
Annual Performance Report

Project/Programme title:	Transforming Livelihoods through Climate Resilient, Low Carbon, Sustainable Agricultural Value Chains in the Lake Region Economic Bloc, Kenya (FP255)
Accredited Entity:	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Date of Report submission:	15 April 2026
Version number	V1.0



Contents

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

RATIONALE

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

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

METHODOLOGY

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

A. PROJECT DATA (Prefilled where possible)

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

A.1. Date of report submission		15 April 2026												
A.2. Project or programme	Project	A.3. Sector	Public											
A.4. Total Financing (GCF + Cofinance)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>GCF Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 29.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>Mill. USD 29.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Co-Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 20.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grants</td> <td>Mill. USD 20.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Financing</td> <td>Mill. USD 50.0</td> </tr> </table>				GCF Financing	Mill. USD 29.2	Grants	Mill. USD 29.2	Co-Financing	Mill. USD 20.8	Grants	Mill. USD 20.8	Total Financing	Mill. USD 50.0
	GCF Financing	Mill. USD 29.2												
	Grants	Mill. USD 29.2												
	Co-Financing	Mill. USD 20.8												
	Grants	Mill. USD 20.8												
Total Financing	Mill. USD 50.0													
A.5. Total GCF funding disbursed to this date	NA (draft)													
A.6. Implementation period	From NA to NA													
A.7. ESS Category (Refers to GCF revised <u>Environmental and Social Policy</u> and GCF ESS Standards to assess your FP category.)				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)										
FAO Kenya	Kenya	UN System Entity – a specialized agency, subsidiary organ or other part of the UN system	Executing Entity	FAO-KE@fao.org										
STITCHING AGRITERRA	Kenya	Civil society organization/Non-governmental organization	Executing Entity	vangeel@agriterra.org & Kenya@agriterra.org										
Government of Kenya	Kenya	Public sector – Government (which may be acting through a ministry or department)	Executing Entity	pstnt@treasury.go.ke										

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)
Government of Kenya	Kenya	pstnt@treasury.go.ke	Government	Government of Kenya

Full legal name	Country of registration (or, for intl orgs, country of HQ)	Focal Point(s) and email(s)	Ownership Type	Beneficial Owner(s)
Government of Denmark	Denmark	phiake@um.dk	Government	Government of Denmark
FAO Kenya	Kenya	FAO-KE@fao.org	UN System Entity – a specialized agency, subsidiary organ or other part of the UN system	FAO Kenya

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

Country	Date of NDC/ NAP submission	NDC/ NAP objective	Brief description of project's alignment with NDC/ NAP objectives	Percentage of target met with proposed project.Beneficial owner(s)
Kenya	30 April 2025	Kenya's NDC objective is to enhance climate resilience and reduce emissions through climate-resilient agriculture, sustainable land management, ecosystem restoration, and promotion of low-emission agricultural value chains.	The project contributes directly to Kenya's NDC adaptation and mitigation priorities by strengthening climate-resilient agricultural value chains in the Lake Region Economic Bloc. It supports implementation of climate-resilient agricultural production systems, restoration of degraded lands, and sustainable land management practices to enhance ecosystem resilience and agricultural productivity. These interventions enhance carbon sequestration through improved land management and restoration of degraded ecosystems. The project strengthens climate-resilient agricultural value chains and improves livelihoods of vulnerable farming communities. It also strengthens institutional capacity for climate-resilient agricultural planning, implementation, and governance. By restoring degraded ecosystems, improving climate-resilient agricultural production systems, enhancing carbon sequestration, and strengthening institutional capacity, the project directly supports Kenya's NDC priorities for climate-resilient agriculture, ecosystem restoration, and low-emission agricultural development.	100%
Kenya	28 February 2017	Kenya's NAP objective is to strengthen climate resilience of agricultural systems and rural livelihoods through climate-resilient agriculture, ecosystem restoration, and adaptation planning.	The project supports Kenya's NAP priorities by strengthening climate resilience of agricultural systems through climate-resilient agricultural production, restoration of degraded ecosystems, and sustainable land management. These interventions enhance resilience of agricultural livelihoods and reduce vulnerability to	100%

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)
			climate risks such as drought and land degradation. The project strengthens adaptive capacity of farming communities and strengthens institutional capacity for climate-resilient agricultural planning and implementation. By improving resilience of agricultural value chains, restoring ecosystems, and strengthening adaptation capacity, the project directly supports Kenya's National Adaptation Plan priorities for climate-resilient agriculture and rural livelihoods.	

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

B. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

B.1. Summary

The FP255 project became effective on 20th February 2025 and was launched in March 2025. It responds to Kenya’s high vulnerability to climate change, particularly in the 14-county Lake Region Economic Bloc (LREB), an agricultural hub facing rising temperatures, recurrent droughts, increased rainfall, flooding, and ecosystem degradation. In this context, low productivity and limited adaptive capacity among smallholders on marginal lands further strain natural resources and contributes to deforestation-related emissions.

During the reporting period, the project established critical institutional and operational foundations to deliver adaptation and mitigation outcomes. A fully operational Project Management Unit and regional offices were set up; implementation arrangement and governance structure were established; and the Inception Report and Operations Manual were approved by the GCF. Environmental and Social Safeguards instruments advanced, and co-financing was secured from the Government of Denmark. Technical assessments across six priority value chains identified climate-smart, low-carbon technologies and mapped restoration sites.

The project onboarded 642 Farmer Field School groups (64 percent women; 39 percent youth; 6 percent persons with disabilities) and 212 facilitators, strengthening cooperative-led climate resilience. These foundations position FP255 to scale technology transfer, enhance adaptive capacity, restore landscapes, and strengthen resilient, market-oriented value chains from 2026.

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)

1. Overall Progress in 2025

During the reporting period, the FP255 project established critical institutional and operational foundations required to deliver adaptation and mitigation outcomes. A fully operational Project Management Unit and regional offices were established; implementation arrangements and governance structures were operationalised at county, regional and national government levels. Farmer organizations were onboarded, and both the Inception Report and Operations Manual were approved by the GCF. Environmental and Social Safeguards instruments advanced significantly, and co-financing commitments were secured from the Government of Denmark. A stock take of climate information system and agricultural extension services was conducted across all 14 counties of the Lake Region Economic Bloc (LREB) of Kenya. This assessment, along with an analysis of six priority value chains identified gaps and opportunities for climate-smart, low-carbon technologies and supported the mapping of restoration sites.

2. Key Achievements by Component

Component 1: Enabling local government support for adaptation and mitigation

Implementation gaps in extension methods and climate information services have been identified across the 14 counties. These findings support the participatory design of innovative and efficient Climate Resilient, Low Carbon, Sustainable Agricultural (CRLCSA) extension approaches. The work undertaken strengthens the basis for enhancing farmers' adaptive capacity, improving climate-mitigation practices, and supporting soil carbon sequestration. This diagnostic phase ensures that extension models to be rolled out in 2026 will be context-specific, evidence-based, and aligned with both national climate priorities and GCF investment criteria.

Component 2: Sustainable Resilient Agricultural Landscapes

The projects sensitized 14 County Environment Committees on the need for a comprehensive assessment and participatory mapping of landscape degradation. This process will guide improved watershed management, inform county-level land-use planning, and enable targeted reforestation and assisted natural regeneration initiatives. By building awareness and technical understanding at county level, the project strengthened government ownership and positioned counties to lead the development of integrated landscape management strategies in 2026.

Component 3: Resilient livelihoods

The first phase of beneficiaries (Farmer Field School (FFS) groups) and FFS Facilitators was successfully onboarded. Additionally, the first cohort of farmer cooperatives was also identified. In total, 642 FFS groups were selected (64% women, 39% youth, 6% persons with disabilities), together with 212 FFS Facilitators.

This represents a key milestone for the project's impact pathway: the onboarding of farmer groups enables the transfer of climate-smart technologies, skills development, restoration practices, and improved resource management. These foundations position the project to accelerate technology transfer, enhance adaptive capacity, restore landscapes, and strengthen resilient, market-oriented value chains from 2026.

Component 4: Scaling through CRLCSA market and finance

Activities began with value chain mapping to identify actors across the six priority value chains. This preparatory work will inform value chain upgrading plans, business development services, and the design of financial products that support women, youth, and cooperatives to adopt climate-resilient, low-carbon technologies. Engagement will be scaled in 2026.

Innovations & Emerging Good Practices

An innovative Expressions of Interest (EOIs) was introduced, encouraging farmers groups to apply for participation in the FFS programme. This approach ensured a transparent, fair and demand-driven selection process. A total of 5,288 EOIs were received (2,314 online and 2,974 offline). A joint vetting process between Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and county government teams - guided by a jointly formulated evaluation tool integrating ESS and inclusivity - resulted in the transparent identification of 642 FFS groups in the first cohort. The introduction of a dual offline-online EOI system played a significant role in mitigating exclusion risks, ensuring participation of communities with limited digital access, low literacy, or geographical constraints. This significantly reduced potential for women, youth, and

persons with disabilities and is emerging as a replicable good practice for inclusive beneficiary selection in the agriculture sector.

3. Challenges & Risk Mitigation

To further safeguard against social and environmental risks, the project implemented a transparent joint vetting process between FAO and county government teams, guided by a jointly developed evaluation tool that fully integrated ESS and inclusivity. This process reduced risks related to elite capture, discrimination, or under-representation of vulnerable groups. In addition, Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) was obtained from all the selected 642 FFS groups, ensuring voluntary participation, respect for cultural rights, and full alignment with the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF). These measures strengthened inclusivity, accountability, and risk mitigation across the selection process.

4. Priorities for 2026

In 2026, the project will transition from foundation-building to full-scale implementation. Priority activities include:

- Developing and rolling out innovative CRLCSA extension methodologies.
- Tailoring, producing, and disseminating county-level climate information products.
- Training agro-meteorological departments to strengthen climate services.
- Establishing a decentralized carbon accounting system for LREB.
- Developing and implementing county-specific landscape degradation management strategies.
- Initiating targeted restoration activities, including reforestation and assisted natural regeneration.
- Conducting technology assessments and delivering capacity-building for smallholder farmers through FFS.
- Supporting cooperative development and enhancing the participation of women and youth in value chains.
- Conducting market demand assessments to identify climate-resilient investment opportunities.
- Developing financial products that promote the adoption of low-carbon, climate-resilient technologies and practices.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GCF Outcome Level: Standardized Indicators

PMF/IRMF Results Management Framework

No indicators/questions defined.

**(PMF) M1 Tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂eq) reduced as a result of GCF-funded projects/programmes
(IRMF) Core 1 Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered**

Provide the total GHG emissions reduced, avoided or removed/sequestered (tCO₂eq) as a result of GCF support.

Unit						Tonnes of CO ₂ -equivalent
Baseline	Target			Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value <i>(automatically calculated)</i>
	Mid-term	Final target	Lifetime			
0	643,794	1,287,589	4,268,492	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	643,794	1,287,589	4,268,492	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
Kenya	0	643,794	1,287,589	4,268,492	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	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value
	Mid-term	Final target		
0	15,000	30,540	0	0

(PMF) M9.1 Hectares of land or forests under improved and effective management that contributes to CO ₂ emission reductions (IRMF) Core 4: Hectares of natural resource areas brought under improved low emission and/or climate resilient management practices						
Provide the total degraded or converted ecosystems under restoration (ha), disaggregated by country.						
Unit						Hectares
Disaggregation by: Project Countries	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Kenya	0	15,000	30,540	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	3,500	7,090	0	0	0
Cropland	0	10,500	21,450	0	0	0
Grassland	0	1,000	2,000	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	0	2,800	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	0	2,800	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
Kenya	0	0	2,800	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	286,000	572,000	0	0	0
Health and well-being, and food and water security	0	286,000	572,000	0	0	0
Ecosystem and ecosystem services	0	286,000	572,000	0	0	0

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of 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	143,000	286,000	0	0	0
Female	0	143,000	286,000	0	0	0

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of 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
Kenya	0	286,000	572,000	0	0	0

(PMF) A1 and A2 Total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (IRMF) Core 2 Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached						
Provide the total number of indirect beneficiaries (female/male) cumulatively receiving adaptation benefits from GCF-supported interventions, disaggregated by result area.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Result Areas (Adaptation)	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Livelihoods of people and communities	0	1,049,070	2,098,140	0	0	0
Health and well-being, and food and water security	0	1,049,070	2,098,140	0	0	0
Ecosystem and ecosystem services	0	1,049,070	2,098,140	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	524,535	1,049,070	0	0	0
Female	0	524,535	1,049,070	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
Kenya	0	1,049,070	2,098,140	0	0	0

Livelihoods of people and communities

No indicators/questions defined.

(IRMF) Supplementary 2.5 Beneficiaries (female/male) adopting innovations that strengthen climate change resilience						
Provide the total number of direct beneficiaries (female/male) using new or improved climate adaptation technologies or innovations, disaggregated by gender.						
Unit						No. of Beneficiaries
Disaggregation by: Gender	Baseline	Mid-term	Final target	Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value
Female	0	71,500	171,600	0	0	0
Male	0	71,500	171,600	0	0	0

Optional Co-Benefit Indicators

No indicators/questions defined.

Total number of direct and indirect jobs (measured in full-time equivalents, female/male) created or maintained					
Provide the total number of direct jobs (measured in full-time equivalents, female/male) created or maintained.					
Unit					No. of Full-time equivalent jobs
Baseline	Target		Previous Year Cumulative Value	Annual value	Cumulative Value (automatically calculated)
	Mid-term	Final target			
0	1,000	3,000	0	0	0

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
1.1.1 Develop and deploy innovative and efficient extension methods for disseminating and demonstrating CRLCSA knowledge, technologies, and practices in gender-responsive and socially inclusive ways	55	31,587.42	193,037.13	16
1.1.2 Strengthen the dissemination of climate information services to last-mile users including women, youth and PLWD through cooperatives and Farmer Organizations.	30	59,590.16	937,453.67	6
1.1.3 Develop and test methodologies for decentralized carbon accounting	0	0	0	0
1.1.4 Upgrade and update agricultural databases, crop and productivity datasets, cooperative census	10	7,854.16	345,000	2

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
1.1.5 Assess local climate change impacts and eligible climate solutions for the ag sector	0	0	50,987.4	0
1.1.6 Share knowledge and lessons learned through existing platforms	5	0	478,420	0
2.1.1 Develop a county climate-resilient and low-carbon agricultural landscape management strategy and implementation plan, including improved watershed management, land use planning, reforestation, and natural regeneration	10	5,980.24	315,003.98	1
2.1.2 Implement and monitor climate-resilient and low-carbon landscape management plans.	10	0	0	0
3.1.1 Deploy CRLCSA production/ processing assets and training to smallholder farmers, farmer organizations and associations	30	608,633.63	21,698,456.11	2
3.1.2 Disseminate CRLCSA technology, knowledge, and assets to cooperative members through peer-to-peer networks and exchanges	2	0	0	0
3.1.3 Support smallholder farmer aggregation into cooperatives and other business units as climate risk reduction and risk sharing mechanisms	0	0	0	0
3.1.4 Support improvements in social inclusion and women's meaningful participation in CRLC value chains	10	0	341,492.87	0
4.1.1 Work with buyers and aggregators to increase demand and market opportunities for CRLCSA commodities	0	0	1,070,687.63	0
4.1.2 Increase access to various certification and labeling schemes	0	0	0	0
4.2.1 Develop gender-responsive and socially inclusive private finance tools, procedures, and products to promote the upscale of CRLCSA value chains	10	2,953.3	905,318.05	0
4.2.2 Support smallholders and their business units in the development of bankable business plans, with particular focus on social inclusion and gender-based access	0	0	0	0

Activities				
Activity Name	Implementation Progress (%)	Utilised GCF Budget	Allocated GCF Budget	% (Automatically calculated)
4.2.3 Facilitate smallholders access to financial incentives schemes for agroforestry	0	0	0	0

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
No subprojects	USD	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
C.3. Compliance with FAA covenants				Yes ☒ No ☐			
N/A							
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	Test 1		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Money Laundering (ML) & Terrorist Financing (TF)		
Description	N/A		
Consequences	N/A		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	N/A		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 2	Test 2		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Sanctions		
Description	N/A		
Consequences	N/A		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	N/A		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low

Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 3	Test 3		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Fraud / Bribery & Corruption / Collusion and any other prohibited practice		
Description	N/A		
Consequences	N/A		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	N/A		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 4	Test 4		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Integrity		
Risk Sub-area	Conflict of interest		
Description	N/A		
Consequences	N/A		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Mitigation Measure(s)	N/A		
Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood 1 - Unlikely	Impact 1 - None	Severity 1 - Low
Comments	N/A		
Risk 5	Environmental Risk (Extreme weather events)		
Risk Origin	External Factors		
Risk Area	Natural hazard		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Kenya continues to face high natural-hazard exposure, particularly to extreme weather events, which could directly affect implementation of projects like FP255. Increased rainfall variability – due to climate change, including potential flooding in low-lying areas such as Kano Plains (Kisumu County), Budalangi (Busia County), and Nyatike (Migori County), may disrupt seasonal implementation of climate resilient agriculture and restoration interventions. Possible dry spells or below-average rainfall later in the season may reduce crop performance despite project interventions.		
Consequences	Natural hazards reduce feasibility, affect timing and disrupt implementation of field activities. Temporary delays in field activities and input delivery may affect seasonal alignment of adaptation measures but are unlikely to fundamentally compromise annual targets if managed proactively. Reduced productivity gains due to dry spells could slow visible resilience improvements but would not reverse institutional or cooperative strengthening outcomes.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood 3 - Likely	Impact 3 - Medium	Severity 9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	To manage natural-hazard risks, the project will apply adaptive planning and climate-risk-informed implementation. This includes weather forecasting, seasonal calendar adjustments, coordination with county disaster units, promotion of resilient crop varieties, and flexible scheduling of project activities in the affected areas. As part of overall objectives of FP255, the project will promote the use of drought-tolerant crops, water harvesting, soil moisture conservation, and climate advisories to adapt to climate change.		

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	Implementation Risks		
Risk Origin	Partner Related		
Risk Area	Partner capacity and suitability		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	FP255 delivery involves multiple stakeholders including different service providers at national and county levels, including implementation of safeguards instruments. Variations in technical, operational, and safeguards capacity among counties and implementing partners/ service providers may affect the consistency and sequencing of project activities. Differences in experience with safeguards screening and familiarity with FAO/GCF requirements could result in uneven application of necessary measures across sites.		
Consequences	Variations in capacity among partners may cause delays in activities, uneven uptake of interventions, and inconsistent application of safeguards measures. Misalignment with FAO/GCF standards could reduce implementation quality and project effectiveness.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	FAO will ensure that technically competent service providers are engaged through a rigorous partner selection process and supported with standardized workplans, reporting templates, and ongoing technical assistance. The Project Management unit (PMU) will conduct regular coordination meetings, joint reviews, and supervision missions to ensure consistent implementation across partners. At the County level, coordination structures will be strengthened, and targeted training provided on environment and social safeguards, including safeguards screening, risk management, GRM, and FPIC, in line with FAO/GCF requirements. Implementation gaps will be systematically identified addressed through monitoring reports, field visits, document reviews, and stakeholder feedback. Identified gaps will be addressed through tailored technical support, refresher trainings, and time-bound corrective actions with clear time-bound corrective action plans with clear responsibilities. Adaptive management, including adjustments to workplans or escalation for persistent gaps, will ensure safeguards compliance and maintain project quality and effectiveness.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 7	Potential exclusion of beneficiaries, inadequate identification of Indigenous Peoples		
Risk Origin	Project Related		
Risk Area	Environmental and Social		
Risk Sub-area	Environmental and Social Safeguards		
Description	Variations in capacity, awareness, and engagement practices among counties and implementing partners may limit meaningful participation of project stakeholders, including women, youth, PWD, Indigenous Peoples, and marginalized groups. Inadequate communication, poorly timed consultations, or inaccessible processes could prevent intended beneficiaries from fully engaging in project activities. There is a risk that Indigenous Peoples in project areas may not be adequately identified or engaged, which could lead to unintentional encroachment on their territories. Currently, only Transzoia and Bungoma counties have self-identified Indigenous Peoples populations, and FPIC was conducted there. Other counties may host Indigenous Peoples who have not declared themselves, increasing the risk of exclusion or unintended encroachment.		
Consequences	Limited or uneven participation may reduce the effectiveness and inclusivity of project interventions, weaken local ownership, and lead to grievances or misalignment with community priorities. Failure to engage women, youth, Indigenous Peoples and marginalized groups could result in exclusion from project benefits, grievances,		

	implementation delays, and reputational risks. Encroachment on Indigenous Peoples territories could lead to non-compliance with FAO and GCF ESS standards.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	3 - Medium	6 - Medium
Mitigation Measure(s)	The project will continue to implement structured stakeholder engagement, including accessible Expressions of Interest (EOIs) (both paper and online), broad dissemination of information, participatory screening, and joint preparation of tools and matrices. Communication and participation processes will be inclusive, culturally appropriate, and consider local language, literacy, and mobility constraints. A Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) will capture and address stakeholder concerns promptly. The project will implement the Gender Action Plan, ensuring participation targets for women/youth/PWD. Gender-transformative approaches are integrated into all activities, and a zero-tolerance SEAH policy is enforced. Mandatory training for all staff and partners, combined with a survivor-centered, confidential GRM, ensures complaints are addressed promptly. Continuous monitoring and reporting will track compliance and uptake of gender/SEAH safeguards. FPIC processes will be applied where Indigenous Peoples are identified. The project will conduct participatory mapping and screening to ensure territories are respected. EOIs and consultations will remain open and widely accessible.		
Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Current Residual Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	2 - Possible	2 - Low	4 - Medium
Comments	N/A		
Risk 8	Country specific political and regulatory uncertainty, limited collaboration among stakeholders		
Risk Origin	External Factors		
Risk Area	Political		
Risk Sub-area	N/A		
Description	Kenya is a multi-party democracy by law and practice with regular elections. Kenya's next general election is scheduled for 2027, which may result in changes in key government officials, ministerial structure, and priorities. Considering the number of key stakeholder involved in the project and Kenya's devolution processes, the project could also experience limited collaboration between stakeholders from different ministries (e.g. Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment and the National Treasury) as well as the county governments on project's activities (in particular land restoration activities due to cross-cutting issues) and the coordination of the overall project implementation.		
Consequences	Political and regulatory shifts in Kenya during/ after elections could result in slowed decision making and require additional stakeholder engagement, which may cause some delays in implementation on the ground. Reduced availability of government stakeholders during the election may also affect timely organization of meetings/ joint missions and delayed coordination. The slow/ limited collaboration may negatively affect project implementation and coordination, resulting in slowed decision making, limited information and knowledge-sharing on climate-resilience practices and technologies, and ultimately impair the overall long-term project impact.		
Inherent Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Severity
	3 - Likely	3 - Medium	9 - Medium High
Mitigation Measure(s)	To manage political and regulatory uncertainty, the project will maintain flexible implementation planning, including adjusting activity sequencing during politically sensitive periods and prioritizing seasonal interventions ahead of anticipated slowdowns. All actors have been/will be engaged in the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and Project Technical Coordination Committee (PTCC) to ensure that government organizations work hand-in hand. At local (county) level, all activities have been/will be coordinated under the county level working groups to ensure collaboration between all government stakeholders. Strengthened communication with county-level actors through the project office in the target region (Kisumu) helps maintain field momentum even when national-level processes slow.		

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
Kenya	Grants	USD	29,215,309	3,699,003	821,444	821,444	5%	95%
Total		USD	29,215,309	3,699,003	821,444	821,444	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
Government of Denmark - DMFA	Grants	USD	6,146,629	3,081,145	0	0	23%	77%
Government of Kenya	Grants	USD	14,000,000	0	37,054.64	37,054.64	23%	77%
FAO	Grants	USD	985,910	0	0	0	23%	77%
Total		USD	21,132,539	3,081,145	37,054.64	37,054.64	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: Final revised - APR2025 - Grant Financial Progress Report FP255 Kenya - 20260408 OCB rev NO ETL.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

<i>Recruitment of ESS specialists</i> The project recruited an International ESS/Gender Expert to guide inception activities and develop the ESMP. A National ESS Specialist was hired to support preparatory implementation, including community identification, cooperative onboarding, FPIC, and gender/social integration. <i>Preparation of Safeguards Documents</i> The ESS Specialists prepared a draft ESMP which remains under review. <i>Disclosure of Safeguards Information</i> The project ensured transparency by engaging national and county governments, partners, and stakeholders through TV, radio, online platforms, and in-person meetings during launch and inception. Tools such as Expressions of Interest (EOIs), FPIC forms, and capacity assessment instruments were developed to support inclusive participation. Community sensitization reached 55,072 people (46% women, 30% youth, 3% persons with disabilities). EOIs were voluntary and accessible both online and offline. A joint FAO–county review identified eligible Farmer Field Schools, followed by FPIC and verification. The process enhanced trust, participation, and informed consent. <i>Establishment and Dissemination of the GRM</i> A multi-level GRM was created, aligned with FAO/GCF standards and linked to community-preferred structures. Complaints can be submitted through multiple channels, including hotline, email, website, and in-person. The system addresses environmental, social, labor, exclusion, governance, and benefit-sharing grievances, with SEAH/GBV cases referred directly to the FAO Inspector-General. Anonymous reporting to the GCF Independent Redress Mechanism is supported. <i>Stakeholder Engagement</i> The project was launched in Kisumu (27–28 March 2025), engaging government, private sector, and community representatives. County-level consultations across 14 counties informed site selection and coordination, culminating in an inception workshop with 98 participants (37 women, 8 youth). Community sensitization and EOI processes led to the identification of 642 FFS groups, all taken through FPIC and verification. A stocktake in five counties engaged 681 stakeholders (65% women). Capacity Building Training on FPIC and safeguards was provided to FAO staff, county MEL leads, and 75 enumerators in November 2025.
Outputs during the reporting period
The project strengthened safeguards capacity through recruitment of an International ESS/Gender Expert and a National ESS Specialist (March–December 2025). They provided technical guidance on integrating FPIC, gender equality, and disability inclusion into community engagement and onboarding, while establishing a safeguards oversight structure. Safeguards compliance was monitored through supervision of community identification and ongoing technical review. A draft ESMP was jointly developed by ESS specialists, incorporating context-specific measures aligned with the ESMF. Technical review, validation, and internal consultations are ongoing prior to finalization. Safeguards information was widely disclosed through TV/radio, online platforms, and in-person forums. Institutional consultations were conducted with national and county stakeholders. Community sensitization reached 55,072 people. Tools such as EOIs, FPIC forms, and capacity assessment templates were developed, and an inclusive online/offline EOI system was implemented. A multi-level GRM was established across FFS groups, cooperatives, county structures, and the PMU, with multiple reporting channels and SEAH/GBV referral procedures. GRM accessibility and functionality are continuously monitored. Stakeholder engagement included sensitization, receipt of 5,288 EOIs, and selection of 642 FFS groups. A stocktake engaged 681 stakeholders across five counties. All 642 groups completed FPIC, with verification and full documentation. Capacity-building trainings reached 99 participants, strengthening safeguards application during implementation.
Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during implementation
A key risk identified at the inception stage was the limited institutional capacity to manage safeguards requirements during implementation. This was addressed through the recruitment of an International ESS and Gender Expert and a National ESS Specialist, who provided technical guidance to integrate safeguards considerations, including gender equality, disability inclusion, and FPIC, into project planning and community onboarding processes. In addition, the project initiated the development of a draft ESMP aligned with the ESMF to identify potential environmental and social risks associated with project activities and define mitigation and monitoring measures. Another key issue related to ensuring transparency, inclusive participation, and voluntary community engagement. To address this, the project conducted extensive stakeholder sensitization and safeguards disclosure through multiple channels including television, radio, online platforms, and in-person forums, reaching individuals across 14 counties. Measures were also implemented to reduce risks of exclusion by promoting the participation of women, youth, and persons with disabilities, and by monitoring participation through disaggregated data. A structured FPIC process was conducted with 642 Farmer FFS groups, ensuring that community participation was voluntary and informed. Additionally, a multi-level GRM was established to provide accessible channels for stakeholders to raise concerns, including confidential procedures for handling sensitive complaints such as SEAH/GBV. Capacity building was also conducted for project staff and partners to strengthen safeguards implementation and ensure compliance with FAO and GCF environmental and social standards.
Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention
N/A
Remarks/Notes

F.4. Sub-projects information	
Have any subprojects been implemented?	Yes ☒ No ☐
Title of the sub-project	No subprojects
ESS management plan/instrument in place	
N/A	
Stakeholder engagement plan in place	
N/A	
Activities/engagement conducted with Indigenous peoples	
N/A	
Key environmental, social and gender issues, risks and impacts addressed during this reporting period	
N/A	
Any pending key environmental, social and gender issues needing accredited entity's actions and GCF attention	
N/A	

F.5. Implementation of the stakeholder engagement plan	
Were any actions undertaken to increase engagement of relevant stakeholders in the project, particularly regarding environmental, social, and gender elements?	Yes ☒ No ☐
Activities implemented during the reporting period	
During the reporting period, the project implemented extensive stakeholder engagement activities in line with the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP), strengthening transparency, inclusivity, and participation across national, county, and community levels. The FP255 project was formally launched in Kisumu on 27–28 March 2025, introducing project objectives, expected outputs, and implementation approaches. The launch also sensitized stakeholders on environmental and social safeguards, gender considerations, and feedback mechanisms. Participants included national and county government representatives, value chain actors, UN agencies, research and financial institutions, private sector entities, NGOs, community representatives, and media. The event strengthened political commitment, visibility, and ownership by the LREB and national government. Between April and May 2025, stakeholder consultations were conducted across all 14 LREB counties. These sessions re-engaged stakeholders from the project design phase and facilitated discussions on focal point identification, value chain prioritization, and site/community selection. Meetings involved CECMs for agriculture and environment/climate change, followed by multi-sectoral workshops across agriculture, water, livestock, forestry, cooperatives, and trade departments. The process emphasized locally led implementation, alignment with CIDPs, and coordination across departments. The consultations culminated in an inception workshop on 6–9 July 2025, attended by 98 participants (37 women, 8 youth). Community-level sensitization reached 55,072 individuals (46% women, 30% youth, 3% persons with disabilities). A dual-mode Expression of Interest (EOI) system generated 5,288 EOIs, leading to the transparent selection of 642 FFS	

groups, all of which underwent FPIC, community dialogues, and physical verification. A stocktake on extension and climate information services engaged 681 stakeholders in five counties, identifying gaps for inclusive climate-smart agriculture. Additionally, 99 staff and enumerators received capacity-building training on safeguards and FPIC documentation. Overall, these activities enhanced inclusive participation, transparency, and accountability, advancing SEP implementation.
Dates and venues of engagement activities
Project launch event: 27–28 March 2025 at Siala Resort, Kisumu County. County-level stakeholder consultations across all 14 counties between 29 April and 23 May 2025. Inception workshop: 6–9 July 2025 at Acacia Hotel, Kisumu. Community sensitization: 25 Aug–5 Sept 2025. EOIs ran 23 Sept–15 Oct 2025, with selection 21 Oct–14 Nov, and FPIC/verification 8–21 Nov 2025. Stocktaking: 1–11 Dec 2025 in Homa Bay, Kericho, Kisii, Nyamira, and Migori.
Sex-disaggregated data on stakeholder engagement participants (male + female = total)
Stakeholder consultations were conducted across all 14 counties of the Lake Region Economic Bloc (LREB) between 29 April and 23 May 2025 as part of the project inception phase reaching 246 county government staff: 29 April 2025, Migori; 27 May 2025, Homa Bay; 5 May 2025, Kakamega; 6 May 2025, Vihiga; 7 May 2025, Siaya; 8 May 2025, Busia; 14 May 2025, Nyamira; 15 May 2025, Kisii; 16 May 2025, Kisumu; 19 May 2025, Trans Nzoia; 20 May 2025, Bungoma; 21 May 2025, Nandi; 22 May 2025, Kericho; and 23 May 2025, Bomet. Inception workshop was conducted from 6 to 9 July 2025, at Acacia Hotel in Kisumu, attended by 98 individuals (37 Female, 8 youth). Community sensitization was conducted from 25 August 2025 to 5 September 2025 across all the 14 targeted LREB counties reaching 55,072 individuals (25,519 women, 16,795 youth, 1,876 Persons with Disability) through physical meetings and sessions. Stocktaking assessment of extension and climate information services engaged 681 stakeholders (442 women, 220 youth, and 36 persons with disabilities). The stakeholders included farmers, county government staff, Kenya Metrological Department, Civil Society Organizations, private organizations, and Agro-dealers.
Information shared with stakeholders
The project was formally launched on 27–28 March 2025 in Kisumu, introducing objectives, expected outputs, and implementation approach. The event sensitized stakeholders on environmental and social safeguards, gender considerations, and feedback mechanisms. In April-May 2025, stakeholder consultations were held across all 14 counties, re-engaging actors from project design and discussing focal point identification, value chain prioritization, site/community selection, and coordination structures. Meetings with County Executive Committee Members (CECMs) for agriculture and environment/climate change were followed by multi-sectoral workshops involving agriculture, water, livestock, forestry, cooperatives, and trade departments. Consultations emphasized locally-led implementation, alignment with CIDPs, and strong inter-departmental coordination. Community sensitization from 25 August–5 September 2025 reached 55,072 people (46% women, 30% youth, 3% persons with disabilities), providing information on project objectives, safeguards requirements, targeting criteria, and the non-eligibility list. Communities were informed that timelines depended on safeguards/FPIC processes, which guided the selection of 642 FFS groups from 5,288 EOIs. All selected groups underwent FPIC, including dialogue sessions and physical verification. A stocktake in five counties engaged 681 stakeholders (65% women, 32% youth, 6% PWDs) to assess gaps in extension and climate information services. 99 FAO staff, county officers, and enumerators were trained on safeguards and FPIC documentation.
Outputs including issues raised and addressed during the reporting period
During the reporting period, stakeholder engagement processes conducted generate feedback that informed project design refinement and safeguards integration. Key concerns raised by stakeholders included need for locally led implementation approaches, strengthened local technical capacity, improved farmer training platforms, and enhanced value addition to increase farmer incomes and resilience. Community members also raised questions regarding participation criteria, including access to markets and improved livestock breeds, and potential support for cooperative infrastructure such as milk coolers. The project team addressed these concerns within documented safeguards (SEP and ESMF): (a) Livestock Breeds: Stakeholders were informed that the project prioritizes Climate – Smart Agriculture practices and improved feed management rather than immediate procurement of high-cost breeds, with any new breeds being

subject to ESMF Exclusion List (Appendix 1) and biosafety protocols. (b) Milk Coolers and Equipment: While value addition is a priority, all large-scale equipment must remain within the six-approved value chains and pass environmental and social screening. (c) Cooperative Capacity and market Access: Based on the SEP's 2022 Cooperative Census, the project applied a phased approach completing identification and verification of 642 FFS groups, providing guidance on livestock management and outlining the phased rollout of equipment and market support. No fundamental opposition to the project was raised during consultations. Minor concerns on group selection criteria and the focus on six priority value chains were addressed through clear explanation of the Board-approved project scope. Stakeholders were also briefed on the Grievance Regress mechanism (documented in SEP, Section 6), providing a formal channel for any future concerns.
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	
In 2026, the project will strengthen environmental and social safeguards through dedicated staffing, finalization of safeguards instruments, and continuous monitoring of risks. An ESS Specialist will lead safeguards compliance, coordinate mitigation measures, and oversee monitoring. A Gender/Youth Specialist will be recruited to support gender mainstreaming, youth inclusion, and implementation of the Gender Action Plan (GAP). Additional consultants may be engaged for assessments, consultations, and monitoring as needed. The project will finalize and operationalize the ESMP. All sub-activities will undergo environmental and social screening using FAO's Safeguards Screening Checklist to classify risks as low, moderate, or high. Only low- and moderate-risk activities will be supported; high-risk activities and those on the non-eligibility list will be excluded. Screening and risk management will continue throughout implementation. A fully operational GRM will be maintained to allow stakeholders to raise concerns. Safeguards procedures and GRM channels will be disseminated through community meetings, farmer organizations, and local institutions. The GRM will include confidential reporting mechanisms for SEAH/GBV. Regular stakeholder engagement will ensure participation of farmers, cooperatives, local authorities, and women/youth groups. FPIC processes will continue where Indigenous Peoples are present. Based on FPIC outcomes, an Indigenous Peoples Plan will be developed, implemented, and monitored to ensure protection of formal and customary tenure rights and traditional knowledge. Capacity building will focus on gender equality and social inclusion. Training will be provided on SEAH and GBV prevention, gender-responsive approaches, and leadership development. Women's and Youth Leadership training and GALS awareness activities will target smallholders, FFS groups, and farmer organizations. Approximately 50,000 farmers will receive training on gender-related approaches. Safeguards implementation will be monitored quarterly. Progress on gender and social inclusion will be tracked using surveys and tools such as the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI), and a gender impact assessment will be conducted at project completion.	
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	
The best practice worth mentioning is the community onboarding process. This involved community sensitization activities reaching up to 55,072 individuals across the 14 counties, including 46% women, 30% youth, and 3% persons with disabilities. A dual-mode system for submitting EOLs was introduced, enabling both online and offline participation that significantly expanded accessibility for interested FFS groups. A total of 5,288 EOLs were received (2,314 online and 2,974 physical). A joint vetting process between FAO and county government teams - guided by a jointly formulated criteria evaluation tool that integrated ESS and inclusivity - resulted in the transparent identification of 642 FFS groups in the first cohort. All the 642 groups were taken through FPIC, and upon consent, physical verification was conducted to confirm group existence, governance structures, and operational functionality.	
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

The project has made strong progress in implementing gender-responsive and inclusive activities. Under Activity 1.1.2.1, a stocktaking assessment of extension and climate information services was conducted in **Homabay, Kisii, Nyamira, Migori, and Kericho**, engaging **681 stakeholders** (65% women, 32% youth, 6% persons with disabilities). The assessment identified gaps and opportunities to improve access to timely, relevant, and inclusive climate-smart agriculture information.

Gender-responsive beneficiary selection was ensured through a jointly issued FAO–County Government call for applications, which received **5,288 Expressions of Interest**. Using a jointly developed evaluation tool, **644 Farmer Field School groups** were selected with deliberate attention to inclusion. Current beneficiary composition—**64% women, 39% youth, and 6% persons with disabilities**—exceeds project inclusion targets of 50% women, 20% youth, and 2% PWD.

Gender Action Plan (GAP) activities are integrated into implementation, including planned training on **SEAH and GBV prevention, Women's and Youth Leadership**, and **Gender Action Learning System (GALS)** awareness. The project will train **50,000 farmers** on gender-responsive approaches.

Quarterly monitoring of gender outcomes will continue using surveys and tools such as the **Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI)**. Based on current progress, the project is on track to meet its gender equality and inclusion objectives.

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

Yes ☒ No ☐

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

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

GAP Activity

Mainstream GESI and integrate Gender-sensitization into all training materials and trainings

Indicator

Cross-cutting - Percentage of Gender-responsive training materials and curricula designed and developed by a Gender specialist

Rating of Indicator

GREEN (on track to be met)

Baseline	0
Target, including sex-disaggregation where applicable	100
Annual progress update (Reporting Period)	
0	
Cumulative progress update (Entire period)	
0	
Budget	12,000
Currency	USD
Timeline (Planned completion of activity)	28 February 2026
Responsibility	
FAO International/ National Gender Specialists	
Remarks/Notes	
The activity is GREEN, on-track and would be concluded in Feb-2026 at the end of Y1 implementation timelines. For the rest of GAP activities, please refer to the document uploaded under Section G GAP.	
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>The International ESS and Gender expert is still onboard.</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>Majority of the GAP activities are mainstreamed in the Project Activities budget, and this is implemented as per the FAA. 14,347 USD will be used to hire National gender expert in year 2 out of USD. 71,736 for the whole project and 30% of the project activity budget will be dedicated to align with GAP.</i>	
Are the planned activities, targets, indicators, timelines, etc. on track during the reporting period?	Yes ☒ No ☐

<i>All activities implemented have mainstreamed GAP and are on track.</i>	
Were there any revisions of the approved GAP during the reporting period? Please submit the updated GAP in Annex section of this APR and ensure that the updated GAP has details on each change.	Yes ☐ No ☒
N/A	
Are the reported results on track to contribute to meeting the sex-disaggregated targets for the direct beneficiaries in the funding proposal, if applicable?	Yes ☒ No ☐
<i>Overall, 64% of beneficiaries are Women, 39% are youth and 6% are Persons with Disability. This distribution will contribute towards meeting the sex-disaggregated targets for the direct beneficiaries in the funding proposal.</i>	
Has the project/programme experienced any implementation challenges that affect gender-related activities? If yes, please include lessons learnt and how they are informing ongoing actions.	Yes ☐ No ☒
N/A	
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 ☒
N/A	
Provide planned activities on gender elements for the next reporting period	
<i>A Gender and Youth Specialist will be recruited to support gender mainstreaming, youth inclusion, and implementation of the Gender Action Plan (GAP). Capacity building will focus on gender equality and social inclusion. Staff and stakeholders will be trained on SEAH, GBV prevention, and gender-responsive approaches. Women's and Youth Leadership training and Gender Action Learning System (GALS) awareness activities will be delivered to smallholders, Farmer Field Schools, and farmer organizations. In addition, approximately 50,000 farmers will be trained on gender-related approaches. Safeguards implementation will be monitored quarterly, including progress on gender and social inclusion objectives through surveys and analytical tools such as the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI). A gender impact assessment will be conducted at the end of the project.</i>	

G. ANNEXES (UPLOADED)
Annex 1: GHG emission reduction calculation methodology (for projects reporting GHG emission reductions) and details on the calculations of the annual and cumulative value.
File Name: APR2025_Annex1_GHG-EXACT_FP255_Original.xlsx File Name: APR2025_Annex1_GHG-GLEAM_FP255_Original.xlsx
Annex 2: Communication and visibility material
File Name: APR2025_Annex2_Communication and visibility_FP255_20260410.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: APR2025_Annex5_Y2-Timetable_FP255_20260323.xlsx
Annex 6: Updated Gender Assessment and/or Action Plan
File Name: APR 2025 - section F.8_FP255_GAP-progress.docx
Additional Annexes (if applicable)
No annexes provided.

