
Annual Performance Report

Project/Programme title: Enhanced climate resilience in the Trois-Rivières region of Haiti through Integrated Flood Management (FP208)

Accredited Entity: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Date of Report submission: 14 August 2026

Version number V2.0



Contents

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

RATIONALE

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

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

METHODOLOGY

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

A. PROJECT DATA (Prefilled where possible)

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

A.1. Date of report submission		14 August 2026		
A.2. Project or programme	Project	A.3. Sector	Public	
A.4. Total Financing (GCF + Cofinance)				
	GCF Financing		Mill. USD 22.4	
	Grants		Mill. USD 22.4	
	Co-Financing		Mill. USD 8.9	
	Grants		Mill. USD 8.9	
Total Financing		Mill. USD 31.3		
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 Environment	Haiti	Public sector – Government (which may be acting through a ministry or department)	Executing Entity	Sonia Orismé, sorisme@gmail.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)
Heifer International Haiti	Haiti	Hervil Cherubin, hervil.cherubin@heifer.org	NGO	Communities
UNDP	Haiti	Sylvain Merler sylvain.merler@undp.org	International Organization	Communities

A.10. Alignment with country NDCs & NAP <i>(NB Only populate if applicable, e.g., if your project/programme specifically contributes to a country's NDC or NAP target/s)</i>				
Country	Date of NDC/ NAP submission	NDC/ NAP objective	Brief description of project's alignment with NDC/ NAP objectives	Percentage of target met with proposed project.Beneficial owner(s)
Haiti	6 January 2022	Haiti's revised NDC by the Ministry of the Environment aims to strengthen the country's commitment to combating climate change by combining mitigation and adaptation actions. It seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, particularly in the energy, agriculture, forestry, and waste sectors, while strengthening the resilience of vulnerable populations and sectors such as agriculture, water resources, and coastal areas, with a particular focus on integrating climate into public policy and mobilizing international financing.	Haiti has included 4 main adaptation priorities of which the project has been able to focus on the following y: i) promoting integrated water resources and watershed management; ii) preserving and strengthening food security; and iii) information dissemination, education and awareness raising The project focuses on Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) and the restoration of riparian ecosystems, aligns with Haiti's revised NDC by contributing to climate resilience, water resource protection, and reducing communities' vulnerability to the effects of climate change. Similarly, through its communication campaigns it looks to enhance information dissemination and awareness raising.	10%
Haiti	1 May 2023	Reducing vulnerability to the impacts of climate change by strengthening adaptive capacity, disaster risk reduction, and resilience, and integrate climate change adaptation into relevant new and existing policies, programs, and work, in particular sustainable development planning processes and strategies, in all relevant sectors and at different levels, as appropriate. (UNFCCC, 2020)	The project focuses on Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) and the restoration of riparian ecosystems, aligns with Haiti's revised NDC by contributing to climate resilience, water resource protection, and reducing communities' vulnerability to the effects of climate change.	15%

A.11. Estimated duration of impact	
A.12 Report to be shared with NDA	Yes ☒ No ☐
2 July 2026	

B. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

B.1. Summary

The project aims to support the Government of Haiti in managing the impacts of climate -induced flooding on the TR watershed through the implementation of an integrated approach to flood management. The project’s approach includes: i) implementing ecosystem based adaptation measures in the form of restoration and agroforestry activities to address soil erosion caused by flooding, reduce health risks associated with water- and vector-borne diseases, and provide alternative climate-resilient livelihood options to target communities; (ii) improving land-use planning and management at a local level for sustainable and resilient productive practices that will result in improved food security; and iii) enhancing the capacity of national- and local-level actors responsible for decision-making around the use of water resources to implement climate-resilient integrated water resources management (IWRM). By the end of the project, it aims to benefit a total of 773,832 vulnerable people, to implement 17,740 ha of agroforestry systems, to rehabilitate 7,700 ha of forests in water towers, to reduce by 50% the number of households affected by 100-year flood events and to mitigate an estimated 1,018,290 tCO₂-e as a co benefit.

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 since its inception on June 2024, has been facing several challenges that have resulted in delays to its implementation i) insecurity in Haiti which causes severe restrictions of movement, two out of seven (7) municipalities targeted by the project- Gros Morne and Bassin Blue- are deeply affected by insecurity and have been designated as red zones, where armed groups are have been targeting residents and road users and ii) lack of capacities to deliver some of the specialized consultancies due to a lack of interest of qualified professionals' availability in Haiti. Similarly, the second disbursement tranche for the project faced significant delays and required activities to cease as well as the hiring of relevant consultancies on safeguard plans. This has resulted in disruptions to the project's Management Unit where Coordinators for Output 1 & 2 have changed twice during the year. The project has adopted several measures for its effective implementation. These implemented measures include: the elaboration of a security plan, the adoption of the SES roadmap, constant consultations with stakeholders, change in coordination of output 1 & 2, the completion of the recruitment of the project key staff, and the opening of the new project office in the northern region. For the field-core activities related to the implementation of agroforestry systems, the project has planned to launch activities including training and planting seedlings by March 2026.

Due to the socio-political crisis that has been plaguing the country for several years, Haitian professionals with diverse skills have been forced to leave in search of better living conditions in other countries. As a result, the project has faced challenges in recruiting certain specialized firms or consultants to carry out specific consultations outlined in the project document, such as those related to carbon sequestration, waterborne diseases, water governance, and the 33 land-use plans, to name just a few.

Several calls for tender have been unsuccessful. As strategy to face this situation, some studies previously planned for individual consultants have sometimes been changed into offers for local firms. For instance, this has been the case for studies on vector water born diseases. Full-time staff positions may be turned firstly into individual consultant positions to speed up the process and deliverables and then secondly returned into the initial full-time staff positions. In the case where the interested single individual consultants previously expected to conduct studies and do not meet all the relevant skills requirements, the project agrees to ask for a group of consultants. In this case, the studies may more and less exceed the envisioned budget, and the project must make some arrangements as in the case for the consultancy for the water act. Moreover, due to inflation, studies are under-budgeted when comparing the planned costs in the project design phase with the actual necessary costs in the project design phase. Therefore, time-consuming negotiation processes are often undertaken between the project and consultants or firms to conciliate budgets. Few examples are the 33 Land Use Plans and the Carbon monitoring, etc.

These adaptative measures have allowed for the following results.

Output 1. Ecosystem-based flood management solutions implemented in 25,440 hectares of the Trois-Rivières watershed

Activity 1.1. Strengthen the capacity of community groups, including farmer and women's associations, for climate-resilient land-use planning in seven target communes in the Trois-Rivières watershed

- Baseline survey: since the first quarter of the year 2025, the baseline survey has been completed. The objective of this study was to collect essential data on climate vulnerabilities, agricultural practices, and food security, to serve as a baseline for assessing the impact of actions taken as the project progresses.
- Validation of the communal section: The 33 communal sections have been validated by communities.
- Awareness campaign: through workshops and public gathering, few awareness campaigns on the impacts of climate change on flooding in the TR region have been conducted.
- Awareness campaign on SES and gender linked to output 1 has been launched.

Activity 1.2. Implement ecosystem-based flood management solutions in the Trois-Rivières watershed

- Agroforestry systems: the project has already selected more than 100 ha of targeted sites for agroforestry systems.
- Engagement workshop and training: Training sessions for first group of smallholder farmers on personal leadership development and good agricultural practices have been launched.

Output 2. Enhanced technical and institutional capacity at the commune, inter-commune and department levels for implementing productive climate-resilient agricultural practices and sustain

Activity 2.1. Strengthen institutional capacity at the commune, inter-commune and department levels in Haiti's Trois-Rivières watershed for productive and sustainable land-use management

- The capacity need assessment: The main objective of this consultation was to conduct an in-depth assessment of gaps and needs in the agricultural sector of the seven targeted municipalities in the Trois-Rivières region with a view to productive and sustainable soil management.
- The establishment of the 7 communal development councils: 7 communal development councils have been established, one for each of the 7 targeted municipalities of the project. The goal is to develop the governance

mechanisms and frameworks for sustainable landscape management (SLM) to facilitate the uptake of the new sustainable practices in the Trois-Rivières watershed.

Activity 2.2. Enhance the technical capacity and access to finance of national and local representatives involved in agriculture in the Trois-Rivières watershed for adopting climate-resilient sustainable land-use practices

Activity 2.3. Implement a social protection system to support vulnerable households at risk to food insecurity because of climate change

□ The mapping and SWOT analysis of existing Village Savings and Credits Association are ongoing. In addition, the project has already identified more than 80 Mutual of Solidarity (MUSO) and is capitalizing on the findings of the capacity need assessment to design trainings for farmers and communities in the seven target communes, work with farmers and communities to prioritize adaptation interventions for agricultural value chains (post-harvest techniques, enhanced seeds) and to improving access to financing for small farmers thanks to Village Savings and Credits Association.

Output 3. Strengthened governance and capacity for climate-resilient integrated water resources management (IWRM)

Activity 3.1. Strengthen national capacities for the implementation of the Water Act

- Initiated the process for the legal and technical analysis for the provisions to the water act: the legal and technical analysis report on the current provisions of the Water Law, including proposals for amendments or new provisions adapted to the Haitian context and IWRM objectives is expected for the first quarter of 2026. This study also provides a legal framework to establish the Catchment Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Committee and the 31 Sub-Catchment Water Resource Users Associations

Activity 3.2. Develop an integrated, climate-resilient water management governance framework targeting the catchment and sub-catchment levels in the Trois-Rivières watershed

Activity 3.3. Implement regular monitoring and evaluation of water resources at the catchment and sub-catchment levels to support the implementation of integrated water resources management (IWRM) plans

- The project has initiated health monitoring and impact evaluations of the EbA flood management solutions and health monitoring protocol and baseline analysis. The health monitoring protocol is expected by the end of Q1 2026
- The Baseline assessment of the prevalence of water- and vector-borne diseases within the TR watershed is expected to be completed by the beginning of Q2 2026

Additionally, the project has achieved cross-functional activities related to safeguards and gender on the three (3) output. Those activities include:

- Capacity strengthening of implementing partners on SES: Training on SES standards and the gender action plan for about 30 staff members of the project partners, including Heifer, the Ministry of Environment and UNDP.
- Awareness campaign on SES and gender launched.
- Mapping and capacity assessment of women associations and community grassroots associations.
- Project level GRM established: 7 GRM committees have been created in the 7 targeted municipalities and trained.
- The elaboration of SES Roadmap.
- The launch of the process for recruiting an international consultant for conducting the environmental and social impact Assessment (ESIA), including a biodiversity action plan and conflict analysis.
- SEAH GRM: the ToR for putting in place the SEAH has been elaborated and the follow up is ongoing to set the mechanism.
- The elaboration of the security plan by UNDP security unit and the project.

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	Mid-term	Target Final target	Lifetime	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
0	436,410	1,018,290	0	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) as a result of GCF support, disaggregated by result area.							
Unit							Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent
Disaggregation by: Result Areas (Mitigation)	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Lifetime	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Forestry and land use	0	436,410	1,018,290	0	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.							
Unit							Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Lifetime	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Haiti	0	436,410	1,018,290	0	0	0	0

Forestry and land use

No indicators/questions defined.

(PMF) M9.1 Hectares of land or forests under improved and effective management that contributes to CO ₂ emission reductions (IRMF) Core 4: Hectares of natural resource areas brought under improved low emission and/or climate resilient management practices					
Provide the total degraded or converted ecosystems under restoration (ha).					
Unit					Hectares
Baseline	Mid-term	Target Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
0	12,720	25,440	0	0	0

(PMF) M9.1 Hectares of land or forests under improved and effective management that contributes to CO2 emission reductions (IRMF) Core 4: Hectares of natural resource areas brought under improved low emission and/or climate resilient management practices						
Provide the total degraded or converted ecosystems under restoration (ha), disaggregated by country.						
Unit						Hectares
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Haiti	0	12,720	25,440	0	0	0

(PMF) M9.1 Hectares of land or forests under improved and effective management that contributes to CO2 emission reductions (IRMF) Core 4: Hectares of natural resource areas brought under improved low emission and/or climate resilient management practices						
Provide the total degraded or converted ecosystems under restoration (ha), disaggregated by land type.						
Unit						Hectares
Disaggregation by: Land Type	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Forest Land (reforestation)	0	3,850	7,700	0	0	0
Forest Land (afforestation)	0	8,870	17,740	0	0	0

(IRMF) Supplementary 4.1 Hectares of terrestrial-forest, terrestrial-non-forest, freshwater and coastal-marine areas brought under restoration and or improved ecosystems						
Provide the total land areas under sustainable management practices (ha).						
Unit					Hectares	
Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)	
	Mid-term	Final target				
0	12,720	25,440	0	0	0	

(IRMF) Supplementary 4.1 Hectares of terrestrial-forest, terrestrial-non-forest, freshwater and coastal-marine areas brought under restoration and or improved ecosystems						
Provide the total land areas under sustainable management practices (ha), disaggregated by type.						
Unit						Hectares
Disaggregation by: Land Type	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Forest Land (reforestation)	0	3,850	7,700	0	0	0
Forest Land (afforestation)	0	8,870	17,740	0	0	0

(IRMF) Supplementary 4.1 Hectares of terrestrial-forest, terrestrial-non-forest, freshwater and coastal-marine areas brought under restoration and or improved ecosystems						
Provide the total land areas under sustainable management practices (ha), disaggregated by country.						
Unit						Hectares
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Haiti	0	12,720	25,440	0	0	0

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by result area.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Result Areas (Adaptation)	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Livelihoods of people and communities	0	44,714	234,272	0	83	83
Health and well-being, and food and water security	0	10,000	58,328	0	18	18

(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	40,561	140,448	0	61	61
Female	0	14,153	152,152	0	40	40

(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
Haiti	0	54,714	292,600	0	101	101

(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	195,067	361,843	0	0	0
Health and well-being, and food and water security	0	42,819	79,429	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	114,185	211,811	0	0	0

Female	0	123,701	229,461	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
Haiti	0	237,886	441,272	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	5,000	40,331	0	61	61
Female	0	5,000	13,921	0	40	40

(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
Haiti	0	10,000	54,252	0	101	101

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	176,350	212,049	0	0	0
Female	0	190,890	229,563	0	0	0

(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 country.

Unit						Enter unit
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Haiti	0	226,740	441,612	0	0	0

(PMF) A2.2 Number of food secure households (in areas/periods at risk of climate change impacts)

(IRMF) Supplementary 2.2 Beneficiaries (female/male) with improved food security

Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) with improved or sustained food security through enhanced physical, social, and economic access to, and utilization of, food and nutrition in areas at risk of climate change, 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	12,118	42,412	0	0	0
Female	0	13,127	45,947	0	0	0

Project Specific Indicators

Indicator	Unit	Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
			Mid-term	Final target			
Number of farmers trained in climate resilient sustainable land use practices	No. of Farmers	0	5,400	48,852	0	0	0
Number of governance frameworks at the communal and inter communal level is created for integrated, climate-resilient water management	No. of Strategic Frameworks	0	42	63	0	0	0
Number of community land-use plans giving stewardship over forests and other natural resources	Plans	0	33	33	0	0	0
% increase in yields per productive unit	Percentage	0	0	25	0	0	0
Hectares of land under agroforestry and/or rehabilitated for EBA	Hectares	0	12,720	25,440	0	0	0
GHG emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered	Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent	0	436,410	1,018,290	0	0	0
Reduced incidence of water borne diseases	Percentage	0	60	0	0	0	0

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
Activity 1.1. Strengthen the capacity of community groups, including farmer and women's associations, for climate-resilient land-use planning in seven target communes in the Trois-Rivières watershed	15	173,046.45	1,702,000	10
Activity 1.2. Implement ecosystem-based flood management solutions in the Trois-Rivières watershed.	7	114,011.63	16,396,800	0
Activity 2.1. Strengthen institutional capacity at the commune, inter-commune and de-partment levels in Haiti's Trois-Rivières watershed for productive and sustainable land-use management	13	0	0	0
Activity 2.2. Enhance the technical capacity and access to finance of national and local representatives involved in agriculture in the Trois-Rivières watershed for adopting climate-resilient sustainable land-use practices	5	0	0	0
Activity 2.3. Implement a social protection system to support vulnerable households at risk to food insecurity because of climate change	5	0	0	0
Activity 3.1. Strengthen national capacities for the implementation of the Water Act	5	151,313.41	1,015,140	14
Activity 3.2. Develop an integrated, climate-resilient water management governance framework targeting the catchment and sub-catchment levels in the Trois-Rivières watershed	10	79,143.95	1,090,066	7
Activity 3.3. Implement regular monitoring and evaluation of water resources at the catchment and sub-catchment levels to support the implementation of integrated water resources management (IWRM) plans	5	19,532.5	690,952	2

C.2.1. Subprojects

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

Title	Currency	GCF Funds	Co-Financing	Country	GHG Emissions Reduced	Direct Beneficiaries	Indirect Beneficiaries
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
C.3. Compliance with FAA covenants				Yes ☒ No ☐			
Yes, legal agreements have been complied.							
C.4. Funded Activity Implementation Arrangements in the Following Year				Yes ☐ No ☒			
N/A							

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	Insecurity and sociopolitical instability		
Risk Origin	External Factors		
Risk Area	Political		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	For the recent decades, Haiti has been faced with sociopolitical unrest characterized by controversial elections or failure to hold elections, frequent public demonstrations, uncompleted presidential terms, illegal territory control by armed groups, impoverishment, etc. With the aim to control the ressources (public markets, natural ressources) and the electorate, armed groups are expanded to countrysides. This is the case of the municipalities of Gros-Morne and Bassin-Bleu, 2 municipalities targeted by the project		
Consequences	The risk of insecurity and political instability in Haiti, particularly in the communes of Gros-Morne and Bassin Bleu located in the Trois Rivières watershed, represents a major constraint to project implementation. This situation is reflected in a rise in banditry, kidnapping threats, illegal roadblocks, and widespread insecurity, which hinder the free movement of people, goods, and project teams, while also limiting community participation in planned activities. Therefore, the insecurity causes significant delays in project implementation.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	4 - Almost certain	4 - High	16 - High
Mitigation Measure(s)	A security plan was developed in collaboration with UNDP security team, in which the municipalities of Gros-Morne and Bassin Bleu are classified as red zones. Regular coordination is maintained with local authorities and relevant community stakeholders to ensure continuous updates on the security situation in the project intervention areas. The project has also adopted flexible operational strategies, including the use of local organizations, community focal points to support community mobilization and awareness-raising, as well as the use of remote monitoring modalities when required by		

	the context. These measures mainly contribute to reducing the impact of the risk on the implementation of project activities, while also partially lowering its likelihood of occurrence. However, the security context remains volatile. The residual risk level is therefore estimated at 4 out of 5, particularly in the municipalities of Gros-Morne and Bassin Bleu, indicating a substantial risk that requires continuous monitoring and ongoing adaptive measures.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	4 - High	12 - Medium High
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	4 - High	12 - Medium High
Comments	This risk is primarily linked to the presence of armed groups, recurring sociopolitical unrest, weak public institutions, and economic constraints that increase the vulnerability of local populations. In certain intervention areas, particularly in Gros-Morne and Bassin Bleu, the presence of armed groups significantly limits, and in some cases prevents, access for project teams, slows down the implementation of field activities, and reduces the participation of beneficiaries and stakeholders. The assessment of this risk considers the presence and influence of armed groups, the frequency of security incidents, and their potential impact on community activities and project implementation. As an external risk, the project has limited capacity to control it. Despite the implementation of mitigation measures, including the development of a security plan, regular monitoring of the security context, and the adaptation of operational strategies, the situation remains unpredictable and requires continuous vigilance.		
Risk 2	Economic displacement due to limited access to land		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	The Trois Rivières project, through its agroforestry and reforestation activities, may limit access to land and cause economic displacement. Local communities rely on agriculture for their income and food security. Reduced access to land, due to land pressure, the absence of clear land registration, or the project's use of land, may decrease agricultural production and household income. Some families may be forced to temporarily or permanently relocate their agricultural activities, affecting their economic and social stability. Without support, compensation, or land mediation, the project risks increasing inequalities, weakening the economic resilience of riverine communities, and compromising social acceptance as well as the sustainability of the planned activities.		
Consequences	The use of agricultural land for forestry and agroforestry activities, in the absence of appropriate mitigation measures, may lead to a reduction or alteration of agricultural production, thereby exacerbating poverty and increasing the vulnerability already fragile groups. This risk may also generate social tensions and land conflicts between local communities and project stakeholders. Furthermore, the temporary or permanent relocation of agricultural activities may disrupt the socio-economic organization of households, weaken their resilience to economic shocks, and compromise the social acceptability as well as the sustainability of the project's interventions		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	4 - High	12 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	To limit economic displacement resulting from restricted access to land and natural resources, the project will prioritize the use of state-owned or non-agricultural land and, where necessary, obtain the informed consent of beneficiaries. Agroforestry and forestry activities will be implemented according to land-use zoning and mapping for sustainable management, accompanied by compensatory measures such as enhancing agricultural productivity and providing training in sustainable farming practices		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	The project reduces the risk of economic displacement by prioritizing non-agricultural or state-owned land, obtaining beneficiaries' consent, and sustainably strengthening agricultural production.		

Risk 3	Natural habitat degradation and biodiversity loss		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	The risk of natural habitat degradation and biodiversity loss in the Key Biodiversity Area is linked to the pressure exerted on fragile ecosystems within the Trois Rivières watershed. This risk may manifest through the destruction or fragmentation of natural habitats, the decline of local plant and animal species, and the alteration of essential ecological functions such as water regulation and soil protection. The root causes of this risk include deforestation driven by wood harvesting and uncontrolled agricultural expansion, the introduction of exotic or unsuitable plant species (invasive plant species), unsustainable agricultural practices, demographic pressure, and the dependence of local communities on natural resources for their livelihoods. The effects of climate change, particularly increased flooding, soil erosion, and extreme weather events, also contribute to weakening these ecosystems and accelerating biodiversity loss.		
Consequences	The risk of natural habitat degradation and biodiversity loss in the Trois Rivières key Biodiversity Area (KBA) remains relevant and is monitored under UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (SES), particularly N1: Biodiversity Conservation and Natural habitat Management and N2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation. Potential impacts include habitat loss or fragmentation, reduced biodiversity, disruption of ecological connectivity, and decline of ecosystem services such as water regulation, soil stabilization, erosion control, and land productivity. These impacts may affect community livelihoods, reduce food security and increase vulnerability of at-risk groups, including women and rural households. Ecosystem degradation may also lower carbon sequestration and heighten exposure to climate hazards.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 4 - High	Severity 8 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Including promotion of native species, environmental monitoring and community engagement are implemented and regularly reviewed under adaptive project management.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 2 - Possible	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 6 - Medium
Comments	The risk of habitat degradation and biodiversity loss in the Trois Rivières watershed represents a major challenge for the sustainability of the project. It requires an integrated approach combining ecological conservation, sustainable natural resource management, and community engagement, in accordance with UNDP SES standards and the good practices of GCF environmental and social management.		
Risk 4	Risk of Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (SEAH): biodiversity loss		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	Gender & SEAH		
Description	Project implementation involves regular interactions between beneficiaries, community members, implementing partners, and project personnel. In a context marked by gender inequality, socio-economic vulnerability, insecurity, and weak institutional enforcement, these interactions may expose women and vulnerable groups to risk of sexual exploitation, abuse, or harassment (SEAH). Power imbalances, limited access to formal justice systems, fear of retaliation, and social stigma may discourage reporting of incidents. Although no SEAH incident has been reported to date under project, the risk remains relevant given the broader national context and the UNDP and GCF's zero tolerance policy. Root causes include structural gender inequalities, economic dependency, weak accountability mechanisms, and fragile governance structure.		
Consequences	If not effectively prevented and addressed, SEAH-related risks could undermine safe participation in project activities and weaken stakeholder trust in project governance. They may negatively affect community engagement, compromise inclusive implementation, and expose the project to reputational and compliance risks under GCF and PNUD standards. Inadequate management could affect institutional credibility,		

	partnerships, and overall project performance, ultimately hindering the achievement of gender-responsive and accountable project outcomes.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	4 - High	8 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Mitigation measures include the formalization of dedicated-sensitive protocol, within the project-level Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), aligned with UNDP zero-tolerance policy, GCF integrity requirements, SES standards and the GAAP. The SEAH-GRM defines secure and confidential reporting channels (hotline, secure email, sealed complaint box), ensures acknowledgement within 24 hours, and mandates transmissions to UNDP institutional mechanisms within five (5) working days. The mechanism applies strict principles of confidentiality, non-retaliation, informed consent, "need-to-know" information sharing, and a survivor-centered approach. No community level-level meditation or local investigation is permitted; all SEAH cases are exclusively handled by UNDP institutional mechanisms. Regular awareness sessions and integration of SEAH prevention into field activities further reduce risk exposure. These measures significantly reduce the potential impact of incidents while strengthening accountability and reporting systems.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	The SEAH risk is assessed under the Integrity Risk Area in line with GCF zero-tolerance standards and UNDP accountability framework. Although no incident has been reported, the assessment reflects the project's operational footprint and multiparters implementation context. Given the preventive safeguards in place, the residual risk is assessed as moderate and remains subject to continuous monitoring and institutional oversight.		
Risk 5	Turnover among government officials (ministers, General Managers)		
Risk Origin	External Factors		
Risk Area	Political		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Frequent changes in government departments, particularly the Ministry of the Environment - a key partner in the project - are a major risk to the project's progress and results. Since the project's inception in 2024, there have been three Ministers of the Environment and three Directors General. Each change of interlocutor requires additional efforts in terms of communication and diplomacy to ensure that the project is properly anchored and appropriated by the new authorities.		
Consequences	Frequent turns over in the government tend to slow down administrative processes and to repeat other processes including engagement, communication, etc.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	Engage constant consultation and communication with the government		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	2 - Low	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	2 - Low	6 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 6	Misuse of project resources for money laundering or terrorist financing		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Money Laundering (ML) & Terrorist Financing (TF)		
Description	Money laundering and terrorist financing risks may involve the misuse of funds, structures, or assets to conceal illicit origins or use money to support terrorism. No matter how low it may be, the project may be exposed to risks of money laundering and terrorist financing due to operational complexity associated with the engagement of multiple service providers to carry out specialized technical studies (carbon sequestration, water legal framework, land-use plans, environmental and social impact assessments, etc.), the high volume of transactions linked to field activities (agroforestry and reforestation) involving various operators. as well as the constrained security		

	context in certain project intervention communes (Gros-Morne and Bassin-Bleu). These factors may affect the traceability of financial flows, increase vulnerabilities in fiduciary controls, and heighten the risk of misuse of project resources.		
Consequences	This risk may lead to significant consequences at financial, operational, institutional, legal, and reputational levels. From a financial and operational perspective, it may result in inefficient or inappropriate use of project resources, thereby undermining the achievement of expected results. Institutionally, it may lead to a deterioration of the project's credibility and that of its implementing partners, as well as the suspension or withdrawal of funding by donors. In terms of compliance, it exposes the project to risks of non-compliance with UNDP and GCF fiduciary standards, potentially resulting in adverse audits, investigations, or corrective measures. Finally, from a reputational standpoint, it may significantly affect the project's image among communities, stakeholders, and financial partners, leading to a lasting loss of trust.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	4 - High	8 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The project has developed coordinated strategy to implement activities in these areas and took measures to prevent money laundering and terrorism financing. The risk of using project resources for money laundering or terrorist financing has been mitigated through a combined system of control and prevention measures. UNDP fiduciary procedures (HACT, internal controls), the use of traceable payment systems, and the segregation of duties reduce opportunities for misappropriation. Rigorous partner selection (sanctions of screening, capacity assessment, anti-corruption clauses) limits exposure from the outset of partnerships. Financial transparency is strengthened through proper documentation, regular audits, and routine budget monitoring, enabling the timely detection of anomalies. Capacity building for partners further enhances compliance with financial management rules. Finally, coordination with UNDSS for security risk analysis and the integration of fraud alerts into the GRM strengthen early detection and response mechanisms. Overall, these measures reduce both the likelihood and the impact of the risk.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	2 - Low	2 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 7	Non-compliance with international sanctions regimes in the implementation of the project		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Sanctions		
Description	As part of the climate resilience improvement project in the Trois-Rivières watershed, the risk of non-compliance with international sanctions regimes refers to the possibility of engaging, directly or indirectly, individuals, organizations, or service providers subject to restrictive measures, or conducting transactions with sanctioned parties during project implementation. This risk is heightened by several root causes, including the multiplicity of implementing partners, service providers, and local operators; the complexity of supply chains linked to field activities (agroforestry, reforestation, community works); and varying levels of capacity in compliance and due diligence. In addition, security and access constraints in several municipalities of the watershed may limit thorough verification processes, while screening and monitoring mechanisms are sometimes insufficiently systematized at the level of local actors.		
Consequences	Non-compliance with international sanctions regimes in the context of the Trois-Rivières watershed resilience project could lead to significant financial, operational, and reputational consequences. Financially, it may result in the suspension or cancellation of funding, freezing of funds, or penalties. Operationally, it could cause delays in the implementation of activities, termination of contracts with some partners or service providers, and disruptions in supply chains or the submission of deliverables. Furthermore, this risk may affect the credibility and reputation of the project and its implementing partners with donors, national authorities, and communities. It may also		

	lead to legal and regulatory implications, as well as increased controls and audits, thereby adding procedural burdens and slowing overall project implementation.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	In the context of the Trois-Rivières watershed resilience improvement project, the risk of non-compliance with international sanctions regimes has been managed through a strengthened prevention, control, and monitoring framework. Mitigation measures include the systematic screening of partners, contractors, and suppliers against international sanctions lists prior to any contractual engagement, as well as regular verification throughout implementation. The strict application of UNDP fiduciary procedures, including HACT mechanisms and internal controls, together with the use of traceable payment systems, helps reduce the risk of inadvertently engaging with sanctioned parties. In addition, contractual clauses on compliance and termination for non-compliance with sanctions requirements further strengthen the legal framework. Capacity building of partners on compliance matters, as well as coordination with security and risk management entities, also contribute to enhanced vigilance. These measures reduce both the likelihood and the impact of the risk by strengthening controls at both the upstream and implementation stages.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	1 - Unlikely	1 - None	1 - Low
Comments	The risk of non-compliance with international sanctions regimes in the context of the project to enhance the resilience of the Trois-Rivières watershed is primarily linked to the complexity of implementation arrangements and the multiplicity of service providers and partners involved in technical studies and field activities (agroforestry and reforestation). This diversity of actors may increase the risk of unintentional engagement with individuals or entities subject to international restrictive measures, particularly due to varying capacities for compliance and verification at the local level. However, this risk is assessed as low to residual thanks to the implementation of robust mitigation measures, including systematic screening of partners against international sanctions lists (UN, EU, OFAC), enhanced due diligence, contractual compliance clauses, and the use of traceable financial channels. These measures significantly reduce both the likelihood and impact of the risk		
Risk 8	Fraud / Bribery & Corruption / Collusion		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	The project is exposed to fraud, bribery and corruption risks where unethical and often illegal practices involving the misuse of power, influence, or resources for personal gain take place. These practices often take place through procurement or HR processes where staff members may attempt to unethically gain advantage.		
Consequences	Fraud, bribery, corruption, and collusion may have severe consequences on the project. Cascading consequences may severely impact financial, operational, and reputational outcomes, resulting in activities that may be over budgeted, delayed, and of poor quality.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	4 - High	12 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	The mitigation measures include mandatory training on ethic for project internal staff members, conducting transparent processes for all activities including recruitment and calls for tenders/proposals, applying tolerance zero against any fraudster and corruptor, promoting and implementing the grievance redress mechanism		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 9	Conflict of interest during project implementation		

Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	The interested links that individuals may develop in their professional, social, or family relationships can interfere with the independent, impartial, and objective performance of their duties within the project and may lead to misconduct affecting the integrity of the projects and partners.		
Consequences	Conflict of interest may have severe consequences on the project. These consequences include impartiality of the decision- making processes, damage to the reputation of the project and its partners, loss of public confidence, unfair outcomes, disengagement of stakeholder, lack of participation in project activities		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	The mitigation measures include mandatory training on ethic for project internal staff members, conducting transparent processes for all activities including recruitment and calls for tenders/proposals, applying tolerance zero against any fraudster and corruptor, promoting and implementing the grievance redress mechanism.		
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		

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
Haiti	Grants	USD	22,427,206	2,437,580	598,537.5	614,495.12	0%	100%
Total		USD	22,427,206	2,437,580	598,537.5	614,495.12	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
HEIFER	Grants	USD	8,303,355	1,003,708.88	822,357.88	1,003,708.88	0%	100%
UNDP	Grants	USD	560,000	49,929.8	49,929.8	49,929.8	0%	100%
Total		USD	8,863,355	1,053,638.68	872,287.68	1,053,638.68	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 5996_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 ☒

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

- To comply with ESS standards as outlined in the ESMF, the project operationalized key environmental, social and gender safeguards through coordinated institutional and community-level actions.
- Operationalization of the GRM: Seven (7) municipal GRM committees were established across the targeted communes and equipped with secure complaint boxes. Initial capacity-building sessions clarified Terms of Reference, complaint intake procedures, confidentiality principles, referral pathways, and alignment with UNDP accountability standards. A SEAH-sensitive protocol was embedded within the GRM framework to ensure survivor-centered handling of sensitive cases.
- Capacity-building on ESS, Gender and SEAH: A two-day training on Environmental and Social Safeguards (SES), Gender Action Plan (GAAP) implementation and SEAH risk prevention were delivered to approximately 30 staff members from the Ministry of Environment, Heifer International and UNDP, strengthening institutional compliance and gender-responsive programming capacities.
- ESS Roadmap: A structured roadmap was developed to guide phased safeguard integration, monitoring responsibilities and compliance checkpoints throughout implementation.
- Launch of ESIA Process: The recruitment process for the ESIA, including ESMP and Biodiversity Action Plan, was initiated in line with UNDP SES and GCF requirements.
- Community-level popularization of ESS and GAAP: Participatory workshops were conducted across the seven communes to disseminate safeguard principles and the Gender Action Plan. Mapping and capacity assessment of grassroots organizations and women's groups generated sex-disaggregated data to inform inclusive planning and implementation.
- Security plan: Regarding the security situation in the implementing areas, the project has put in place a security plan in collaboration with the security unit of UNDP Country Office.

Outputs during the reporting period

GRM committees have been established and locked complaint boxes installed in Port-de-Paix, Chansolme, Bassin-Bleu, Plaisance, Pilate, Marmelade, and Gros-Morne. Initial training sessions were conducted in three of the seven municipalities to strengthen committee capacity. Grassroot community associations and women's groups were mapped, and their capacities assessed to ensure inclusive participation. Project partners received training on Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) and Gender, supported by a detailed ESS roadmap. The project integrated a SEAH-sensitive protocol into the GRM, aligned with UNDP's zero-tolerance policy and GCF Integrity standards. Gender-sensitive tools—including social analysis grids, SWOT matrices, community-based organization profiles, and GAAP monitoring templates—were developed in line with SES and ESMF requirements. Gender analysis was incorporated into technical diagnostics, including gender-responsive PEA modules. A dedicated SEAH awareness session was delivered within the SES and Gender training, attended by 26 participants (14 women, 54%; 12 men, 46%). These combined efforts strengthen accountability, safeguard integrity, and promote gender equity across project activities, ensuring that community voices are heard and that mechanisms are responsive to both environmental and social concerns.

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

Risk Mitigation Risks identified at appraisal stage translated into operational measures and institutional strengthening. Social risks (land access, economic displacement, community tensions) mitigated through structured consultations and early safeguard integration. Environmental risks (deforestation, biodiversity loss, soil/water degradation) addressed via ESIA, ESMP, and Biodiversity Action Plan. Gender risks (unequal participation, structural inequalities) tackled through accountability mechanisms, grievance systems, and sex-disaggregated monitoring. Capacity Building SES training sessions conducted for partners to ensure systematic safeguard integration. Targeted ESG training and technical support provided to harmonize monitoring and reporting practices. Environmental Safeguards ESIA process initiated, including ESMP and Biodiversity Action Plan. Terms of reference developed for ESIA and biodiversity planning, integrating safeguard and gender considerations. Gender and Integrity Strengthened accountability mechanisms to ensure safe, inclusive, gender-responsive participation. Gender considerations embedded in decision-making and technical diagnostics. Monitoring of sex-disaggregated participation data implemented. ESS Roadmap Roadmap developed to align ESS risk/mitigation measures with project log frame. Systematic application of safeguards ensured across all project activities. Stakeholder Engagement Stakeholder engagement plan progressively implemented. Activities include stakeholder mapping, communication campaigns, participatory consultations, grievance mechanisms, and partner training on SES and gender inclusion. Institutional Strengthening Partner heterogeneity addressed through training, technical support, and shared monitoring tools.

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

While substantial progress has been achieved in operationalizing ESS commitments, several elements require continued technical follow-up and institutional oversight. The ESIA, ESMP and Biodiversity Action Plan processes remain ongoing and will require close supervision to ensure timely validation and effective integration into field-level implementation. Further strengthening of GRM committees is necessary to consolidate consistent, confidential and gender-responsive grievance handling capacities across all municipalities. Enhanced coordination with implementing partners is also required to ensure harmonized accountability and safeguard alignment, particularly regarding SEAH risk management. Continued monitoring of sex-disaggregated participation data and inclusion of vulnerable groups (including women-headed households and youth) remains critical to sustain progress toward gender-responsive outcomes.

Remarks/Notes

The reporting period consolidated the institutional foundations of the project's safeguards system, ensuring alignment with UNDP SES and GCF requirements. Environmental, social and gender dimensions were progressively integrated into operational tools, accountability mechanisms, and partner capacities, strengthening compliance, transparency and inclusive implementation.

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

Coordination and consultation meetings were organized with local authorities, community-based organizations, Communal Agricultural Office (BAC) officials, and implementing partners to ensure alignment of interventions and strengthen institutional collaboration. In addition, structures bringing together local authorities, community organization leaders, and community notables were established, including Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRM) and Community Development Committees (CDC), to promote stakeholder engagement, local ownership, and institutional anchoring of the project.

Furthermore, training sessions were conducted for implementing partners on environmental and social safeguard measures, gender inclusion, and participation of vulnerable groups. These actions will be progressively extended to local authorities and community structures.

Overall, these initiatives have contributed to strengthening community ownership of the project, improving transparency, and reducing social and environmental risks associated with activity implementation.

Dates and venues of engagement activities

In 2025, seven local grievance management committees and seven Community Development Committees (CDCs) were established across watershed municipalities. Training and awareness sessions for CDC members were held in December, while grievance committee members received training in Marmelade, Plaisance, and Pilate in November and December. A mini retreat for implementing partners took place in August at the Caracol office to strengthen coordination and harmonize interventions. From December 13–16, a hybrid consultation and partner training workshop was organized in Cap-Haïtien and online. Monthly virtual coordination and exchange meetings among partners were also conducted to sustain collaboration and transparency.

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

Participatory workshops, consultations with women's associations and community-based organizations (CBOs), and social and SWOT:

364 people: 192 women (53%) and 172 men (47%)

Grievance Redress Mechanism committees (7)

49 people: 21 women (42%) and 28 men (58%)

SES training

26 people: 14 women (54%) and 12 men (46%)

Capacity needs assessment survey

500 people/farmers: 175 women and 325 men

Local interviewers trained in the use of digital tools (producers, community leaders, municipal technicians, and representatives of farmers' organizations):

126 people: 55 women and 71 men Feedback workshops to validate findings 175 people: 72 women and 103 men
Information shared with stakeholders
Under the Trois Rivières Project, stakeholder consultations were conducted in line with SEP, ESMP, GCF, and IFC requirements. Overall, information was shared on project objectives, activities, intervention areas, participation opportunities, and beneficiary selection criteria. Stakeholders were informed about potential environmental and social risks, including land access, livelihoods, biodiversity, and resource management, along with mitigation measures. Communities were made aware of the grievance redress mechanism to ensure transparency and accountability. Gender inclusion and participation of vulnerable groups were promoted, while roles and responsibilities of partners and local actors were clarified to support effective coordination and project ownership.
Outputs including issues raised and addressed during the reporting period
During the reporting period, local authorities and beneficiaries expressed concerns about delays and certain approaches used in project implementation. In response, the project team reinforced stakeholder engagement through committee establishment, capacity building, and transparent communication on requirements such as the ESIA. Under the ESMF, participatory workshops, consultations with women's associations and community-based organizations, and social/SWOT analyses were conducted across the North, Artibonite, and North-West departments. These activities mobilized 364 participants—192 women (53%) and 172 men (47%)—exceeding GAAP 1.1.2 targets and contributing to GAAP 1.1.3. Each targeted municipality established a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) committee of seven members, including at least three women, ensuring at least 21 women's participation overall. Gender-responsive modules were integrated into a three-day PEA and SES training with 26 participants (54% women), covering gender analysis in farm diagnostics, adaptation of tools to women's constraints, equitable resource access, and SEAH risk prevention. A capacity needs assessment surveyed 500 farmers (175 women, 325 men) across seven municipalities, representing upstream, middle, and downstream agro-ecological zones. Local interviewers trained in digital tools built trust, particularly in areas with skepticism toward external projects. Focus group discussions gathered 126 participants, including 55 women, fostering exchange among producers, leaders, technicians, and farmer organizations. Feedback workshops in all seven municipalities engaged 175 participants (72 women), providing the most inclusive stage of the process. These sessions enabled local authorities, cooperatives, and women's associations to validate findings, reinforcing transparency and ownership. Overall, the project advanced safeguards, strengthened accountability, and promoted inclusive participation. By embedding environmental, social, and gender considerations into diagnostics, training, and institutional mechanisms, the project addressed risks proactively while ensuring equitable involvement of women and vulnerable groups in decision-making and implementation.
Remarks/Notes
N/A

F.6. ESS forward planning and lessons learned	
Are there any planned ESS activities for the next reporting period or lessons learned to share from this period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
Provide planned activities on environmental and social safeguards for the next reporting period	
1. Continue training sessions for grievance management committees to strengthen their technical capacities and make the grievance redress mechanism fully operational. 2. Continue to strengthen the capacities of Heifer and Ministry of Environment technical staff engaged in the project regarding environmental and social safeguard (ESS) standards. 3. Prepare the launch of an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for the project. 4. On-going monitoring of compliance with environmental and social standards (ESS) in the implementation of project activities, in accordance with the requirements of the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF);	

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	
One the most interesting, good practices is related to the protection of the riverbank, especially in the municipality of Chansolme. For many years, the flooded river entered the properties of inhabitants and brought everything with itself. Through an initiative undertaken by the project, landowners closed to the riverbank implement traditional nurseries to provide seedlings to the project. They plant this seedling to protect the riverbank. By this way, large part of the riverbank is restored. By observing restoration achieved, neighboring property owners are joining this initiative. As challenge, in addition to insecurity mentioned earlier, it has also been observed the impatience of communities in the face of the delays and their expectations out of the context of the project, such as cash for work, road and bridge maintenance. In this context, the project has engaged further consultations with local communities and authorities for the sustainable ownership of the project.	
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 ☒
N/A	
F.8. Implementation of activities and actions agreed in the Gender Action Plan	
Since early 2025, the Gender Action Plan has moved from initial rollout to structured institutional integration across the Trois-Rivières project. A comprehensive gender and social baseline was established through mapping of women's and community organizations, participatory SWOT analyses, and documentation of barriers to women's participation in climate governance. These findings now guide planning and capacity-building strategies.	
Gender-responsive tools—including social analysis grids, sex-disaggregated data templates, and structured consultation methodologies—were institutionalized, strengthening accountability and evidence-based reporting. Systematic integration of sex-disaggregated monitoring has ensured transparency and alignment with international standards.	
Institutional ownership was reinforced through retreats and workshops that clarified partner responsibilities and embedded gender indicators into planning, reporting, and monitoring systems. Gender modules were integrated into technical trainings, enhancing the ability of partners to apply gender analysis in agricultural and resilience interventions.	
Workshops across seven communes embedded gender considerations into social and capacity gap assessments, while sex-disaggregated data tools were established to support future monitoring. A three-day training with 26 participants (54% women) strengthened readiness for gender-responsive climate-resilient agriculture.	
Collectively, these measures shifted the project from ad hoc inclusion to a structured, monitored, and strategically anchored mainstreaming approach, positioning it toward enhanced gender performance and credible alignment with global standards.	

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		
During the reporting period, GAAP Activity 1 was operationalized across the seven target communes of the Trois-Rivières watershed, focusing on equitable awareness-raising and gender-responsive land-use planning. Participatory workshops, consultations with women's associations and community-based organizations (CBOs), and social and SWOT analyses were conducted in the North, Artibonite and North-West departments. These activities mobilized 364 participants, including 192 women (53%) and 172 men (47%), thereby exceeding the equitable participation target under GAAP 1.1.2 and contributing directly to GAAP 1.1.3. In parallel, the land-use planning process was initiated in coordination with the designated consultant. Gender analysis and sex-disaggregated data were integrated into consultations and preliminary drafts to inform the forthcoming 33 community land-use plans in line with GAAP 1.1.1. Seven communal GRM committees were established or reinforced with meaningful female representation, and sex-disaggregated data were systematically incorporated into monitoring tools. Overall, GAAP Activity 1 is on track, with gender considerations embedded in both community engagement and technical planning processes.		
Indicator		
• (GAAP 1.1.1) Number of community land-use plans developed with gender-inclusive stipulations. • (GAAP 1.1.2) Percentage of women participating in awareness campaigns and consultations. • (GAAP 1.1.3) Number of female and male participants reached per awareness campaign.		
Rating of Indicator	GREEN (on track to be met)	
Baseline	0	
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	33	
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)		
During the reporting period, GAAP Activity 1 was advanced through the structured operationalization of gender integration mechanisms within the project. Through workshops, a comprehensive social and institutional baseline through mapping of women's and community-based organizations, participatory SWOT analyses, and documentation of gender-related barriers affecting participation in climate governance. Methodological tools were developed and deployed, including social analysis grids, sex-disaggregated data templates and structured consultation frameworks aligned with GAAP and SES requirements. Institutional strengthening was reinforced through a dedicated GAAP session during the project mini-retreat, clarifying partner responsibilities and donor expectations regarding gender mainstreaming. Gender modules were further integrated into SES training activities, strengthening analytical capacities to identify women's roles, constraints and participation gaps in agricultural systems. Sex-disaggregated data collection is now systematized across activities, and seven communal GRM committees were established or reinforced with meaningful female representation, strengthening inclusive accountability mechanisms.		
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)		
Since February 2025, GAAP Activity 1 has progressed from initial operational rollout to structured institutional integration within the Trois-Rivières project. Through workshops, a comprehensive gender and social baseline through		

mapping of women's and community-based organizations, participatory SWOT analyses, and documentation of structural barriers affecting women's participation in climate governance. These analytical foundations now inform project planning and capacity-building strategies.

Gender-responsive tools were developed and institutionalized, including social analysis grids, sex-disaggregated data templates, and structured consultation methodologies aligned with GAAP and SES/ESMF requirements. Systematic integration of sex-disaggregated monitoring has strengthened accountability and evidence-based reporting to the GCF.

Institutional ownership was reinforced through the project mini retreat, which clarified partner responsibilities and embedded GAAP indicators into planning, reporting, TOR development and monitoring systems. Gender modules were integrated into PEA and SES trainings, strengthening technical capacities to apply gender analysis in agricultural and resilience interventions.

Collectively, these measures have shifted the project from ad hoc gender inclusion to a structured, monitored and strategically anchored mainstreaming approach, positioning the project on a credible trajectory toward enhanced gender performance and GEN3 alignment.

Budget	2,951,890
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	28 February 2032

Responsibility

Project Management Unit (PMU), Gender Officer (GAAP/SES focal point), Ministry of Environment (MoE), Heifer International, designated land-use planning consultant, and local communal authorities. The Gender Officer ensures compliance with GAAP indicators, integration of sex-disaggregated monitoring and alignment with GCF gender requirements.

Remarks/Notes

Note on the actual target for this activity as there is no space in the section above:
 33 community land-use plans will be developed with gender-inclusive provisions
 7 communes will conduct awareness campaigns ensuring equitable participation (50% women, 50% men).
 Participation targets were achieved and gender mainstreaming mechanisms are now integrated into consultation, monitoring, and partner coordination processes. Core gender analyses, sex-disaggregated data systems, and structured stakeholder engagement mechanisms have been established on schedule. No major delays were recorded. Ongoing integration of gender considerations and regular monitoring will maintain compliance with GAAP indicators and strengthen gender-responsive outcomes.

GAP Activity

During the reporting period, GAAP Activity 2 focused on integrating gender considerations into the technical and institutional preparation of climate-resilient agricultural interventions under Output 2.

In December 2025, gender-responsive modules were fully integrated into the three-day PEA and SES training (26 participants: 54% women). Sessions addressed gender analysis in farm diagnostics, adaptation of PEA tools to women's constraints, equitable access to productive resources, and SEAH risk prevention in field implementation. Gender criteria were incorporated into training materials, diagnostic grids, and technical documentation related to capacity-building and agricultural support activities. Sex-disaggregated participation data are now systematically collected for all Activity 2-related trainings and consultations.

In parallel, the SEAH-GRM mechanism was drafted to ensure a safe and inclusive operational framework for future large-scale agricultural interventions (input distribution, VSCAs strengthening, social protection activities). Large-scale implementation components under Activity 2 (e.g., agricultural input distribution, financial access mechanisms, food coupon system) are scheduled according to the project timeline and have not yet entered operational implementation during this reporting period.

Indicator

- Inclusion of gender considerations in capacity gap assessments (2.1.1);
- Percentage of women participating in institutional trainings (2.1.3) and PEA/SES capacity-building sessions.
- Systematic collection of sex-disaggregated data in all Activity 2-related trainings and consultations.
- Integration of gender criteria in training curricula, agricultural diagnostic tools and preparatory technical documents.
- Preparatory measures ensuring women's access to future agricultural inputs, finance mechanisms and social protection interventions (2.2 and 2.3).

Rating of Indicator	AMBER (needs attention to be met)
Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	50

Annual progress update (Reporting Period)

During the reporting period, large-scale agricultural and social protection interventions under Output 2 have not yet entered full operational implementation, in line with the project timeline (Y2–Y3). However, significant preparatory progress was achieved to ensure gender-responsive implementation. Gender modules were fully integrated into the December 2025 PEA/SES training (26 participants: 54% women). Gender-sensitive diagnostic tools were incorporated into agricultural assessment methodologies. Sex-disaggregated data collection templates are now systematically used in Activity 2-related trainings. Capacity-building materials, TORs and technical documents linked to Output 2 were reviewed and aligned with GAAP requirements. The SEAH-GRM mechanism was drafted to ensure a safe operational framework prior to large-scale agricultural support and social protection rollout. Overall, Activity 2 is on track, with gender safeguards and monitoring mechanisms established ahead of implementation.

Cumulative progress update (Entire period)

Since the recruitment of the Gender Officer in March 2025, key steps have been taken to operationalize gender integration under Output 2. Although large-scale agricultural support, financial access mechanisms, and social protection interventions are planned for Years 2 and 3, essential preparatory gender mainstreaming actions have been completed according to schedule. Gender considerations were embedded into social and capacity gap assessments across the seven target communes through field workshops using participatory methodologies. Sex-disaggregated data tools were established to support future monitoring of Activities 2.1–2.3 and guide agricultural and institutional strengthening efforts. In late 2025, a three-day PEA/SES training was delivered to project partners and technical staff. Gender-responsive modules covered social and gender analysis in farm diagnostics, adapted PEA/SES tools, and SEAH risk prevention. Twenty-six participants attended (54% women), enhancing institutional readiness for gender-responsive, climate-resilient agricultural activities. Simultaneously, technical documents, TORs, and training materials under Output 2 were reviewed and aligned with GAAP standards. The SEAH-GRM mechanism was drafted to ensure a safe operational environment ahead of large-scale implementation. Overall, gender integration for Output 2 is advancing in line with the approved implementation timeline, with strong foundational systems now in place.

Budget	744,865
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	28 February 2032

Responsibility

Ministry of Environment (MoE), Heifer International and UNDP Haiti are responsible for implementing Output 2 activities. The PMU supports and monitors the integration of GAAP requirements across capacity-building, agricultural support, financial inclusion and social protection interventions. Technical partners and local institutions (communal structures, agricultural offices, women's associations and CBOs) contribute to implementation and data collection.

Remarks/Notes	
AMBER. Foundational gender mainstreaming actions under Output 2 have been completed, including integration of gender into capacity gap assessments across the seven communes, establishment of sex-disaggregated data systems, delivery of a three-day PEA/SES training (54% women participants), and drafting of the SEAH-GRM mechanism. However, the large-scale rollout of agricultural support, financial access mechanisms and social protection interventions has experienced delays relative to the initial timeline. While preparatory work is in place and no structural barriers have been identified, acceleration of implementation in the upcoming period will be required to ensure full achievement of GAAP 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 ☐
<i>A full-time Gender Analyst was recruited on 15 March 2025 and remains actively engaged in the project. The position is retained and fully integrated within the project management structure, with responsibility for coordinating and overseeing GAAP implementation across Outputs. The role is reflected in the 2026 operational workplan, confirming continued institutional commitment to gender integration and compliance with GCF and UNDP requirements. No changes in engagement status are foreseen.</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>The Gender Action Plan (GAP) is being implemented in line with the Activity Agreements and the Green Climate Fund's Updated Gender Policy, with a structured shift from compliance-based integration toward results-oriented institutionalization. Since February 2025, gender integration has evolved from standalone activities to a governance and risk-management lever within project architecture. Gender-responsive diagnostics have informed planning sequences under Outputs 1 and 2, ensuring that forthcoming agricultural support, financial inclusion and social protection interventions are grounded in evidence-based social analysis. Sex-disaggregated monitoring systems are now embedded in project M&E frameworks, strengthening accountability and traceability toward GCF reporting requirements. Institutional capacity has been reinforced through structured technical sessions with implementing partners, positioning gender not as an add-on but as a performance variable linked to climate resilience outcomes. The integration of SEAH risk mitigation mechanisms further strengthens operational safeguards, reducing reputational and fiduciary risks. Gender considerations are systematically reflected in TORs, technical deliverables, and the 2026 operational workplan currently under preparation. This forward-looking planning approach enhances implementation readiness and supports the project's trajectory toward GEN3 alignment. Overall, GAP implementation is advancing from foundational mainstreaming toward institutional consolidation and performance-driven integration.</i>	
Are the planned activities, targets, indicators, timelines, etc. on track during the reporting period?	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>Gender-related planned activities, targets and indicators remain broadly on track during the reporting period. During Year 1, the focus has been on institutional structuring, systems development and alignment with GAAP commitments across Outputs. Gender indicators have been systematically integrated into monitoring tools, reporting templates and partner deliverables to ensure structured tracking and accountability. Gender considerations have been embedded across planning documents, Terms of Reference (ToRs), consultation processes and governance structuring, reinforcing coherence between implementation timelines and approved GAAP milestones. While certain technical components of the broader project experienced minor operational delays due to contextual constraints, gender mainstreaming actions progressed as scheduled and were strategically sequenced to support subsequent implementation phases. The 2026 operational workplan is currently being finalized in coordination with project partners to consolidate these foundations and ensure that upcoming large-scale beneficiary activities are fully aligned with sex-disaggregated targets, governance commitments and safeguarding requirements defined in the Funding Proposal and GAAP.</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 ☒

No formal revisions were made to the approved GAAP during the reporting period. All gender commitments, indicators and targets remain unchanged. However, operational sequencing has been refined to prioritize institutional readiness, safeguarding integration (SEAH-GRM), and capacity strengthening before full-scale agricultural and social protection roll-out. These adjustments enhance implementation quality and risk management while maintaining full compliance with the approved GAAP framework and GCF Gender Policy.	
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 ☐
Targets defined in the Funding Proposal and the Gender Assessment and Action Plan (GAAP) are being progressively operationalized through structured and measurable early-phase actions. In April 2025, a gender-focused field mission was conducted across the seven communes of the Trois-Rivières watershed. Participatory workshops and consultations mobilized 364 participants, including 192 women (53%) and 172 men (47%). These activities enabled the systematic collection of sex-, territory- and organization-disaggregated data, as well as the verified mapping of women's associations and community-based organizations. This established a solid baseline for tracking women's participation, leadership, and equitable access to project benefits. In August 2025, a two-day project mini-retreat was organized with the three implementing partners (MdE, UNDP and Heifer International). The gender integration session gathered 17 participants: 13 in person (3 women and 10 men) and 4 remotely (2 women and 2 men), representing an overall participation of 5 women (29%) and 12 men (71%). The session strengthened institutional understanding of GAAP indicators, participation targets, governance-related commitments, and accountability obligations. Particular emphasis was placed on women's inclusion in decision-making structures, communal committees, and future beneficiary selection processes. In December 2025, gender-responsive modules were fully integrated into the PEA and SES training programme. The training reached 21 participants, including 5 women (24%) and 16 men (76%). Modules covered social and gender analysis in farm diagnostics, gender-sensitive planning, and SEAH risk prevention. This reinforced both institutional and technical capacity to implement climate-resilient agricultural interventions in a gender-responsive and safe manner. Overall, the reporting period demonstrates concrete and measurable progress toward sex-disaggregated participation targets and GAAP compliance. Monitoring tools, structured sex-disaggregated databases, and strengthened institutional capacities are now in place to support effective implementation of upcoming activities while ensuring continued alignment with the project's gender commitments.	
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 ☐
Gender-related implementation has been influenced by contextual security constraints and institutional capacity gaps among partners. Localized insecurity and mobility limitations in certain communes affected the timing of field activities and women's consistent participation in coordination and consultation spaces. In addition, structural gender inequalities and socio-economic vulnerability continue to limit women's effective engagement beyond numerical participation targets. Institutional heterogeneity among partners initially required additional time for alignment on GAAP indicators, safeguarding integration, and reporting standards, which slowed early harmonization of implementation processes. Key lessons learned include: (i) the importance of integrating gender requirements at the design stage of ToRs and planning documents to avoid retroactive adjustments; (ii) the need for continuous capacity strengthening of partners on gender-responsive governance and SEAH prevention; and (iii) the value of structured sex-disaggregated monitoring systems to shift from participation counting toward meaningful inclusion and accountability. These lessons are informing the 2026 operational workplan through strengthened coordination mechanisms, reinforced safeguarding integration, and targeted capacity-building measures to support effective and safe gender mainstreaming during large-scale roll-out.	
Were there any best practices identified, or case studies prepared on benefits/activities undertaken as agents of action by women and the female heads of households during the reporting period? Please share any case studies in the text boxes or in the Annex section of the APR.	Yes ☒ No ☐
During the reporting period, best practices were identified through the gender-focused social and SWOT analysis conducted across the seven target communes. A key practice was the integration of community mapping with participatory diagnostics (SWOT/social analysis), generating an operational understanding of local organizations and women's groups, including governance dynamics, levels of formalization, and gender-specific barriers to participation. This approach produced a validated territorial mapping of women's associations and community-based organizations (female-only and mixed structures), strengthening evidence-based planning and reducing targeting risks for future beneficiary selection. The assessment also highlighted replicable mechanisms supporting women's resilience and economic empowerment, including women-led solidarity structures such as MUSO/VSCA and locally rooted female leadership within several OCBs. Findings were consolidated into bloc-level and transversal strategic recommendations on legal formalization, institutional strengthening, women's entrepreneurship, market access, and gender-responsive governance. Beyond project-level benefits, the documentation process contributes to institutional memory, inter-unit collaboration within UNDP (Gender, SES, Resilience), and knowledge-sharing with other UN agencies and partners. This	

capitalization approach supports institutional continuity, cross-project synergies, and long-term sustainability of gender-responsive climate action.

Provide planned activities on gender elements for the next reporting period

Planned gender-related activities for the next reporting period will translate diagnostic findings into implementation-ready actions aligned with GAAP indicators across Outputs. Priorities include:

- *Finalization and operationalization of the SEAH-GRM, including survivor-centered procedures, confidential reporting channels, referral service mapping, and training of focal points and partners.*
- *Strengthened gender-responsive monitoring and reporting, with quarterly updates of sex-disaggregated databases and systematic integration of GAAP indicators into partner reporting tools and APR contributions.*
- *Targeted capacity strengthening of women's associations and community-based organizations, including legal formalization (statutes, patente, recognition), governance improvement, and practical tools for planning, budgeting, and reporting.*
- *Preparation of support to women-led income-generating activities and local value-chain initiatives (including solidarity mechanisms such as MUSO/VSCA, small-scale processing, and community market linkages), based on bloc-specific needs identified during the mission.*
- *Reinforced inclusion of women in local governance structures and beneficiary selection processes, supported by structured coordination under the 2026 operational workplan.*

G. ANNEXES (UPLOADED)
Annex 1: GHG emission reduction calculation methodology (for projects reporting GHG emission reductions) and details on the calculations of the annual and cumulative value.
No annexes provided.
Annex 2: Communication and visibility material
File Name: Annex 2 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
File Name: 5996 Annex 5 Updated implementation timetable APR 2025.xlsx
Annex 6: Updated Gender Assessment and/or Action Plan
No annexes provided.
Additional Annexes (if applicable)
No annexes provided.

