

TERMINAL EVALUATION

Project ID:	9522
Project Name:	Global Learning, Finance, and Partnerships Project under TRI
Countr(ies):	Global
Implementing Agency:	IUCN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW	3
A. Description	3
B. Key Dates	3
C. Disbursements	3
II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES	4
A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings	4
B. Stakeholder Engagement	6
C. Gender Equality	8
D. Knowledge Management	9
III. CORE INDICATORS	10
IV: CO FINANCING	13
V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS	14
VI. ANNEX	15

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name

Global Learning, Finance, and Partnerships Project under TRI

Country

Global

GEF ID

9522

Implementing Agency

IUCN

Executing Entity

IUCN, FAO, UN Environment Finance Initiative

Trust Fund

GET

Project Type

FSP

Objective

Project Objective: Strengthen overall delivery of TRI by establishing and supporting structures and processes for coordination, monitoring, and adaptive management of the Program, while providing key supports to TRI country projects in the areas of policy identification and uptake, knowledge generation and dissemination, and mobilization of new/additional finance for FLR, to generate enhanced programmatic benefits and support the achievement of country FLR objectives

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

4/6/2018

Agency Approval

9/5/2018

Implementation Start

12/15/2018

First Disbursement

12/1/2018

Expected MTR

3/1/2022

MTR Submission

7/11/2025

Actual MTR

8/22/2022

Expected Completion

12/31/2024

Actual Completion

12/31/2024

Actual TE

2/14/2025

TE Submission

7/11/2025

Final Disbursement

5/31/2025

C. Disbursements

Project Financing 3,836,500.00	Cumulative Disbursement 1,650,948.00
-----------------------------------	---

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings

Global Child Project (GCP) Performance Findings

The GCP played a pivotal role in ensuring coherence, coordination, and knowledge-sharing across the TRI Programme. By adopting a well-structured, programmatic approach, it significantly enhanced the overall effectiveness of the initiative.

In terms of **relevance**, the GCP aligned closely with global environmental commitments, including the Bonn Challenge, CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD, and the SDGs, and responded effectively to the strategic priorities of the GEF and its IAs. The division of responsibilities among the three IAs (IUCN, FAO, and UNEP) allowed for targeted support across diverse national contexts, increasing the Programme's adaptability and relevance. This relevance further evolved over time in response to emerging challenges, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, which prompted the adoption of virtual platforms and the development of innovative tools like the Restoration Factory.

From a **coherence** standpoint, the GCP provided critical technical support, capacity building, and coordination. Governance structures, including the PSC, PAC, and GCU, provided effective strategic oversight. However, coherence was slightly affected by structural limitations, including differing implementation timelines of national child projects and procedural variations among IAs. The GCP's limited resources, comprising 2.9% of total TRI funding, restricted its ability to provide more tailored in-country support, and misalignment between its design and national project expectations at times hampered responsiveness. This was notably lower than the levels of funding typically allocated to coordination functions in more recent GEF Integrated Programs, such as those under GEF-7 and GEF-8, where global components have received relatively larger shares of total programme budgets. While national child projects will require further commitment from national governments in the form of planning and resources.

Regarding **efficiency**, the GCP achieved high financial execution rates (98%) from 2018 to 2024. This success was enabled by a centralized coordination model and adaptive financial planning, particularly in response to disruptions like the pandemic. The use of standardized monitoring frameworks, centralized knowledge dissemination, and shared methodologies, such as the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM) and Species Threat Abatement and Restoration (STAR), created economies of scale that enhanced cost-effectiveness. Complementarity among the three IAs was well-leveraged, contributing to efficient delivery. The GCP also effectively complemented global restoration efforts, including AFR100 and the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, avoiding duplication and enriching the broader FLR knowledge ecosystem. The GCP's centralized project management and governance structure were instrumental in ensuring efficient implementation. However, resource limitations curtailed the project's ability to provide more hands-on, tailored support.

In terms of **effectiveness**, the GCP adopted a highly interconnected approach that bridged knowledge-sharing, policy engagement, and financial mobilization. Its technical guides, training events, and knowledge products contributed directly to shaping national and sub-national FLR policy frameworks, helping countries cultivate enabling environments for restoration finance. Tools like the Restoration Factory, along with FAO's e-

learning course on developing bankable business plans for sustainable forest-based enterprises, strengthened stakeholders' ability to access funding and develop viable restoration projects. This integrated approach enhanced synergy across thematic areas, though its implementation varied depending on country-specific institutional capacities and available resources. However, the extent of integration varied across countries, influenced by structural constraints, staffing capacity, and the limited resources available for tailored in-country support.

The GCP demonstrated adaptive management, particularly in its response to the Midterm Review (MTR). Key recommendations were acted upon, including revisions to the results framework to better align indicators and targets, enhanced coordination through a finalized Stakeholder Engagement and Partnership Strategy, and improved staffing across M&E, communications, policy, and gender. The project also strengthened digital collaboration through tools such as shared Teams platforms and virtual PAC meetings. Although the project was granted a no-cost extension, the absence of additional funding limited the extent to which long-term sustainability could be addressed.

The GCP played a central role in strengthening **monitoring, reporting**, and coordination across the TRI Programme. It established a harmonized MEL framework, introduced nine Core Indicators, and developed standardized tools such as the Restoration Barometer and OpenForis. These enabled more consistent reporting across national child projects and facilitated knowledge exchange. Midterm evaluations were standardized and conducted across several countries, supporting evidence-based adjustments. However, financial and capacity constraints limited GCP's ability to deliver tailored, in-country MEL support. Reporting inconsistencies remained in specific indicators, and language barriers posed additional challenges. Despite these constraints, the GCP achieved approximately 80% of its MEL-related targets, demonstrating strong progress and impact on programme-wide learning and coordination. In parallel, the IAs collectively ensured timely reporting against the GCP's own results framework through annual PIRs, the MTR, and inputs to the final evaluation.

The **impact** of the GCP was significant in elevating the global profile of FLR. It strengthened coordination and monitoring frameworks across the TRI Programme, introduced technical guidance tools, and fostered policy dialogue. Tools such as STAR, ROAM, and the Restoration Barometer enhanced national projects' data-driven planning and monitoring capabilities. Through global knowledge-sharing platforms, the GCP helped embed FLR principles into broader environmental discourse, empowering national child projects to better deliver on Programme goals. It also played a key role in policy integration and institutional capacity building, contributing to multi-stakeholder engagement and enabling environments for FLR policy implementation.

On **sustainability**, the GCP contributed meaningfully by institutionalizing FLR methodologies, technical tools, and knowledge systems at both global and national levels. Tools like STAR and Framework for Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring (FERM) were successfully integrated into the knowledge systems of the IAs, laying the groundwork for sustained FLR learning and practice. However, several challenges remain. Financial uncertainties, political instability, and variable institutional capacities across countries, coupled with limited private-sector engagement, threaten the durability of gains achieved. Structured sustainability planning, particularly for long-term financial and institutional resilience, remains a critical area for future attention. Furthermore, continued funding, policy enforcement, and community involvement will be critical to ensuring the longevity of restoration efforts.

Lastly, the GCP made solid progress on **cross-cutting themes**. It successfully mobilized targeted co-financing (USD 3.9 million) through a combination of grants and in-kind contributions, primarily leveraging staff and technical expertise from FAO, IUCN, and UNEP. While overall co-financing across the TRI Programme fell short of initial expectations, the GCP met its co-financing targets, reflecting effective resource mobilization for its coordination and technical functions. Environmental and social safeguards were applied in line with GEF guidelines, in line with the low-risk nature of GCP activities. Given that the GCP did not involve direct

implementation on the ground, safeguard requirements were minimal and appropriately focused on institutional and knowledge-based activities. Gender integration advanced steadily, particularly through the Restoration Factory, which achieved 40–50% women’s participation. Still, inconsistent collection of gender-disaggregated data hindered full analysis of gender impacts. Stakeholder engagement was broad and inclusive, fostering collaboration with governments, communities, and civil society. While fiduciary standards were generally upheld, variations in procedures among IAs and shortfalls in co-financing occasionally posed implementation challenges.

The table below summarizes the overall performance ratings of the GCP, based on the standard GEF evaluation criteria:

Evaluation Criteria - Ratings

Relevance - Satisfactory

Coherence - Moderately Satisfactory

Effectiveness - Satisfactory

Efficiency - Satisfactory

Outcome Rating - Satisfactory

Sustainability - Moderately Likely

Project Implementation - Satisfactory

Project Execution - Satisfactory

Project M&E (Design) - Satisfactory

Project M&E (Implementation) - Moderately Satisfactory

Based on its implementation experience, the GCP yielded several positive **lessons** for future integrated, multi-country initiatives. These included the importance of a centralized programmatic approach, the synergistic value of integrating a technical backstopping facility, standardization of core indicators to facilitate overall progress tracking, flexibility and adaptive management for better responsiveness, and the value of south-south collaboration. The evaluation also revealed that the effectiveness of policy support to countries is often constrained by weak institutional capacity, political turnover, and funding gaps; and that businesses operating in the FLR sector are financially vulnerable and considered high-risk investments by potential funders and require ongoing capacity-building support to access to sustainable finance.

B. Stakeholder Engagement

The TRI Programme effectively engaged a diverse range of stakeholders throughout its implementation, ensuring inclusive participation in restoration efforts. This broad engagement included local communities, farmers, national and international policymakers, civil society organizations, private sector entities, and research institutions. By doing so, the national child projects demonstrated that sustainable restoration relies on active collaboration among all relevant parties and worked to integrate their diverse perspectives into its design, implementation, and decision-making processes.

Government agencies at national, regional, and local levels were instrumental in the Programme's support of policy-related initiatives. For instance, in Cameroon, the MINEPDED played a pivotal role in developing and approving the country's Action Plan (2021–2030) for the Restoration of Land and Forest Landscapes. Similarly, in Kenya, the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, and Forestry led efforts to formulate the FOLAREP 2021–2025, ensuring alignment with national priorities. These collaborations not only provided strategic oversight but also facilitated policy alignment, contributing to more effective implementation.

In addition, government agencies also participated in project implementation in a number of national child project countries. For instance, in Pakistan the national child project was implemented through the respective Provincial Forest Departments; in Kenya (ASAL), KEFRI was the executing agency; in DRC, the executing agency was the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development; in STP, the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Rural Development and the Ministry of Environment through the Directorate of Forests and Biodiversity; in CAR, the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development; in China, the National Forestry and Grassland Administration; and in Tanzania, the VPO, Division of Environment.

Civil society organizations played an equally vital role, engaging in project implementation, advocacy, community mobilization, and capacity building. For instance, Nature Kenya ensured local communities were not merely beneficiaries but active participants in the restoration process through capacity-building initiatives, training, and the establishment of community-based structures like forest associations and water resource user associations. Similarly, in Guinea-Bissau, the TRI project partnered with the EU-funded Mangrove Project to develop a mangrove law and a national strategy for mangrove restoration. Such partnerships highlighted the Programme's ability to synergize with existing initiatives and amplify its impact.

The Programme also prioritized private sector engagement, acknowledging its critical role in financing and implementing restoration projects. Initiatives like the Restoration Factory provided mentorship and support for bankable restoration projects. In Cameroon, EcoPlanet Bamboo's involvement demonstrated the potential for impactful collaborations, while in Kenya, the Programme adapted its approach to address challenges in engaging private sector actors, who at times found the proposed methods misaligned with their business models. Efforts to provide business development support helped mitigate these challenges, reflecting the Programme's adaptability in fostering meaningful engagement. The national child project in STP worked with a local non-governmental organization, Alisei, on communication and outreach and engaged with Plan Vivo to explore opportunities for carbon credit certification. However, while there were varying degrees of support to the establishment or improvement of micro and small enterprises, the national child projects across the board lacked the engagement of large businesses and corporations, even though such actors are commonly associated with land and forest use globally. However, in the baseline analyses of several TRI countries, other drivers and actors were more prominently identified as contributing to degradation.

Mechanisms such as multi-stakeholder platforms were key to facilitating dialogue, coordination, and collaboration among diverse actors. In STP, the National FLR Platform served as a forum for stakeholders to contribute to decision-making, share knowledge, and coordinate restoration efforts; while in Cameroon, consultations with local communities were integral to the national action plan for land and FLR. Participatory approaches, such as the ROAM also ensured that restoration activities aligned with local needs and priorities. For example, in Kenya's ASAL project, ROAM assessments informed the development of Country Environment Action Plans and the establishment of community conservancies.

The Programme also highlighted the value of leveraging partnerships to address staffing gaps and enhance expertise. For example, in Cameroon, the project collaborated with International Bamboo and Rattan (INBAR) to provide technical support on bamboo restoration. Similarly, in Kenya, the project partnered with the World Resources Institute (WRI) to conduct a ROAM assessment, which benefited from WRI's expertise in this area. These partnerships allowed the project to access specialized knowledge and skills that were not readily available within the project teams.

Despite these successes, the Programme encountered challenges, including administrative challenges, such as the three-year delay caused by disagreements between the Tanzanian government and UNEP over the implementing agency and fund management, specifically, the government's insistence on routing GEF funds through the Ministry of Finance rather than through CIFOR, and difficulties in engaging certain stakeholders, such as initial resistance from some communities to land-use planning restrictions and the need to educate local leaders and experts on the concept of restoration. Furthermore, the level of engagement with CSOs differed considerably across the participating countries. In some countries, such as Kenya, CSOs like Nature Kenya played a central role in project implementation, community mobilization, and advocacy. Similarly, in STP, and Guinea-Bissau partnerships with local NGOs were instrumental in achieving project objectives. However, in other countries like China and Pakistan, the engagement with CSOs was less prominent, with a stronger focus on government-led initiatives and state-owned entities.

Overall, the TRI Programme successfully engaged a wide array of stakeholders, fostering collaboration across governments, civil society, the private sector, and local communities. While challenges such as private sector engagement and administrative challenges persisted, its comprehensive and adaptive approach ensured meaningful progress in fostering sustainable restoration efforts. The Global Child Project (GCP) made significant progress in implementing the MTR recommendations, primarily by refining frameworks, improving coordination, and enhancing digital collaboration. The GCP successfully completed its Partnership Strategy as part of the broader Stakeholder Engagement Plan finalized in Q3 2022. Evidence of its implementation was seen in the enhanced coordination among TRI partners, particularly during the organization of the 2023 Global Learning Workshop in Tanzania (Recommendation 2).

C. Gender Equality

The Evaluation found that the GCP promoted gender equality and addressed gender concerns, albeit with varying levels of integration across components and national contexts. Despite being included in the Project design, a Gender Action Plan (GAP), which was intended to be developed based on the findings of gender analysis, was not developed. Nevertheless, gender considerations were embedded in the implementation of certain activities.

Specifically, capacity-building efforts targeted gender concepts to enhance the understanding and integration of gender-related issues among national child project teams and stakeholders. For instance, training sessions and webinars were organized on topics such as gender-responsive FLR, integrating gender into monitoring and evaluation, and addressing gender-specific challenges in accessing finance. Among the most notable efforts were a dedicated gender session during the 2019 workshop in Rome and training programs on FLR finance that included gender-specific content. The ELTI online learning course further reinforced these efforts by integrating gender considerations into its curriculum, equipping participants with knowledge on how to incorporate gender responsiveness in FLR implementation.

The Restoration Factory also introduced a gender balance criterion to ensure access for women entrepreneurs and businesses led by women; and achieved a 40 percent participation rate for women entrepreneurs in the first cohort and 50 percent in the second cohort. The Project also facilitated gender-focused discussions within its CoPs, ensuring that gender equity remained a cross-cutting theme in knowledge-sharing platforms.

The collection and reporting of gender-disaggregated data within the national child projects were inconsistent and presented a challenge throughout the project's lifecycle. The project's initial M&E framework lacked specific gender-sensitive indicators and did not emphasize collecting sex-disaggregated data. While the revised M&E framework aimed to address this gap, actual data collection and reporting remained

inconsistent. Given the GCP's focus on national-level executing partners and institutional stakeholders, there were inherent limitations in tracking gender-related outcomes at the community level.

The Restoration Factory was one of the few project components that collected gender-disaggregated data, ensuring gender balance in its selection criteria and tracking progress toward achieving a 50 percent female participation rate. The project also facilitated the collection of sex-disaggregated data in specific activities, such as surveys conducted for CoPs, which included gender-related questions.

In conclusion, while training and capacity-building efforts provided critical support for gender mainstreaming, the absence of a structured GAP and a formal gender analysis limited the project's ability to systematically address gender gaps. Ultimately, while the project made some efforts to integrate gender considerations, gaps in data collection and monitoring limited the ability to comprehensively assess its contributions to gender equity.

Lessons learned

To duly prioritize the role of women in FLR, projects must:

- Develop a structured Gender Action Plan at both the Programme and project levels to ensure consistent tracking of gender-disaggregated data.
- Increase participation of women in FLR-related decision-making through leadership training and targeted capacity-building programs.
- Ensure gender-sensitive design of financial mechanisms to improve women's access to FLR funding and entrepreneurial opportunities.

D. Knowledge Management

The TRI Programme has significantly exceeded its overall target for publishing the best practices, achieving 250% of the planned goal across all project countries. As depicted in figure 16, several countries far surpassed their targets, including STP (950%), CAR (500%), Kenya ASAL (280%), and Pakistan (280%), demonstrating strong efforts in documenting and disseminating best practices. China (150%), and Cameroon (107%) also exceeded their goals, while Guinea-Bissau (100%) fully met its target. Kenya Tana River Delta (73%) and DRC (73%) are still processing towards its target. Although, target for Tanzania was not determined at the time of the Evaluation, it made notable contributions by producing 8 knowledge products. These results highlight the strong focus on knowledge product development across TRI countries, with some national child projects making exceptional contributions while others may require additional efforts to fully meet their targets.

A key pattern observed is that countries with strong institutional frameworks, such as Kenya, Cameroon, and China, utilized a mix of print, digital, and audiovisual materials, while others, like Guinea-Bissau and Tanzania, focused on mass media and international visibility. Countries with significant local community engagement, like DRC and CAR, developed region-specific educational tools such as comic books, illustrated guides, and training manuals to ensure accessibility.

At the TRI Programme-level various knowledge products, including annual reports, newsletters, and online courses, were developed to capture and disseminate lessons learned. Stakeholder interviews emphasized the value of knowledge sharing. In particular, the TRI web portal, a harmonized M&E framework, and the internal Dgroup online platform facilitated knowledge exchange among countries. Key publications, such as

the TRI Year in Review, disseminated valuable insights and lessons learned, contributing to the broader promotion of FLR practices.

Overall, TRI countries employed a combination of communication methods tailored to their specific audience, balancing technical knowledge-sharing, mass media outreach, and public engagement to effectively promote FLR initiatives. Considering the low literacy levels and digital accessibility in most Programme countries, the use of illustrative guides and audio-visual channels is encouraging. Similarly, initiatives such as Kenya ASAL's webinar series and Guinea-Bissau's participation in COP 27 highlight efforts to position TRI projects on global platforms. Furthermore, interviews with stakeholders revealed that they found the Programme-level knowledge resources, e.g. the TRI Year in Review report as well as the exchange visits to Programme countries particularly useful. The survey findings indicate that the quality of knowledge products and tools developed and disseminated by the TRI Programme is highly regarded by respondents. A majority (51.43%) rated them as 'Excellent,' while 40% rated them as 'Good.' Only a small percentage (8.57%) remained neutral, suggesting that the knowledge products were generally well-received and considered valuable.

However, due to the lack of a standardized framework for monitoring the reach, utility, and effectiveness of knowledge products across countries, the evaluation was unable to fully assess their effectiveness. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that these knowledge products made at least some contribution to the Programme's overall effectiveness in areas such as policy (CI 1) and mobilizing flow of financial resources for restoration (CI 7). Furthermore, as elaborated in the section on Efficiency and M&E, this component often suffered from low resource allocation in the national child project budgets.

Although requests were made for in-country knowledge management and communication support, the GCP's lack of resources and mandate prevented it from responding to requests for in-country knowledge management and communication support.

Lessons learned

To further enhance its work in FLR knowledge sharing and capacity building, future projects should:

- Expand South-South cooperation and exchange programs with dedicated funding for peer-learning and country-to-country technical support.
- Improve accessibility of knowledge products by expanding multilingual translations and ensuring materials are available in Portuguese, French, and other relevant languages.

III. Core Indicators

Indicator 3 Area of land and ecosystems under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	321947		356907

Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 3.2 Area of forest and forest land under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	321,947.00		356,907.00

Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and woodland under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
---------------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	649490		715164

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	649,490.00		715,164.00

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
---------------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported

Name of the OECMs	WDPA-ID	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
-------------------	---------	----------------------------	--	----------------------------	---------------------------

Documents (Document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)		86494133		34486662
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)		9185160		12414959

Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)		86,494,133		34,486,662
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)		9,185,160		12,414,959
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)
------------	---------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		325,404	0	279,508
Male		325,404	0	343,915
Total	0	650,808	0	623,423

IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO(\$)	Materialized at MTR(\$)	Materialized at TE(\$)
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	750,000.00		750,000.00
GEF Agency	IUCN	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,560,000.00		1,560,000.00
GEF Agency	IUCN	Grant	Investment mobilized	390,000.00		390,000.00
GEF Agency	UN Environment REDD+ Programme	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,000,000.00		1,000,000.00
GEF Agency	UN Environment Finance Initiative	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	50,000.00		50,000.00
GEF Agency	UN Environment Finance Initiative	Grant	Investment mobilized	150,000.00		150,000.00
Total Co-financing				3,900,000.00	0.00	3,900,000.00

Comments

The Global Child Project mobilized co-financing solely in the form of grants and in-kind contributions. The total co-financing committed amounted to USD 3.9 million, and this was fully disbursed by the end of implementation. IUCN provided USD 1.95 million against a commitment of USD 1.9 million, exceeding its pledge by 8%. UNEP and FAO each delivered their full commitments of USD 1.2 million and USD 750,000 respectively. This demonstrated strong financial delivery against the co-finance targets and ensured the availability of complementary resources to support the GCP's mandate. A comparative overview of the committed versus actual disbursed amounts by each co-financing partner is presented in Figure 26: Percentage of Co-financing Commitments Provided by IAs. The co-financing mobilization was primarily composed of staff time, technical advisory services, and contributions to project-related outputs and activities. These in-kind contributions played a central role in supporting coordination, knowledge generation, and capacity-building across the programme. The financial grants were used to support core areas such as programme management, communications, monitoring and evaluation, training activities, and the development of technical and learning tools.

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
		Low	Low

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

The GCP adhered to GEF's environmental and social safeguards policies within the parameters of its low-risk classification, met the minimum safeguards requirements set by GEF, and no violations were reported. As the Project was classified as low risk during the ESMS screening at project inception. Consequently, a detailed Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) was not required, and the project design did not include explicit mitigation and management measures for potential environmental and social risks. The project's primary focus on FLR, knowledge sharing, and policy support, which generally yield positive environmental and social outcomes, was a key factor in this classification.

While the project's objectives aligned with positive environmental and social benefits, the project design and reporting lacked evidence of a comprehensive safeguards assessment. This absence meant that key safeguards themes, such as gender considerations, the inclusion of vulnerable and marginalized groups, Indigenous peoples' rights, biodiversity conservation, and climate resilience, were not systematically integrated as risk mitigation components. However, given the nature of the GCP, there was very limited direct engagement with marginalized groups, Indigenous Peoples, or other affected communities. Nevertheless, these themes were implicitly reflected in project activities.

Additionally, the project design did not incorporate a structured environmental and social risk monitoring system, which could have enabled proactive tracking of emerging issues. While the low-risk classification justified the absence of a detailed ESMP, integrating a basic monitoring framework could have strengthened safeguards integration and ensured continuous risk assessment throughout implementation.

However, no significant unforeseen environmental or social risks emerged during the implementation of the GCP. The project reporting consistently maintained a low-risk status, and no new or escalating risks requiring mitigation were reported. The project's nature, focused on policy engagement, knowledge sharing, and capacity building rather than direct on-the-ground interventions, minimized the likelihood of encountering environmental or social risks.

Unlike TRI national child projects, which faced land tenure challenges, biodiversity disturbances, and climate-related constraints, the GCP did not engage in activities that could directly contribute to such risks. As a result, land-related conflicts, environmental degradation, or social grievances were not reported under the GCP. In conclusion, the GCP design lacked explicit mitigation measures due to its low-risk classification, though its focus aligned with positive environmental and social outcomes. No significant unforeseen risks emerged, and its nature minimized potential challenges. While the project adhered to GEF's safeguards policies, the absence of structured tracking limited documentation of compliance beyond initial risk classification.

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category M and E Document	Title Management Responses to Final Evaluation of TRI
Document Category M and E Document	Title Independent Final Evaluation of “The TRI Global Child Project and TRI Programme”