions.		
Consequences	Fluctuations in the value of the local currency against the euro can reduce the real value of loan repayments, creating a financing gap for the programme. In Ghana, where the cedi is more volatile, significant depreciation could lower the effective repayment amount, affecting the financial integrity of the credit line and limiting the ability of national institutions to maintain concessional terms for final borrowers. This may also reduce the predictability of lending operations, undermine the financial sustainability of participating institutions, and constrain the flow of green finance to smallholder farmers and MSMEs. In the long term, persistent currency instability could weaken investment confidence, slow uptake of climate-resilient technologies, and affect the programme's overall capacity to deliver intended climate benefits.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity

	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Foreign exchange risk is mitigated through a combination of structural monetary safeguards and targeted institutional measures. In Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal, the fixed parity between the FCFA and the euro eliminates short-term currency volatility and substantially lowers the likelihood of FX losses. The stability of the WAEMU monetary framework further reduces the probability of adverse movements. In Ghana, IFAD applies established hedging mechanisms to protect the value of euro-denominated resources, while the Bank of Ghana regulates and supervises the interbank FX market to limit excessive fluctuations. Under the technical assistance component, national entities will also receive support to apply standard hedging instruments such as forward contracts. Together, these measures reduce both the probability and the impact of FX losses, ensuring that concessional lending terms and programme financial integrity remain protected throughout implementation.		
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 2	Governance Risk		
Risk Origin	External Factors		
Risk Area	Regulatory		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Governance systems in several participating countries remain weak, which can undermine coordination, decision-making, financial management, and overall programme performance. Weak institutional capacity, fragmented policy processes, and limited experience managing large climate-finance programmes contribute to inconsistent implementation, delays, and vulnerability to mismanagement. These challenges stem from structural governance constraints identified across the IGREENFIN countries, as well as varying levels of administrative efficiency and oversight at national and subnational levels.		
Consequences	Weak governance systems can slow decision-making, delay implementation, and reduce the effectiveness of programme coordination. Limited oversight capacity increases the likelihood of mismanagement or inconsistent application of fiduciary standards, which may compromise transparency, reduce investor and stakeholder confidence, and hinder the programme's ability to achieve expected climate-resilience outcomes. Persistent governance weaknesses may also affect long-term sustainability of programme results.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The programme applies IFAD's established country-level presence, fiduciary controls, and risk-management framework to strengthen governance. Implementation is anchored in existing IFAD project management units, supported by continuous policy dialogue and partnerships with national institutions. A regional coordination mechanism enhances oversight, ensures consistent standards, and provides technical backstopping. Regular audits, supervision missions, and IFAD's zero-tolerance approach to corruption further reduce fiduciary and governance risks. These measures primarily lower the impact of governance failures and, over time, also reduce the probability through strengthened institutional capacity and clearer accountability mechanisms.		
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	Technical and Operational Risk		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Design and Implementation		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		

Description	The programme introduces sustainable finance practices and climate-risk management approaches that are new to national development banks, financial regulators, and smallholder borrowers. Because these institutions have limited experience with green lending instruments and climate-aligned financial products, there is a risk of operational delays, weak adoption, or inconsistent application of new procedures. The root cause is the novelty of climate-aligned banking practices in all participating countries and the limited institutional familiarity with the technical, financial, and regulatory requirements involved. This affects both supply-side actors (banks, ministries, regulators) and demand-side actors (farmers, MSMEs), increasing the likelihood of implementation bottlenecks if capacity is not adequately supported.		
Consequences	If unmanaged, these technical and operational gaps could slow programme rollout, reduce the quality of financial services offered to beneficiaries, and undermine the viability of new green financial products. Weak understanding of climate-risk tools may result in inconsistent lending decisions, poor subproject preparation, and reduced uptake by farmers and MSMEs, limiting the programme's ability to achieve expected climate-resilience outcomes.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The programme is built on a demand-driven process, ensuring early buy-in from banks, governments, and farmers. Extensive consultations during design, and continued policy dialogue during implementation, help align expectations and build ownership. IFAD applies robust due-diligence procedures with national executing entities, financial institutions, ministries of finance, and central banks to ensure strong engineering, procurement, and governance systems. A regional coordination mechanism and strengthened PMU structures further support consistent implementation. Technical assistance will provide targeted capacity building on green lending, climate-risk management, and operational procedures to mitigate technical gaps. IFAD's grievance mechanism, including community-level channels, ensures accountability and provides a structured avenue for addressing issues related to social and environmental compliance.		
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 4	Political Instability and Security Risk		
Risk Origin	External Factors		
Risk Area	Political		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Several countries participating in the programme, particularly Mali and Burkina Faso, continue to face political instability, conflict, and localized insecurity. These conditions can disrupt access to programme sites, limit the movement of staff and partners, and delay implementation. The root cause stems from ongoing political transitions, armed-group activity, and fragile security environments that affect parts of the Sahel. Although the programme targets secured regions, broader national instability may still influence operational planning, stakeholder engagement, and delivery of services.		
Consequences	Deteriorating security conditions could restrict access to project sites, delay field activities, and limit participation of beneficiaries and institutions. Prolonged instability may weaken coordination mechanisms, disrupt supply chains for equipment and technical assistance, and reduce the programme's ability to deliver planned climate-resilience outcomes on time or at scale.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The programme intervenes only in areas identified as secure by national authorities, and each country will prepare a site-specific security plan as part of implementation readiness. IFAD conducts security due diligence through its existing country presence and updates operational plans based on real-time assessments. Activities can be rescheduled, relocated, or shifted to remote modalities if needed. Close coordination with government ministries, local administrations, and community structures ensures that early warning information is incorporated into planning. These measures primarily		

	reduce the impact of security disruptions by ensuring continuity of operations in controlled environments. Over time, strengthened collaboration with national partners also helps lower the probability that security incidents will affect programme delivery.		
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 5	Fraud, AML/CFT, and Integrity Risk		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Money Laundering (ML) & Terrorist Financing (TF)		
Description	There is a risk that fraud, misrepresentation, or other deceptive practices could occur within national executing entities (NEEs) or local national agricultural banks (LNABs). Such behavior may undermine due diligence efforts and compromise the reliability of financial information, potentially affecting programme implementation and evaluation. The root cause stems from varying institutional integrity standards across participating countries and the involvement of multiple financial intermediaries managing large volumes of concessional finance. Although all target countries apply Anti-Money Laundering and Combating the Financing of Terrorism (AML/CFT) policies, institutional capacity and enforcement levels differ. However, because loans under the programme are channelled through regulated financial institutions and formal capital markets, the overall likelihood of unidentified fraudulent financing is assessed as low.		
Consequences	If fraud or AML breaches occur, they could disrupt lending operations, delay disbursements, reduce trust in programme governance, and trigger financial or reputational losses. Such events may also weaken compliance systems within partner banks, affect investment confidence, and compromise the programme's ability to deliver climate-resilient outcomes effectively.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The programme applies IFAD's compliance framework, including strict AML/CFT requirements, due-diligence protocols, and internal oversight mechanisms. LNABs and other financial institutions operate under the supervision of their respective central banks, including the Central Bank of WAEMU and the Bank of Ghana, which enforce prudential regulations and integrity standards. IFAD will establish country-specific eligibility criteria for all financial transactions and subject all financed portfolios to its non-objection process through the NOTUS online tool. Regular audits, risk reviews, and supervision missions further strengthen detection and prevention of misconduct.		
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	Procurement		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Conflict of interest		
Description	Component 3 depends on the procurement of consultants, technical service providers, and implementing partners across multiple countries. Because many institutions involved in the Great Green Wall region are interconnected professionally and politically, there is a risk that procurement or selection processes may be influenced by personal or institutional interests. The root cause is the complex, multi-institutional environment where overlapping mandates and informal networks may compromise impartiality.		
Consequences	If unmanaged, this risk can lead to biased selection decisions, reduced competition, delays in contracting, weakened credibility of knowledge products, and diminished trust among participating institutions.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High

Mitigation Measure(s)	The programme applies IFAD's procurement rules, mandatory conflict-of-interest declarations, and NOTUS-based non-objection procedures for all major decisions. Oversight from the Regional Support Unit strengthens compliance. These measures significantly reduce the probability of integrity breaches and limit the impact should any issue 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 7	Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) Risk		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	Gender & SEAH		
Description	Although Component 3 does not directly involve service delivery, programme activities include consultations, workshops, regional exchanges, and community engagement. These interactions create a potential risk of sexual exploitation, abuse, or harassment, particularly in contexts where safeguarding systems are weak or not consistently applied. The root cause lies in unequal power dynamics, varying institutional awareness of PSEA standards, and differing national capacities to enforce safeguarding measures.		
Consequences	PSEA incidents can cause serious harm to affected individuals, reduce trust among communities and partners, trigger reputational damage, and lead to suspension or re-design of activities in affected areas.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 4 - High	Severity 12 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The programme applies IFAD's PSEA Policy, including mandatory codes of conduct, awareness training, and confidential reporting pathways through IFAD's SECAP mechanism. Community-level grievance channels will also be used. These measures substantially reduce the impact of potential incidents and, through capacity building, gradually lower the probability of occurrence.		
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 8	Sanctions and Restricted-Party Risk		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Sanctions		
Description	There is a risk that individuals, institutions, or contractors involved in Component 3 could appear on international sanctions lists or become subject to sanctions during implementation. This may occur due to evolving geopolitical dynamics in the region, limited screening capacity within national institutions, or insufficiently robust vetting of new partners. Because Component 3 operates across multiple jurisdictions, partners may inadvertently engage entities that are restricted under international or IFAD policies.		
Consequences	Engagement with sanctioned parties could lead to suspension of activities, termination of contracts, reputational damage, and interruption of programme delivery. It may also jeopardize compliance with IFAD and GCF policies.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	IFAD screens all partners through sanctions-and-compliance databases and requires national partners to perform similar checks. All contracts undergo legal and integrity review. These measures significantly reduce the probability of sanctioned-party engagement and effectively limit the impact if issues arise.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 4 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity

	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 9	Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Money Laundering (ML) & Terrorist Financing (TF)		
Description	Although Component 3 does not directly handle financial transactions with end beneficiaries, it operates through institutions in countries with varying AML/CFT enforcement capacity. There is a residual risk that programme-related funds, procurement payments, or consulting contracts could be misused to disguise illicit financial flows or indirectly benefit individuals linked to ML or TF activities. Root causes include differing AML/CFT compliance levels, gaps in partner-level due diligence, and limited awareness of international financial-crime standards.		
Consequences	ML/TF exposure could lead to regulatory breaches, reputational harm, suspension of disbursements, and significant delays in programme implementation.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	IFAD's AML/CFT framework, partner due-diligence screening, and central bank supervision in participating countries provide strong safeguards. NOTUS non-objection ensures all contracts are reviewed for compliance. These measures reduce both the probability and impact of ML/TF risks.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 4 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 4 - Medium
Comments	Nothing to add		
Risk 10	Mandate Overlap and Coordination Fragmentation Risk		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Design and Implementation		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Component 3 depends on collaboration between multiple regional and national institutions working on Great Green Wall (GGW) knowledge, coordination, and innovation. A potential risk is the emergence of mandate overlap, competition for visibility, and sensitivity around ownership of results. Several agencies support GGW knowledge management, each with existing initiatives, which can create confusion about roles or duplication of effort. The root cause is the absence of a single, binding coordination mechanism for all GGW knowledge actors, combined with varying institutional mandates, funding sources, and expectations of leadership. Without clear alignment, institutions may be reluctant to share data or fully participate in joint processes, which can weaken the coherence and credibility of regional outputs.		
Consequences	If unmanaged, fragmented collaboration could lead to duplicated work, inconsistent messaging, delays in producing regional knowledge products, and reduced trust among partners. Competition over attribution or ownership may discourage data sharing and weaken the effectiveness of the regional knowledge platform. Ultimately, this can limit the programme's ability to deliver unified regional insights, reduce the visibility of GCF's contribution, and undermine the goal of maximizing resource efficiency across GGW actors.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The programme's governance structure includes a Regional Support Unit and a Regional Advisory Committee to clarify mandates and ensure alignment among GGW institutions. Joint workplans, co-facilitated technical groups, and harmonized knowledge-sharing protocols help reduce duplication. The establishment of the joint GCF-GEF results framework encourages agencies to coordinate around common outcomes rather than parallel activities. Regular coordination with PAAGGW, the UNCCD Accelerator, FAO, OSS, and CIFOR-ICRAF reinforces clarity on roles and expected contributions. These measures reduce the probability of mandate overlap and mitigate the impact by ensuring early detection and coordinated action.		

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 11	Institutional Turnover and Personnel Reshuffling Risk		
Risk Origin	Partner Related		
Risk Area	Partner capacity and suitability		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Component 3 depends on sustained engagement from National Designated Authorities, GCF and GEF focal points, ministerial officials, and staff within regional organizations supporting the Great Green Wall. A potential risk arises from frequent staff reshuffling, political appointments, and turnover within these institutions, which can interrupt continuity of knowledge, slow decision-making, and weaken institutional memory. The root cause is the high rate of administrative rotation within several GGW countries, combined with limited handover processes, variable staff retention, and periodic restructuring within ministries and regional bodies. This instability can affect participation in coordination meetings, delay validation of workplans, and require repeated onboarding of new personnel. Because Component 3 relies on collaborative knowledge processes, inconsistent staffing can reduce cohesion and weaken alignment across institutions.		
Consequences	High turnover can lead to delays in approvals, disrupted collaboration, weakened governance oversight, and inconsistent commitment to agreed regional priorities. New staff may lack familiarity with programme objectives, slowing knowledge consolidation and decision-making. Repeated re-orientation demands can divert time and resources away from technical delivery. Ultimately, this risks reducing the efficiency, coherence, and strategic impact of regional coordination and knowledge-management efforts across the Great Green Wall.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The programme mitigates this risk through structured onboarding tools, standardized knowledge packages, and continuous communication with newly appointed officials. The Regional Support Unit maintains updated stakeholder maps and institutional contact lists to ensure rapid re-engagement when personnel changes occur. Joint GCF–GEF workplans, governance committees, and standardized regional reporting frameworks help reduce dependence on individual staff. Regular capacity-strengthening activities, documentation of decisions, and use of shared digital platforms preserve institutional memory. While these measures cannot prevent turnover, they significantly reduce the impact and help maintain continuity. Over time, stronger institutional systems also lower the probability that turnover disrupts programme delivery.		
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 12	Environmental and Safeguarding Compliance Risk		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	Environmental and Social Safeguards		
Description	Although Component 3 does not finance physical infrastructure, it engages multiple countries through consultations, training events, field missions, and knowledge-gathering activities. These interactions carry a risk of inadequate adherence to environmental, social, gender, and inclusion safeguards. Weak institutional capacity, inconsistent application of national environmental and safeguarding frameworks, and limited familiarity with IFAD's SECAP requirements across participating agencies can result in incomplete screening of activities, exclusion of vulnerable groups, or insufficient attention to environmental and social considerations within knowledge products. The root cause is uneven safeguarding capacity across GGW institutions and differing national procedures.		

Consequences	Safeguard lapses may lead to stakeholder exclusion, reputational damage, inaccurate or biased knowledge outputs, and suspension or redesign of activities if non-compliance is confirmed.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The programme applies IFAD's SECAP requirements, integrates safeguard screening into planning processes, and provides capacity building to national specialists. Regional oversight, documentation protocols, and adherence to IFAD's grievance mechanism significantly reduce the impact, while training and standardized tools lower the probability of non-compliance.		
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 13	Risk of Integrity Breaches in Procurement and Partner Engagements		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Fraud / Bribery & Corruption / Collusion and any other prohibited practice		
Description	There is a risk of fraud, bribery, corruption, or collusion occurring in the implementation of the GGW Regional Support Programme, particularly in procurement, recruitment of consultants, partnership arrangements, and coordination with multiple regional and national stakeholders across eleven countries. Root causes include the programme's multi-country scope, diverse institutional capacities, reliance on third-party partners, and potential information asymmetries between regional and national levels. While no cases were identified in 2025, the complexity of regional coordination and financial flows increases exposure if controls are not consistently applied.		
Consequences	If fraud, bribery, corruption, or collusion were to occur, consequences could include financial losses, delays in implementation, reputational damage to IFAD and the GGW initiative, and reduced trust among donors, governments, and partners. Such incidents could undermine transparency, weaken governance gains achieved by the Regional Support Unit, and compromise the credibility of regional coordination mechanisms. In severe cases, it could lead to funding suspensions, additional audits, or corrective actions that divert management attention away from programme delivery and impact.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The risk is managed through IFAD's robust fiduciary, procurement, and integrity frameworks, which apply to all programme activities. Key measures include centralized financial management by IFAD, segregation of duties, competitive procurement processes, clear Terms of Reference for consultants, and systematic oversight by the Regional Support Unit in Dakar. Additional controls include standardized reporting, coordination with GEF and GCF governance systems, internal reviews, and whistleblowing mechanisms. Capacity strengthening of staff and partners on ethics, transparency, and accountability further reinforces preventive controls. The mitigation measures significantly reduce both the probability and potential impact of the risk. Strong preventive controls lower the likelihood of occurrence, while early detection mechanisms and centralized oversight reduce the severity of impact should an issue arise. As a result, integrity risks remained theoretical and well-controlled in 2025, with no reported cases, and the overall residual risk level is assessed as low to moderate for the reporting period.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 4 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 2 - Low	Severity 4 - Medium
Comments	N/A		

D.2. Report risk incidents

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

(this section is confidential)

E. FINANCIAL INFORMATION

E.1. GCF financing

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

Country	Instrument	Currency (as per FAA)	Committed Amount	Disbursed Amount	Expenditure (reporting year)	Cumulative Expenditure	Mitigation	Adaptation
Burkina Faso	Grants	EUR	3,341,360	0	0	0	33%	67%
Burkina Faso	Loans	EUR	11,380,158	0	0	0	33%	67%
Cote d'Ivoire	Loans	EUR	17,070,228	0	0	0	33%	67%
Cote d'Ivoire	Grants	EUR	3,341,360	0	0	0	33%	67%
Ghana	Loans	EUR	17,070,228	0	0	0	33%	67%
Ghana	Grants	EUR	3,341,359	0	0	0	33%	67%
Mali	Loans	EUR	11,380,158	0	0	0	33%	67%
Mali	Grants	EUR	3,341,359	0	0	0	33%	67%
Senegal	Loans	EUR	17,070,228	0	0	0	33%	67%
Senegal	Grants	EUR	3,341,359	0	0	0	33%	67%
Total		EUR	90,677,797	0	0	0	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
IFAD	Loans	EUR	11,506,000	0	0	0	33%	67%
IFAD	Grants	EUR	26,218,790	0	0	0	33%	67%
AfDB	Grants	EUR	14,794,200	0	0	0	33%	67%
IsDB	Loans	EUR	12,328,500	0	0	0	33%	67%

Co-financier	Instrument	Currency (as per FAA)	Committed Amount	Disbursed Amount	Expenditure (reporting year)	Cumulative Expenditure	Mitigation	Adaptation
BADF Agricultural Bank of Burkina Faso	Loans	EUR	821,900	0	0	0	33%	67%
BNI National Investment Bank of Côte d'Ivoire	Loans	EUR	2,054,750	0	0	0	33%	67%
ARB Apex Bank Limited of Ghana	Loans	EUR	2,054,750	0	0	0	33%	67%
BNDA Agricultural Bank of Mali	Loans	EUR	1,232,850	0	0	0	33%	67%
LBA - Agricultural Bank of Senegal-	Loans	EUR	2,054,750	0	0	0	33%	67%
Total		EUR	73,066,490	0	0	0	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: 2025 IGREENFIN FP183 GCF Grant Financial Progress IGREENFIN.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

Outputs during the reporting period	
Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during implementation	
Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention	
Remarks/Notes	
F.4. Sub-projects information	
Have any subprojects been implemented?	Yes ☐ No ☒
N/A	N/A

F.5. Implementation of the stakeholder engagement plan	
Were any actions undertaken to increase engagement of relevant stakeholders in the project, particularly regarding environmental, social, and gender elements?	Yes ☒ No ☐
Activities implemented during the reporting period	
During this initial phase, at the national level, the programme prioritised early engagement with NDAs, GEF and GGW focal points, AEs, DAEs, CSOs and regional institutions to establish coordination structures and refine country priorities. Introductory consultations supported the development of the joint results framework, governance arrangements, and initial M&E and knowledge-management systems. Engagements also prepared countries for upcoming implementation by clarifying roles, aligning expectations and confirming support needs. Activities remained foundational, setting the basis	

for full-scale 2026 implementation.	
In 2025, stakeholder engagement related to innovation and digital transformation was undertaken primarily at the regional level, focusing on ecosystem building and strategic coordination rather than field-level implementation. The Regional Support Programme engaged with key regional and international partners, notably the FAO Office of Innovation, CIFOR-ICRAF, and OSS, to explore collaboration modalities that support digital solutions for climate resilience, land restoration, and sustainable land management across the Great Green Wall region. Technical consultations with FAO contributed to shared understanding on priority innovation areas, institutional roles, and readiness requirements. In parallel, engagement supported the design of GEF-financed innovation grants, clarifying governance arrangements and complementarities with GCF support. These regional-level interactions strengthened coherence, reduced fragmentation, and laid the foundations for a coordinated and inclusive regional innovation ecosystem.	
Dates and venues of engagement activities	
At the national level, stakeholder engagement was conducted through a combination of virtual and in-country interactions between August and December 2025, following the recruitment of the first National Knowledge Management Specialist in Chad and the subsequent deployment of specialists in Senegal, Burkina Faso, Mauritania, and Eritrea. Engagements included introductory coordination meetings with National Designated Authorities (NDAs) and national focal points, participation in monthly regional expert working-group sessions, and continuous bilateral exchanges with key partners. Additional engagement took place through preparatory consultations ahead of GGW Week and targeted technical discussions with the Pan-African Agency of the Great Green Wall in Nouakchott.	
Sex-disaggregated data on stakeholder engagement participants (male + female = total)	
Engagement included GCF NDAs, GEF and GGW focal points, international AEs, DAEs, national agricultural banks, CSO representatives engaged in GGW implementation, the Pan-African Agency for the Great Green Wall, the African Union Commission, UNCCD, and private-sector platforms (WEF, WBCSD). Additional national institutions participated based on country contexts.	
Information shared with stakeholders	
Stakeholders received updates on programme objectives, the proposed governance structure, the joint results framework, expected support functions, environmental and social requirements, gender considerations, and initial M&E and knowledge-management arrangements. Discussions also covered country programming priorities, coordination modalities and preparatory steps toward implementation.	
Outputs including issues raised and addressed during the reporting period	
Early engagement produced an agreed coordination structure, a draft results framework, and initial alignment on national priorities. Stakeholders highlighted the need for clearer guidance on reporting, stronger support to DAEs, and early capacity-building. These issues were addressed through monthly expert meetings, tailored bilateral sessions and strengthened communication channels.	
Remarks/Notes	
Progress reflects strong early ownership and constructive collaboration, despite the programme still being in its start-up phase. No major delays emerged; remaining gaps will be addressed through intensified engagement during 2026 as implementation accelerates.	

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	

No activities to report on Component 1 and 2, as they have not yet started. Under component 3, the following activities are planned: 1) Host virtual knowledge-sharing webinars linking best practices across countries. 2) Develop and disseminate policy briefs and simple toolkits for local financial institutions and cooperatives. 3) Launch a regional email-based grievance and feedback channel, integrated into the KM platform. 4) Organize South–South exchange among GGWI countries. 5) Establish a digital innovation hub for adaptation technologies. 6) Facilitate multi-stakeholder dialogues at national and regional levels

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

As per Component 3, being a coordination component, it has no effect on environmental and social safeguards. However, the GGW RSP intends to build an inclusive and comprehensive platform, challenges remain in collecting indigenous peoples' and local communities' knowledge and being able to systematize and share it. All activities implemented in 2026 and beyond will be in a way to address the challenge of social inclusion.

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

As we prepare to accelerate implementation in 2026, our approach to the GRM will be adaptive to diverse contexts. In countries with IFAD offices, established GRM policies will be used. Where IFAD is not present, we will utilize UN Inter-Agency PSEA mechanisms and IFAD's SEA system and are exploring partnerships with other UN agencies or GCF/GEF projects for GRM support. All implementing partners, including FAO (still to be contracted) and OSS, will apply their own GRM policies. Regionally, a dedicated grievance email and reporting features will be integrated into the knowledge management platform.

Have there been any grievances received during the reporting period?

Yes ☐ No ☒

Nothing to report!

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

During the reporting period, activities under the GAP were primarily preparatory in nature, focusing on recruitment, planning, and stakeholder engagement. Three out of five regional coordination team positions have been filled, including two female staff member, with recruitment for the remaining roles nearing completion. While full-scale implementation of GAP activities is scheduled to commence in 2026, gender considerations have been integrated into stakeholder consultations and the design of project planning processes.

Key actions agreed in the GAP for the upcoming period include conducting a comprehensive gender gap analysis, integrating gender-responsive indicators into all baseline studies and assessments, and mainstreaming gender into planned knowledge management and digital innovation activities. Collaboration with IFAD's gender specialist will ensure technical support and guidance throughout these processes. Furthermore, targeted outreach and participation of women and vulnerable groups will be prioritized in future project activities. Progress on each GAP activity will be systematically tracked and reported as implementation advances. No direct implementation of specific GAP activities occurred during this reporting period, but foundational steps have been taken to ensure gender responsiveness as the project moves forward.

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

Yes ☒ No ☐

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

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

GAP Activity	
Activity 3.3.2 Ensure governance of RSP is operational	
Indicator	
Number of female hired out of the 5 staff to be hired in the GGW RSP coordination mechanisms	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	5
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
2	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
0	
Budget	123,285
Currency	EUR
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 December 2025
Responsibility	
One Sahel Coordinator	
Remarks/Notes	
To date, three key positions for the Regional Support Programme have been successfully filled: Regional Project Manager, Knowledge Management Specialist, and M&E Specialist. Recruitment for the remaining RSP team members is nearing completion, with only the Regional Finance Specialist and administrative assistant positions still pending. We anticipate finalizing these appointments in the near future to ensure a fully operational team.	

GAP Activity
Activity 3.3.3 Establish the M&E System - Collection of gender disaggregated data for reporting on project performance indicators - Hire specialists to conduct surveys and carry out data aggregation methodologies to obtain gender disaggregated data

Indicator	
Number of reports displaying gender disaggregated dataNumber of female hired in the PMUs	
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	7
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
0	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
0	
Budget	410
Currency	EUR
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	31 December 2026
Responsibility	
RSP Unit – M&E specialist	
Remarks/Notes	
The M&E Specialist joined the team in mid-November 2025. Development of the M&E plan is underway and expected to be completed by the first quarter of 2026. Most M&E activities will begin in 2026 as project implementation gains momentum. All baseline studies and assessments will integrate gender-based indicators to ensure gender responsiveness throughout project monitoring and evaluation.	
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>While the project does not have a dedicated in-house gender specialist, we are actively collaborating with IFAD's regional gender specialist to support the implementation of the gender action plan. This collaboration ensures that gender considerations are effectively mainstreamed across all project activities. In 2026, we plan to conduct a GAP analysis as well as gender-related studies focused on knowledge management and digital innovation. Should the need arise for additional expertise, we will coordinate with IFAD to engage further gender specialists as required. This approach ensures ongoing access to high-quality gender expertise for the duration of the project.</i>	
Has the implementation of gender action plan/s being implemented according to Funding Activity Agreements and GCF's Updated Gender Policy? Please ensure that the budget is included in the reporting above if it was indicated in the approved or updated gender action plan.	Yes ☒ No ☐

<i>Yes, the budget allocated for the implementation of the gender action plan is being managed in line with the Funding Activity Agreements and GCF's Updated Gender Policy. All gender-related activities, including the planned GAP analysis and gender studies on knowledge management and digital innovation, are covered within the approved project budget. Budget provisions for gender mainstreaming were explicitly included in the approved gender action plan, and expenditures are tracked to ensure compliance with both IFAD and GCF requirements. Regular financial monitoring and reporting will continue to ensure that gender-related allocations are utilized as intended and aligned with the project's gender objectives.</i>	
Are the planned activities, targets, indicators, timelines, etc. on track during the reporting period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>During the reporting period, consultations with stakeholders were conducted to inform key recruitment decisions and planning processes. Implementation manuals and the 2026 Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) have been developed, supporting the effective roll-out of project activities. These efforts, alongside continued stakeholder engagement, ensure that the project remains on track and well-prepared for full implementation in 2026.</i>	
Were there any revisions of the approved GAP during the reporting period? Please submit the updated GAP in Annex section of this APR and ensure that the updated GAP has details on each change.	Yes ☐ No ☒
<i>No update in the GAP.</i>	
Are the reported results on track to contribute to meeting the sex-disaggregated targets for the direct beneficiaries in the funding proposal, if applicable?	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>Yes, current results are on track to meet the sex-disaggregated targets for direct beneficiaries. Gender considerations have been integrated into recruitment and planning, and upcoming activities will ensure continued progress toward these targets.</i>	
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 ☒
<i>No significant implementation challenges affecting gender-related activities were encountered during the reporting period. As most activities were limited to recruitment, planning, and stakeholder engagement, gender-focused actions have not yet faced operational constraints. The project remains committed to proactive planning and ongoing consultation to ensure gender considerations are effectively addressed as implementation progresses. Lessons learned will continue to inform future activities should any challenges arise.</i>	
Were there any best practices identified, or case studies prepared on benefits/activities undertaken as agents of action by women and the female heads of households during the reporting period? Please share any case studies in the text boxes or in the Annex section of the APR.	Yes ☐ No ☒
<i>While implementation of Component 3 began during the reporting period, activities were primarily focused on recruitment and planning. As full-scale implementation had not yet commenced, no best practices or case studies on the roles of beneficiaries, women, or the most vulnerable groups were identified or prepared at this stage. Case studies and project stories will be documented and included in future reports as implementation progresses and measurable outcomes are achieved.</i>	
Provide planned activities on gender elements for the next reporting period	

For the next reporting period, the project will prioritize several gender-focused activities. These include conducting a comprehensive gender gap analysis and integrating gender-based indicators into all baseline studies and assessments. Gender considerations will also be mainstreamed into the development of knowledge management and digital innovation studies. Ongoing collaboration with IFAD's gender specialist will guide these activities to ensure gender-responsive planning and implementation. Additionally, targeted stakeholder consultations will be conducted to ensure the perspectives of women and vulnerable groups are actively reflected in project design and delivery.

G. ANNEXES (UPLOADED)
Annex 1: GHG emission reduction calculation methodology (for projects reporting GHG emission reductions) and details on the calculations of the annual and cumulative value.
File Name: Explanatory Note on GHG Emission Reduction Reporting for the 2025 Reporting Period.docx File Name: Annex 17 IGREENFIN_multi-country-project-programme-information_111721_fp.xlsx
Annex 2: Communication and visibility material
File Name: GGW REGIONAL SUPPORT PROGRAM TEAM RETREAT.docx File Name: Annex 2_Communication and Visibility.docx
Annex 3: List of grievances received
No annexes provided.
Annex 4: Procurement information
No annexes provided.
Annex 5: Updated implementation timetable for the Funded Activity for the following year
No annexes provided.
Annex 6: Updated Gender Assessment and/or Action Plan
No annexes provided.
Additional Annexes (if applicable)
No annexes provided.

