PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

Project ID:	11122
Project Name:	Ecosystem Restoration Global Coordination Project
Countr(ies):	Global
Implementing Agency:	CI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW 3
A. Description 3
B. Ratings and Disbursements 3
C. Key Dates 3
II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES 4
A. Progress: Information on progress and outcomes of project implementation activities 4
B. Challenges: Information on challenges of project implementation activities 7
C. Stakeholder Engagement 7
D. Gender Equality 8
E. Knowledge Management 10
III: MINOR AMENDMENTS 11
IV: GEOGRAPHIC COORDINATES OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES 13
V. ANNEX 14

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name
Ecosystem Restoration Global Coordination Project

Country
Global

GEF ID	Implementing Agency
11122	CI

Executing Entity

Trust Fund	Project Type
GET	FSP

PIR Submission	Fiscal Year , PIR Number
9/7/2026	FY 2026 , 2nd PIR

Objective
To scale Global Environmental Benefits through coordinated governance of the GEF-8 Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Program and targeted support to 20 innovative country child projects in catalyzing transformational shifts in ecosystem restoration.

B. Ratings and Disbursements

Implementation Progress	Development Objective
Satisfactory	Satisfactory

Overall risk
Low Risk

Project Financing	Cumulative Disbursement
19,413,000.00	4,113,615.00

C. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval	Agency Approval
3/22/2024	3/22/2024

Implementation Start 3/23/2024	First Disbursement 4/30/2024
Expected MTR 10/1/2027	Actual MTR
Expected Completion 3/30/2031	Actual Completion

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Progress: Information on progress and outcomes of project implementation activities

Component 1: Restoration is catalyzed through innovative and informed ecosystem governance, policy, finance and enabling conditions:
During FY26, progress focused on designing capacity-building programs aligned with country priorities and developing actionable tools to assess enabling conditions and support decision-making.

Strengthening multistakeholder coordination and governance:

In collaboration with WRI, FY26 efforts concentrated on the design and operationalization of a capacity-building program to strengthen multistakeholder coordination for restoration. This work was grounded in a comprehensive, country-driven assessment drawing on Project Documents (ProDocs), capacity needs analyses, UNDP country briefs, and stakeholder input collected during the ERIP Annual Meeting in Cambodia. This process identified priority capacity gaps across countries—particularly in governance, coordination, and policy alignment—which informed the development of a structured program organized around three core thematic areas: Policy Alignment, Restoration Governance and Coordination, and Global Action for Restoration. Looking ahead, the capacity-building program will culminate in regional and global dialogue exchanges. During FY26, a concept note and stakeholder mapping were developed to define the structure and objectives of these dialogues. Implementation is planned for 2027, with participation linked to completion of the multistakeholder coordination training modules and deployment of the Restoration Diagnostic Tool, ensuring that exchanges are grounded in country experience and generate actionable outcomes.

Building country capacity on restoration action planning and finance plans:

In parallel, collaboration with UNDP focused on designing structured capacity-building programs to strengthen country-level planning and financing for restoration.

For **Restoration Action Plans,** FY26 efforts centered on program design and readiness. Key assets—including concept notes, curricula, and participant communication materials were developed to support implementation. The program consists of a 21-week delivery model combining self-paced learning through Learning Journeys, facilitated workshops, and peer exchange, with integrated gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) considerations throughout. The program has a clear framework for engagement, data collection, and measurement of learning outcomes. The bootcamp was launched on June 22 with 181 participant registrations from 18 ERIP countries.

Similarly, the **Restoration Finance Plan** program was fully designed during FY26, building on the BIOFIN methodology and ERIP country's needs, with a structured curriculum organized around priority financing mechanisms, including payment for ecosystem services (PES), carbon markets, blended finance, restoration value chains, and private sector engagement. The program also consists of a 13-week blended learning model and incorporates GESI considerations. Participants will apply the methodology to their own country contexts and develop practical draft outputs that can inform funding proposals, budget allocations, investment cases, and engagement with public and private financiers. By the end of FY26, the curriculum and M&E framework were finalized, positioning the program for implementation in September 2026. As of the end of FY26, the number of people registered for this bootcamp is 199 covering 18 ERIP countries. This bootcamp is also open to other GEF Integrated Programs – the Global Wildlife Program and the Critical Forest Biome Integrated Program.

Innovation and tools:

Complementary to these efforts, progress was also made in advancing key knowledge products and tools to support restoration finance and decision-making, including the Restoration Diagnostic Tool, the Restoration Calculator and PES guidance:

In collaboration with WRI, the **Restoration Diagnostic Tool** was updated from its original 2015 release**,** which supports countries in identifying barriers and opportunities across enabling conditions for restoration. The revised tool expands beyond forest restoration to cover ecosystem restoration broadly. The thematic structure has been updated to reflect advances in restoration practice, incorporating two new modules on finance and gender. The former Excel-based tool is now an online tool that underwent user experience (UX) research with WRI's Data Lab and generates action-oriented outputs and dashboards. It is available in all ERIP languages (English, French, Spanish, and Portuguese) and it was publicly demonstrated at the GEF IP Global Forum in April 2026. Training on the tool has commenced with a subset of countries including Brazil, Madagascar, Chad, Mexico and Vietnam. Brazil and Vietnam are currently planning the deployment of the tool, while Madagascar, Chad and Mexico are interested in follow-up training sessions. Feedback focused on the need for facilitation guidance, engaging the right stakeholders, defining the scope of the assessment and practical aspects of deploying the tool. Countries also emphasized the importance of having continued technical support and training while conducting the assessments. In collaboration with CSF, progress continued to advance the **Restoration Calculator**, strengthening both its technical foundations and user-focused design. Building on the completion of a comprehensive review of restoration costs and benefits across six prioritized ecosystems and several restoration approaches, the team enhanced the Calculator through the integration of spatial datasets including natural regeneration potential and freshwater restoration prioritization layers. The economic model was also strengthened through the incorporation of social risks and logistical accessibility factors, enabling cost estimates to better reflect real-world implementation conditions. In response to feedback from ERIP countries, the tool now includes multiple analytical perspectives—social, private, and community—allowing users to assess restoration investments under different decision-making frameworks. The prototype is in the validation stage, including a user experience expert to support platform refinement based on interview feedback and 11 ecosystem-specific consultants who will collect and validate restoration cost data from ERIP countries helping fill gaps identified through the literature review. It is expected to launch the tool during the ERIP Annual Conference in November 2026.

CI advanced the development of a practical **Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) guide** to support countries in designing, financing, and implementing restoration-focused PES mechanisms. Progress included developing and refining the guide outline based on feedback and preparing a two-page executive summary and detailed table of contents. Technical experts and key informants were identified to strengthen the guidance through interviews and consultations. Content development focused on synthesizing global evidence, case studies, and lessons learned on PES design, financing, stakeholder engagement, monitoring systems, enabling conditions, and long-term sustainability. It is expected to launch the guide during the ERIP Annual Conference in November 2026.

Component 2. Restoration outcomes are enhanced through knowledge management, exchange, learning and strategic communications:

During FY26, the GCP significantly advanced capacity building opportunities, knowledge management, learning infrastructure and strategic communications of the program. Key progress included:

Training on Ecosystem Restoration: Building on earlier design work, the nine Learning Journeys content and structure of the Local Open Online Course were finalized, advancing through production stages (e.g., video recording and platform development in UNDP´s Learning for Nature Platform). In parallel, a structured monitoring framework with three data collection touchpoints (platform registration, pre-assessment, and post-assessment) was developed and validated to measure uptake and application of knowledge. The program has already been launched with participants of the Restoration Action Plans bootcamp taking Journey 1.

Assisted Natural Regeneration Training: The GCP launched the Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR) Practitioner Training Course on June 1st, 2026, in partnership with the ANR Alliance and the Society for Ecological Restoration. The multilingual eight-week online course provides practical training on ANR planning, implementation, monitoring, and knowledge exchange. As of the end of FY26, over 6,000 participants have registered, with 2,685 participants having started the course, representing 153 countries (17 ERIP countries). This initiative is strengthening restoration capacity across ERIP countries while building a global community of practitioners and supporting the integration of ANR into restoration efforts at multiple scales.

Climate Adaptation Training: CI advanced the preparation of this training supported by regular coordination meetings to refine its content and delivery approach. The training is scheduled for launch in September 2026 and is expected to strengthen practitioner capacity on the integration of climate adaptation considerations into ecosystem restoration.

Communities of Practice:

The GCP, along with partners ANR Alliance and the Freshwater Challenge, successfully launched and operationalized two Communities of Practice: Assisted Natural Regeneration and Freshwater Restoration. The CoPs serve as learning platforms focused on peer exchange, case studies, and practical guidance, with early findings highlighting strong demand for applied knowledge, community-centered approaches, and cross-sector integration.

Freshwater Restoration CoP: The first CoP meeting was held on May 7, 2026, formally launching the platform. The CoP is jointly led by the Freshwater Challenge as a global exchange platform for integrating freshwater into ecosystem restoration. During the session, four country case studies (South Africa, Mexico, Vietnam, Canada) showcased: i) Approaches to freshwater integration and ii)

Challenges in stakeholder engagement and cross-sector coordination, iii) Strengthening outcomes, linkages across ecosystems, and stakeholder engagement. The first meeting of the CoP had 41 participants in total from 21 countries (14 ERIP countries). As of FY26, 86 participants have registered to participate in this CoP.

Assisted Natural Regeneration: Two CoP meetings were held in June 2026, creating a space for exchange between practitioners on ANR implementation challenges and opportunities. The CoP is jointly led with the ANR Alliance as a global platform to support countries in scaling ANR as a cost-effective restoration approach. The CoP had 58 participants in total from 25 countries (12 ERIP countries). As of FY26, 138 participants have registered to participate in this CoP.

Knowledge management and Communications:

A major milestone was the expansion of the ERIP Digital Portal into a comprehensive platform supporting knowledge exchange, learning, collaboration, and communications across the 20 participating countries. The portal introduced a Resources Center, a secure Members Area, a Forum, dedicated pages for training opportunities and Communities of Practice (CoPs), and an expanding collection of multilingual restoration resources. By the end of FY26, the Members Area had registered 94 users and the Resource Hub contained more than 40 new resources, including 23 gender-mainstreamed documents, strengthening access to restoration knowledge and tools across the program. In addition, the Forum is actively supporting the Assisted Natural Regeneration and Freshwater Restoration Communities of Practice, as well as the Restoration Action Plan Bootcamp, facilitating discussions and cross-country exchange on restoration challenges and solutions.

Implementation of the Communication Strategy continued, increasing the visibility and coherence of ERIP communications. Key achievements included the establishment of the official ERIP LinkedIn account, publication of regular news articles highlighting country progress and global events, creation of dedicated webpages for training programs and Communities of Practice, and release of two program newsletters. The website increasingly served as the primary communication and engagement hub for country teams, partners, and external stakeholders, while social media and newsletters expanded ERIP's reach and strengthened partner engagement.

Spatial monitoring:

Substantial progress was made on spatial restoration monitoring systems and interoperability. ERIP advanced collaboration with FAO's Framework for Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring (FERM), the programme developed the technical foundation for Trends.Earth–FERM interoperability through a joint Scope of Work covering indicator mapping, metadata alignment, data transfer workflows, and integration requirements. Preparatory activities also prioritized pilot datasets and assessed data accessibility and hosting arrangements to support future interoperability testing. Engagements with Restor, TerraMatch, MyFarmTrees, and the UN Biodiversity Lab further expanded opportunities for alignment across complementary restoration monitoring platforms. Collectively, these efforts strengthened ERIP's capacity to support harmonized spatial monitoring and future reporting across global restoration initiatives.

Component 3: Governance, Coordination and Adaptive Management of the Ecosystem Restoration IP:
During FY26, the GCP continued to strengthen the program´s governance architecture and adaptive management mechanisms, expanding country engagement and improving alignment of country projects with program standards.

Governance and Coordination:
The Project Steering Committee (PSC) met regularly throughout the year, including an in-person meeting during the ERIP Annual Conference in Cambodia and subsequent virtual meetings. PSC members provided strategic guidance on governance, capacity building, country engagement, restoration tools, and program implementation. Recommendations from the PSC were systematically adopted by the Global Coordination Project (GCP), including actions related to country onboarding, governance representation, communication protocols, annual conference planning, and the operationalization of the Technical Project Task Force and Restoration Advisory Pane. Progress was also made in establishing the Restoration Advisory Panel (RAP). Throughout the year, nominations were collected to ensure diverse representation across regions and stakeholder groups, including civil society, private sector, women, and Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities. By the end of FY26, the first RAP event had been held, and opportunities were identified for collaboration at major international events including the UNCCD COP.

Program M&E and Adaptive Management:

The GCP advanced efforts to harmonize monitoring and evaluation approaches across country projects. Presentations, technical support missions, bilateral meetings, and the launch of the ERIP M&E Working Group provided support to countries to better understand ERIP indicators, reporting requirements, and data collection methodologies. Countries including Brazil, Madagascar,

Rwanda, Nepal, Haiti, South Africa, Chad, DRC, Angola, Mauritania, and Mexico received support and feedback to align indicators with ERIP standards. Two M&E Working Group sessions were held during the reporting period, bringing together country specialists to facilitate peer learning, clarify reporting expectations, and strengthen methodological consistency on indicators across the program.

Adaptive management processes were strengthened through regular engagement with Project Management Units and GEF Agencies. Bilateral calls were held with multiple countries to support project startup, discuss indicators, and discuss implementation challenges. The program also reviewed available country work plans to ensure alignment with program-level objectives. Lessons learned and recommendations from governance bodies and monitoring processes were incorporated into planning and decision-making, reinforcing the program's adaptive management approach.

Component 4: Global Coordination Project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E):

The GCP strengthened reporting systems, updated the M&E Plan, and refined project indicators to improve data quality and usability. PSC guidance informed improvements to country engagement approaches, governance mechanisms, training and technical assistance activities, knowledge-sharing efforts, and the integration of gender considerations. An in-person annual work-planning workshop in Nairobi further supported reflection on implementation progress, integration of PSC recommendations, and the development of the FY27 work plan, strengthening accountability, evidence-based decision-making, and adaptive management.

B. Challenges: Information on challenges of project implementation activities

Implementation challenges during FY26 included coordinating activities across multiple partners and establishing systems to support upcoming capacity-building activities. Delays were encountered in confirming participant cohorts, aligning partner outreach efforts, and navigating administrative and budget adjustments required to support program delivery and tool development. These challenges are being mitigated through close coordination among GCP partners, leveraging existing country engagement mechanisms, streamlining registration and outreach processes, and implementing proactive planning.

The GCP also faced challenges in ensuring broad engagement across all 20 ERIP country projects. As many country projects are at different stages of implementation readiness, opportunities for participation in technical activities have varied, with some countries already actively engaging in capacity-building and knowledge exchange opportunities while others are still mobilizing project teams or finalizing implementation arrangements. This uneven pace of implementation creates challenges in achieving consistent participation across the program and requires partners and the GCP to adapt outreach, provide flexible engagement opportunities, and coordinate closely to align activities with country needs and readiness levels.

Private-sector engagement also presented implementation challenges during FY26. Consultations with ERIP countries, corporate partners, and technical experts highlighted that many child projects were not yet ready to engage effectively with businesses or pursue financing opportunities. Key constraints included the absence of appropriate legal and institutional frameworks in some cases, limited project-level pipelines suitable for investment, the time required to navigate multiple governance and approval layers, and the complexity of aligning corporate interests with country priorities and the wider ERIP program architecture. These findings prompted the GCP to review its private-sector engagement strategy, with the aim of shifting toward a more realistic and country-responsive approach that strengthens enabling conditions, builds country capacity, and provides targeted support where viable opportunities emerge.

Establishing the collaboration with FAO represented a significant implementation challenge during FY26. Initial plans for direct engagement with FAO could not move forward due to institutional and contractual constraints, requiring the project team to identify an alternative partnership arrangement that would still allow ERIP to benefit from FAO's technical expertise and leadership within the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration. This led to the development of a more complex collaboration model involving both FAO and the Society for Ecological Restoration (SER). Considerable time was required to clarify roles, funding mechanisms, co-financing arrangements, and implementation responsibilities, while the scope of the collaboration continued to evolve to include additional technical workstreams and capacity-building activities. Despite these challenges, the GCP team worked closely with FAO and SER to develop a revised and more strategic collaboration framework aligned with ERIP priorities, positioning the partnership for implementation during the next reporting period.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

During FY26, the project strengthened the foundations for inclusive engagement across the program by integrating Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) considerations into capacity-building initiatives, governance structures and stakeholder engagement processes. Stakeholder mapping conducted during the ERIP Annual Meeting in Cambodia explicitly included Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs), women, local organizations, governments, NGOs, financial institutions, and private sector actors to inform future multistakeholder platforms and exchanges. In addition, the Restoration Advisory Panel includes representatives from historically marginalized groups, helping ensure that diverse perspectives and lived experiences inform strategic discussions, and restoration priorities.
The program achieved broad participation across its learning and capacity-building portfolio. Among participants in the ANR Practitioner Training and UNDP Ecosystem Restoration Learning Journey, 47% were women, 39% identified as members of local communities, and 12% identified as Indigenous Peoples. These learning opportunities reached participants from 155 countries and created pathways for more inclusive participation in restoration knowledge sharing and capacity development. Survey results from the Learning Journey also indicated that 88% of participants reported increased restoration capacity, including women, Indigenous Peoples, and local community participants. A key challenge for the program is ensuring that traditional and local knowledge is meaningfully incorporated into restoration planning, learning activities, and knowledge products across the portfolio. While ERIP has established inclusive engagement mechanisms and representation from marginalized groups within its advisory structures, further work is needed to create systematic approaches for capturing, sharing, and applying traditional knowledge across countries and partners, while strictly upholding Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) and recognizing traditional intellectual property rights.
In FY27, engagement is expected to expand through the Community of Practice on Gender and Restoration, as well as a proposed community engagement and/or traditional knowledge initiative, creating further opportunities to involve diverse groups.

D. Gender Equality

a) All activities anticipated by the GMP were implemented? Yes/No Why?

Yes, most activities planned for this year were implemented, below a description:

Technical assistance was provided to several countries to strengthen local frameworks, including support to Haiti on inclusive governance and finance, review of Mauritania's baseline study terms of reference, and recommendations for Rwanda's Gender and Anti-GBV Action Plan. GCP also reviewed Madagascar's Gender Action Plan and Safeguards Plan and shared reference materials with Angola to inform its manual on female-led restoration.

In collaboration with CI-GEF, the team began developing a Safeguards and Restoration Tool to provide practical operational guidance for assessing and managing environmental and social risks in ecosystem restoration projects.

As part of a GEF Gender Community of Practice benchmark study, the project assessed 10 child projects to document good practices using the RBET framework (Reach, Benefit, Empowerment, and Transformative). Findings were validated through bilateral consultations with focal points from Madagascar, Brazil, DRC, Mauritania, and Mexico.

A Needs and Preferences Survey was developed to assess country focal points' capacities and inform tailored support and priority learning themes. The survey showed a moderate capacity baseline among focal points, many of whom are new to formal GESI and safeguards roles. This points to a strong opportunity to draw on internal expertise through peer mentorship. Key priorities also emerged, including integrating HRBA and GEWE into restoration programming, leveraging Indigenous and traditional knowledge, and M&E reporting. An onboarding package was also prepared to support effective learning and engagement among GESI and Safeguards focal points. It includes harmonized GESI definitions, guidance on gender-responsive ecosystem restoration, and draft Terms of Reference for the GESI/Safeguards Working Group.

The project refined its GAP and indicators to improve measurability by removing duplicative indicators and focusing on concrete, trackable actions, including accessibility and the visibility of underrepresented groups.

AGM:

GCP AGM dissemination materials were improved and made available in four languages to support their use and circulation during events.

The GCP AGM was shared through the ERIP webpage, bilateral meetings with eight countries—Angola, Haiti, Madagascar, DRC, Chad, Brazil, Nepal, and Cambodia—as well as PSC and RAP meetings and with all hired GESI and Safeguards focal points.

To reduce ineligible submissions, the AGM website was reviewed for clarity, and procedures were updated to include a consent-based referral process for grievances outside the project's scope.

Although the vast majority of planned activities were implemented, two activities experienced delays.

The first was the formal launch of the GESI & Safeguards Working Group. While the launch occurred later than initially anticipated, several preparatory actions were undertaken during the reporting period. These efforts laid the foundation for the Working Group, whose first meeting was successfully held on July 7, 2026.

The second activity was the design and establishment of the Gender and Restoration CoP. Rather than proceeding immediately with a new platform, the project undertook a landscape review of existing initiatives to identify potential partners and avoid duplication of effort. Discussions were held with the manager of Initiative 20x20's Gender & Social Equity Community of Practice to explore collaboration opportunities. However, the assessment found that existing initiatives either have a regional focus, are heavily policy-oriented without sufficient technical restoration expertise, or lack the institutional capacity to support a global program. As a result, the project determined that no existing platform fully met ERIP's needs.

Did the project face any challenges to implementing GMP as initially proposed? Please describe the challenges in case there were any.

The main challenge was identifying an appropriate institutional partnership model for the Gender and Restoration CoP. The review of existing initiatives revealed a fragmented landscape, with no single organization combining global reach, technical restoration expertise, and grassroots engagement. This required additional time to assess options and identify the most effective and sustainable approach.

In response, the project adapted its strategy and decided to co-create the CoP with the newly established GESI & Safeguards Working Group during FY27. The establishment of the Working Group on July 7, 2026, marked an important milestone, and the CoP was already introduced as an agenda item during the inaugural meeting. This approach is expected to ensure that the CoP is demand-driven, grounded in country needs, and aligned with the broader objectives of ERIP.

As compared to the original GMP, was any adaptive management applied to promote meaningful participation of women and advance towards other gender sensitive targets?

Although the project is still in its early stages, initial beneficiary data for GCP activities is encouraging, showing a near gender balance of 47% women and 51% men (2% prefer not to answer).As additional data becomes available, the project will continue monitoring these trends to identify where targeted interventions may be needed to strengthen, refine, and sustain its gender-sensitive targets over time.

Did the project team/stakeholders observe any unintended outcomes (positive or negative) related to gender equality, that are difficult to capture in a quantitative way during this period of time? For example women are more active in decision-making processes in the project, or public servants are more interested and open to advance gender outcomes, men or women are more reluctant to participate in the project activities, or other similar situations.

While it is still too early to identify clear behavioral or social changes on the ground, an important operational trend is emerging in how national teams are organizing GESI and Safeguards staffing. Rather than following a common model, countries are adopting varied human resource arrangements, which may affect the GCP team's ability to engage effectively with countries on gender and safeguards issues.
To date, 8 of the 20 ERIP countries have recruited GESI and/or Safeguards leads, with a clear 50–50 split in staffing models. Half have appointed one focal point to cover both thematic areas, while the other half have assigned them to two separate, dedicated roles.
Findings from the recent Needs and Preferences Survey also show varying levels of time commitment among the 13 onboarded focal points. Nine respondents are fully dedicated to the GEF-8 ERIP Child Project, while four work part-time, with availability ranging from one day per week to 30–40% capacity. Some national projects are also relying on short-term consultants instead of permanent staff, which may affect GCP engagement going forward.

The GCP is following up to clarify staffing models where information remains limited. For two particular projects, no dedicated GESI or safeguards roles are currently planned. The GCP is engaging with the Implementing Agency to better understand how these responsibilities are covered under their operational model, which does not rely on dedicated leads in the same way as other agencies in the program.
For the remaining ERIP countries, visibility is still limited because PMUs have either not yet been hired or were established too recently to assess. The GCP will continue close follow-up across the program to map these staffing arrangements and ensure all institutional models effectively support meaningful participation and strong gender outcomes.

Considering all the above, what are the recommendations for next FY to continue advancing towards gender sensitive targets?

In FY27, the project will continue advancing gender-sensitive targets by strengthening coordination, capacity, and learning across the ERIP portfolio.

A key priority will be to strengthen the newly established GESI & Safeguards Working Group as a platform for peer learning, technical exchange, and joint problem-solving across countries. The Working Group will also inform the co-creation of the Gender and Restoration CoP, ensuring its design is grounded in country teams' practical needs and interests. This demand-driven approach responds directly to country-level priorities while avoiding duplication with existing external platforms.

The project will continue providing targeted technical assistance to child projects, with a focus on strengthening Gender Action Plan implementation, inclusive governance, gender-responsive restoration practices, and safeguards compliance. Drawing on the Needs and Preferences Survey, support and learning opportunities will be tailored to countries' differing capacities, staffing arrangements, and human resource structures.

The GCP will also continue engaging strategic partners and networks working at the intersection of gender and restoration to promote knowledge exchange, amplify good practices, and identify collaboration opportunities. Where possible, the project will leverage existing platforms rather than creating parallel structures

E. Knowledge Management

During FY26, the GCP significantly advanced implementation of the program´s Knowledge Management Strategy by establishing the systems, processes, partnerships, learning platforms, and communication channels needed to facilitate knowledge exchange across the program's participating countries.

Capturing, curating, and storing knowledge

The ERIP Digital Portal continued to expand as the program's central repository for knowledge and learning resources. By the end of FY26, the portal provided access to more than 80 resources, including 23 resources integrating gender considerations, as well as training materials, technical guidance, and collaboration spaces.

The GCP also advanced the development and documentation of key knowledge products and decision-support tools, including the Restoration Diagnostic Tool, which entered the piloting phase; the ANR Readiness Diagnostic; ANR case studies; the Restoration Calculator, which entered validation; and Payment for Ecosystem Services guidance, which remained under development.

Facilitating learning and knowledge exchange

A major milestone was the ERIP Annual Conference held in Cambodia during September 1-4, 2025, in partnership with the Cambodian Ministry of Environment and UNDP Cambodia. The Conference served as the program's flagship knowledge-sharing event, bringing together country teams, implementing agencies, technical partners, and stakeholders to exchange experiences, discuss implementation challenges, and strengthen collaboration across the Integrated Program. A total of 81 participants (17 ERIP countries) engaged in country presentations, knowledge co-labs, technical clinics, panel discussions, partner roundtables, and a field visit to restoration sites within Phnom Kulen National Park.

The conference complemented a broader suite of learning activities already under implementation, including Communities of Practice on Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR) and Freshwater Restoration, ANR training course, UNDP´s learning journeys on ecosystem restoration, UNDP's Ecosystem Restoration Learning Journeys, and the Restoration Action Planning Bootcamp.

The GCP also operationalized the ERIP Forum and Members Area within the Digital Portal. The Forum provides an interactive space for peer exchange, problem-solving, and discussion among country teams, practitioners, and partners. By Q4 FY26, it was

supporting the ANR and Freshwater Restoration Communities of Practice and the Restoration Action Planning Bootcamp, with discussions and posts facilitating cross-country learning and collaboration.

Sharing and disseminating knowledge

The GCP and ERIP countries also participated in knowledge exchanges with other GEF Integrated Programs and external partners. At the Global Forum for GEF Integrated Programs in Nairobi in April 2026, the GCP contributed to technical exchanges on integrated governance, results management, spatial tools, coordination, and program design. It also co-organized sessions on multilevel governance, the Restoration Diagnostic Tool, systems-change monitoring, Integrated Program design and governance, spatial reporting across the Rio Conventions, project start-up, and restoration across GEF cycles. Representatives from Brazil, Cambodia, Madagascar, Mexico, and Rwanda participated, strengthening cross-program learning and identifying opportunities for collaboration.
ERIP also participated in the Global Wildlife Program Protected Areas Conference in China in May 2026. The event supported exchange on protected and conserved area planning, governance, financing, restoration, and management effectiveness. Participants engaged in peer learning and field visits, including to Sichuan Giant Panda National Park, where they observed restoration approaches linking habitat connectivity, conservation, community engagement, and environmental education.

III: Minor Amendments

CONTEXT	
Result Framework	Indicator 2.1.5 (including target) Original Indicator: Indicator 2.1.5: % and diversity of GEF8 Ecosystem Restoration IP portal users engaged in restoration communities of practice, disaggregated by gender, sector, IP&LCs, youth, vulnerable people. Original Target: 50% of portal users surveyed report engagement in restoration communities of practice Proposed Indicator: Indicator 2.1.5: % and diversity of participants in Ecosystem Restoration IP–supported Communities of Practice, disaggregated by gender, sector, Indigenous Peoples, local communities, and youth. Proposed Target: 40% women 5% Indigenous People 5% youth 5% local communities Justification: We think the proposed indicator is stronger than the original because it shifts measurement from passive portal usage and self-reported engagement to active participation in Ecosystem Restoration IP–supported Communities of Practice. By setting explicit participation benchmarks for women, Indigenous Peoples, local communities, and youth, we are operationalizing GESI and providing a more accurate, actionable, and evaluable measure of inclusive knowledge exchange and capacity building. In addition, the original indicator used portal users as a proxy for CoP engagement, which is not appropriate given CoPs are targeted technical networks rather than mass participation platforms. The revised indicator directly measures active participation, improving relevance, evaluability, and alignment with program objectives and GESI outcomes. Indicator 4.1.1 Original Indicator: Indicator 4.1.1: M&E Reports approved by the PSC. Proposed Indicator: Indicator 4.1.1: M&E Reports shared with the PSC Justification: The Project Steering Committee does not approve our reports according to the ToR of the PSC, which was reviewed by the PSC members: EN_ERIP Governance & Decision Making

	Framework.docx . However, the GCP shares M&E reports with the PSC. Indicators 1.1b; 1.1.1; 1.2a; 1.2b; 1.2.1; 1.3.1; 2.1a; 2.1.1; 3.1b. Original indicators included vulnerable people as a disaggregation category. The proposed indicators are the same but do not have this disaggregation category. Justification: The term “vulnerable people” is often context-specific and lacks a universally agreed definition across the 20 ERIP countries, making aggregation difficult and reducing comparability of reported data. The GCP therefore revised indicators to focus on demographic categories that can be clearly defined, ethically collected, and consistently reported across activities, including women, Indigenous Peoples, local communities, and youth. Indicator 2.1.1 Original Indicator: Indicator 2.1.1: The number of users, registered in the portal and receiving communications, disaggregated by gender, sector, IP&LCs, youth, vulnerable people Proposed Indicator: Indicator 2.1.1: The number of users registered in the portal and receiving communications. Justification: This indicator is intended to measure the reach of the ERIP Portal and communications rather than the demographic characteristics of users. Because portal registration is designed to minimize barriers to entry and maximize participation, demographic information is not collected as part of the registration process. Tracking demographic disaggregation through this indicator would therefore require substantial modifications to the platform, increase the burden on users, and potentially reduce registration rates. Demographic inclusion is more appropriately measured through participation-based indicators. Consequently, the simplified indicator provides a more feasible, accurate, and cost-effective measure of portal engagement while avoiding duplication with other ERIP GESI-related indicators. Output 1.3.2 (including indicator and target) Original Output: Output 1.3.2: Proposals and Partnerships supporting incremental financing approved from national, regional and/or global funding sources, including private sector Original Indicator: Indicator 1.3.2: Number of proposals and partnerships approved, disaggregated by those incorporating GESI considerations/ requirements. Original Target: Target 1.3.2: 10 proposals and partnerships approved. Proposed Output: Output 1.3.2 Tailored advisory support provided to countries and child projects to identify restoration finance options including suitable private-sector engagement. Proposed Indicator: Indicator 1.3.2 Number of countries or child projects receiving tailored support to assess financing pathways and institutional readiness needs including private sector engagement options Proposed Target: 10 countries or child projects receive tailored support, with documented recommendations or follow-up actions. Justification: The original output, indicator, and target focused on the approval of financing proposals and partnerships, which are influenced by a range of external factors beyond the direct control of the GCP, including country readiness, national decision-making processes, investor interest, partner priorities, and funding approval mechanisms. Experience during the

	initial years of implementation has demonstrated that many child projects are still building the foundations necessary to pursue restoration finance opportunities and would benefit most from targeted technical assistance, advisory services, and support to assess financing pathways and institutional readiness. The revised output therefore better reflects the GCP's role in providing tailored support to countries and child projects to identify restoration finance options, including appropriate private-sector engagement opportunities. The revised indicator and target focus on a result that is directly attributable to GCP activities and can be consistently verified through documented assessments, recommendations, and follow-up actions. This change does not reduce ambition; rather, it shifts the measurement framework toward a critical enabling step that strengthens countries' readiness to develop future financing proposals, partnerships, and investment opportunities, while ensuring that progress can be realistically achieved and robustly reported within the program timeframe.
Components and Cost	
Institutional And Implementation Arrangements	
Financial Management	
Implementation Schedule	
Executing Entity	
Executing Entity Category	
Minor Project Objective Change	
Safeguards	
Risk Analysis	
Increase of GEF Financing up to 5%	
Co-Financing	
Location of Project Activity	
others	

IV: Geographic Coordinates of Project Activities

V. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Title
M and E Document	Sept 2026_FY26 PIR_11122_ERIP
M and E Document	ERIP GEF Core Indicator Reporting_FY26