

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

Project ID:	11124
Project Name:	Union for Restoration - Enabling large-scale restoration through national policy in Brazil (GEF-PROVEG)
Countr(ies):	Brazil
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	6
C. Stakeholder Engagement	6
D. Gender Equality	8
E. Knowledge Management	9
III: MINOR AMENDMENTS	10
IV: GEOGRAPHIC COORDINATES OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES	11
V. ANNEX	12

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name

Union for Restoration - Enabling large-scale restoration through national policy in Brazil (GEF-PROVEG)

Country

Brazil

GEF ID

11124

Implementing Agency

CI

Executing Entity

WRI Brazil

Trust Fund

GET

Project Type

FSP

PIR Submission

9/10/2026

Fiscal Year , PIR Number

FY 2026 , 1st PIR

Objective

Promote structuring conditions for large-scale restoration in Brazil

B. Ratings and Disbursements

Implementation Progress

Moderately Unsatisfactory

Development Objective

Moderately Unsatisfactory

Overall risk

Moderate Risk

Project Financing

14,603,000.00

Cumulative Disbursement

1,339,725.00

C. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

12/10/2024

Agency Approval

9/9/2026

Implementation Start

5/23/2025

First Disbursement

6/16/2025

Expected MTR 1/31/2028	Actual MTR
Expected Completion 12/31/2030	Actual Completion

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

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

Under Component 1, the project made progress in advancing normative instruments, institutional coordination, and the technical and operational foundations required to advance the native vegetation recovery agenda in Brazil.

A key achievement was the development and approval of the Draft CONAVEG Resolution on 'Restoration Territories,' which was developed through a participatory process involving the MMA, biome-level restoration networks, and CONAVEG governance bodies. The process included multiple rounds of consultation and validation—including contributions from the restoration networks, deliberation by CONAVEG's Territorial Coordination Unit (Núcleo de Articulação Territorial - NAT, in Portuguese), and reviews by CONAVEG itself—ensuring the instrument's technical and political legitimacy. Following its approval, the draft proceeded to legal review and the institutional process required for its adoption as a ministerial resolution. In parallel, the project provided technical support for the revision and approval of CONAVEG Resolution No. 9/2026, which establishes guidelines for Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR), representing an important step forward in defining technical parameters for the restoration agenda.

In addition, progress was made in supporting the CONAVEG Executive Secretariat through the initiation of the recruitment process for a specialized consultancy that will be responsible for assessing, mapping, and analyzing the existing legal framework, identifying bottlenecks and opportunities to increase the scale and effectiveness of restoration implementation. This work will provide a critical basis for identifying the public policies that should be prioritized and supported by the project over the coming years, thereby contributing to the achievement of the proposed outcome.

At the subnational level, progress was achieved through technical and policy coordination with priority states (Minas Gerais, Pará, and Mato Grosso) and partner institutions. Multiple alignment, engagement and exploratory meetings were held, providing a broader understanding of the implementation status of the environmental regularization agenda in each context. Particular emphasis should be given to the kick-off meetings—already completed in Minas Gerais and underway in the other priority states—which have formally launched implementation activities while identifying context-specific challenges and opportunities. The project also supported for the development of the Native Vegetation Recovery Program in Federal Protected Areas, in partnership with ICMBio, MMA, and other technical organizations. This process includes technical assistance, stakeholder coordination, and the recruitment of specialized consultancy services to prepare diagnostics, action plans, and a communication plan. The project also implemented an engagement strategy in relevant forums, such as SAPIS/ELAPIS (Brazilian Seminar on Protected Areas and Social Inclusion (SAPIS) and Latin American Conference on Protected Areas and Social Inclusion (ELAPIS), increasing visibility and institutional alignment. The methodological approach includes participatory stages, such as interviews, technical workshops, and validation processes, with the program expected to be finalized by the end of the year.

In addition, important progress was made in the development of the National System for Geospatial Monitoring and Reporting of Areas Undergoing Native Vegetation Recovery, an institutional partnership coordinated by MMA. Following the initial consolidation and dissemination of data during COP30, efforts focused on refining the methodology and defining the platform's technical requirements, with the system to be hosted by INPE. The in-person technical workshop represented an important milestone for aligning participating institutions and defining the scope of future consultancy contracts, including back-end and front-end system development. The project is now preparing for the implementation of the system's first operational version.

Regarding Component 2, progress was made in establishing the technical, institutional, and territorial foundations required to strengthen the engagement of governments, the private sector, and multisectoral restoration networks in the implementation of restoration actions. During Year 1, the project conducted assessments with the main restoration networks and collectives across the six Brazilian biomes, assessing their institutional capacities, operational challenges, strengthening needs, and opportunities to expand their activities in the territories. In addition, an analysis was conducted on funding opportunities and the maturity stage of these networks to mobilize resources, generating inputs for the development of future investment mobilization strategies for restoration. The project also initiated alignment discussions with restoration networks to define priority landscapes for the

implementation of demonstration projects, seeking to direct planned activities toward territories with greater potential to generate socio-environmental benefits and promote restoration at scale.

As part of efforts to strengthen technical assistance for restoration, an assessment of public and private Agricultural Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (ATER) services was conducted across the different biomes, aiming to identify existing capacities, gaps, and opportunities to improve services focused on restoration. In addition, coordination efforts were initiated with the Brazilian Forest Service (SFB) to develop a training module for ATER professionals on the *Saberes da Floresta* platform, focusing on large-scale restoration planning.

Finally, the project advanced the preliminary identification of two priority landscapes for the development of the planned demonstration projects, establishing the foundations for planning future implementation and field demonstration activities.

Regarding Component 3, the project made significant progress in the identification and prioritization of financial mechanisms with the potential to increase investments in native vegetation recovery in Brazil. Efforts focused on generating strategic knowledge, strengthening coordination among key stakeholders, and developing enabling conditions for the structuring and improvement of public and private financial instruments aimed at restoration.

One of the main results achieved was the consolidation of a structured process for mapping, analyzing, and prioritizing financial mechanisms capable of supporting the scaling up of restoration. In coordination with initiatives led by the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MMA) and strategic partners, the project assessed a broad range of existing instruments, applied alignment and feasibility criteria, and identified opportunities with greater potential for impact. This process resulted in the prioritization of two mechanisms considered strategic for supporting resource mobilization for restoration, including innovative initiatives aimed at facilitating investment flows and strengthening/developing two mechanisms: a Facilitating Agency to support small landholders and an environmental asset fund (inspired by and expanding upon *Florestas Viva*).

In parallel, the project expanded its understanding of financing opportunities across different territorial and thematic contexts, at both national and subnational scales, through the mapping of public and private initiatives related to productive restoration, carbon markets, Payments for Environmental Services (PES), and mechanisms focused on the conservation and recovery of native vegetation. The initiatives mapped include PES and carbon finance in the state of Espírito Santo; restoration initiatives supported by carbon finance in the state of Mato Grosso; potential financing models for productive restoration in the Amazon; mechanisms for financing surplus conserved areas in the Cerrado under the Brazilian Forest Code; and progress on enabling conditions, such as the structuring of guarantee funds for carbon finance mechanisms supporting restoration.

Regarding governance, processes for coordination and collaboration among civil society organizations, government institutions, investors, and other strategic stakeholders involved in the restoration finance agenda were strengthened. Active participation in coordination spaces and specialized forums contributed to aligning priorities, promoting knowledge exchange, and building a shared vision of the pathways required to expand financing for native vegetation recovery. During the first year, the project deepened dialogue with the UK PACT consultancy and actively participated in key coordination spaces related to the topic, including the National Commission for Native Vegetation Recovery (CONAVEG), the Restoration Union, and biome-level restoration networks. In addition, the project has participated in important forums for coordinating efforts related to finance and carbon markets, aiming to identify opportunities, catalyze initiatives, and promote solutions for restoration at scale and with inclusiveness. These include the Interministerial Committee on Climate Change (CIM), the main climate governance body responsible for monitoring the Climate Plan and the Brazilian Emissions Trading System; CONAREDD+ - National Commission for REDD+ (including thematic working groups focused on strengthening quality and integrity in carbon initiatives related to REDD+ and ARR); the Carbon Working Group of the Brazil Climate, Forests and Agriculture Coalition; the Brazilian Forum on Climate Change; the Carbon Working Group of the Atlantic Forest Restoration Pact, co-led by WWF-Brazil; and the Carbon Market Working Group of MAPA (Sustainable AgroCarbon Chamber). These efforts created the foundations for consolidating a more robust governance structure for the topic, aligned with existing institutions under the national restoration policy framework.

The project also advanced the analysis and monitoring of financial mechanisms under implementation or development in Brazil, including public funds, blended finance initiatives, climate finance instruments, and mechanisms focused on restoration and the bioeconomy. This monitoring enabled the identification of opportunities for convergence with project objectives, while also generating strategic inputs for improving existing instruments and developing new financial arrangements capable of addressing the needs of priority territories.

Additionally, progress was made in identifying territories, initiatives, and partnerships with the potential to contribute to future portfolios of investable projects. Work carried out in priority regions helped strengthen territorial readiness to attract investments and connect local initiatives with potential financing sources. In this context, actions in the Serra da Mantiqueira region are particularly noteworthy, where the organization facilitated a new co-investment approach for the territory, strengthening strategic partnerships with WRI Brasil and IUCN (FLR Hub). In Espírito Santo, with support from partners, WWF-Brazil contributed to the launch of the State Plan for Native Vegetation Recovery of Espírito Santo (PERVN-ES), while also supporting the structuring of the state's carbon program for restoration through a jurisdictional approach. These initiatives will contribute to the portfolio of priority territories for the application of financing mechanisms.

Overall, the progress achieved during the period contributed to strengthening Brazil's restoration finance ecosystem, creating technical, institutional, and strategic foundations for the development and improvement of financial mechanisms capable of mobilizing public and private resources in support of national native vegetation recovery targets.

Under Component 4, WRI and the project partners conducted technical alignment discussions to further detail the methodology for achieving the indicators established in the M&E Plan, with a focus on reporting against GEF targets. In addition, the project's monitoring process was structured, including data collection flows, procedures, and evidence recording mechanisms, and was presented to the co-executors during a workshop held in Brasília in April. During the same period, WRI and ERIP held a technical meeting in which a pilot system for indicator reporting by participating countries was presented, contributing to the improvement of the program's monitoring mechanisms and data consolidation processes.

B. Challenges: Information on challenges of project implementation activities

As previously indicated, during the first year of project implementation, significant efforts were dedicated to establishing and/or improving the operational processes required to ensure coordinated implementation among the different partners involved. During this period, efforts focused on consolidating workflows, including, the formalization of the partnership among WRI, TNC, and WWF (which took longer than initially anticipated), progress reporting, the preparation of Terms of Reference, the definition of indicator data collection mechanisms, and alignment of coordination dynamics among the teams. This initial structuring process required time for adaptation and familiarization with project procedures, including the different reporting, documentation, and information management requirements associated with the project. This partially affected the pace of implementation of some activities, while also contributing to the establishment of more organized foundations for the subsequent implementation phases.

Under Component 1, the main challenges identified during the first year of implementation were related to consolidating the operational, managerial, and governance arrangements required for the implementation of a large-scale project involving multiple partner institutions and different levels of action. The need to harmonize procedures, workflows, fiduciary requirements, procurement and contracting policies, as well as requirements related to environmental and social safeguards and GEF standards, required significant coordination and alignment efforts among the parties involved.

Another factor that influenced the implementation schedule was changes in technical and management teams, both at the national and subnational levels, which required additional efforts in stakeholder engagement, institutional alignment, and rebuilding coordination processes with strategic project actors.

Finally, the time required to formalize contractual instruments and complete the administrative procedures necessary to initiate implementation reduced the effective implementation window for activities during the first year of the project. As a result, part of the initial efforts focused on establishing the conditions required for full implementation in the subsequent years.

Under Component 2, the main challenges were related to defining and operationalizing engagement strategies for the different actors involved, particularly restoration networks and collectives. During this first year, the need for greater clarity regarding the roles and responsibilities of these actors within the project context became evident, considering that many of them perform multiple functions, acting simultaneously as beneficiaries, technical partners, representatives in governance bodies, and members of the Advisory Council. This complexity required additional alignment and communication efforts to ensure a common understanding of the different forms of participation and engagement envisaged.

There has been significant delay in the definition of priority landscapes, this process has required the integration of multiple technical, institutional, and territorial criteria, requiring alignment among the different partners and restoration networks involved in the restoration agenda. The process will be finalized through a combination of dialogue and alignment with biome-level restoration collectives and networks, complemented by the analysis of available data and information on territories, including restoration priorities, existing initiatives, institutional capacities, and territorial characteristics. It is expected to be finalized by September 2026 (Q1/Year 2).

The discussions held throughout the period highlighted the need to expand the mapping and engagement of other relevant actors and networks for restoration, including seed networks, protected area mosaics, Private Natural Heritage Reserves (RPPNs in Portuguese), and institutions involved in technical assistance and rural extension. In this context, opportunities for greater integration between Components 1 and 2 were also identified, particularly regarding ATER, public policies, and strengthening governance for large-scale restoration.

Regarding Component 3, the formalization process of the partnership with the parties involved took longer than expected, delaying the signing of the contract by almost six months, as well as the transfer of resources and, consequently, the start of Component activities. Additionally, the complexity of the operational and technical aspects involved required coordination among

different areas and staff members within the organization who needed to be engaged in project implementation. Finally, alignment on workflows and processes among the project's implementing organizations also requires additional time.

Under Component 4, regarding monitoring, efforts were required to develop and improve management instruments, such as the M&E Plan. This process involved cycles of development and alignment with the Implementing Agency and the Global Coordination Program, aiming to ensure compliance with the expected level of detail.

Additionally, challenges were identified regarding access to mandatory project platforms, including training systems and ActivityInfo, which required coordination among WRI's IT teams, the co-executors, and the implementing agency.

In general, many of the challenges mentioned are related to the set-up process, including the signature of legal agreements among the co-executing agencies and partners.

Other challenges were also related to structuring and mobilizing project teams, while simultaneously ensuring information alignment among partners and advancing implementation activities. This familiarization phase with project processes, tools, and reporting workflows represented an important period of institutional learning throughout the year.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

During the first year of project implementation, frequent online meetings were held among the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) (MMA), government partners (ICMBio and SFB), the executing agency, and the co-executors partners to address operational alignment, administrative matters, and technical decisions. An in-person workshop was also held in Brasília, alongside the first meeting of the Restaura Biomas Advisory Council, where project challenges, opportunities, lessons learned, monitoring, and safeguards were discussed. Progress was made in the development and revision of the safeguard plans based on lessons learned and information gathered from the co-executors partners to support the preparation of the impact assessment matrix. However, the plans will be finalized once the ongoing diagnostic assessments (Component 2) are completed, and the implementation areas are defined, which is expected by August. In collaboration with MMA, progress has also been made in implementing good practices and developing a safeguards monitoring system integrated into the Annual Operational Plan (POA), MMA's project management instrument. The combination of virtual meetings, bilateral discussions, and in-person workshops with stakeholders has enabled direct engagement between component managers and safeguard focal points since the beginning of implementation, helping to integrate safeguards into project decision-making processes.

Two meetings of the Advisory Council were held during the reporting period. The Council is composed of representatives from 19 government institutions, civil society organizations, and biome restoration networks.

The first regular meeting was held in person and focused on reactivating the Advisory Council and presenting the results achieved during Year 1 of the project. A total of 48 participants attended, of whom 77% were women and 19% were men.

The second meeting, held virtually as an extraordinary session, aimed to present the proposed Year 2 Work Plan and gather feedback from Council members. Nineteen participants attended, of whom 84% were women and 16% were men.

During both meetings, participants had the opportunity to share suggestions, comments, and concerns regarding project implementation. All contributions were reviewed by the executing team and, where appropriate, incorporated into project planning and implementation, reinforcing the participatory and adaptive nature of the project's governance.

As the Advisory Council had been inactive for more than a year, the decision to resume its activities through an in-person workshop proved particularly valuable in fostering open dialogue, collaboration, and the direct discussion of questions and concerns, especially those related to the prolonged period without engagement. The presence of MMA representatives and the project teams facilitated active listening and transparent communication, helping to align expectations, clarify project information, establish working arrangements, and rebuild engagement with Council members.

In addition to their participation in the Advisory Council, the biome restoration networks are actively engaged in Component 1 through CONAVEG and in Component 2 through the identification of restoration territories and participation in the institutional strengthening diagnostic assessment. During the workshop, representatives from some networks noted an increased workload associated with project activities, as well as other constraints affecting their full participation. To address these challenges, an institutional strengthening plan for the restoration networks will be developed based on the ongoing diagnostic assessment (Output 2.1.1), together with an external communication plan to improve information flows between the project, the Advisory Council, and its members. Both activities are planned for Year 2. Some restoration networks also expressed initial reluctance to participate in the diagnostic process. In response, the project team has maintained proactive communication to better understand the factors influencing participation, manage expectations, identify opportunities for improvement, and strengthen collaborative relationships with stakeholders throughout project implementation. Following these measures, bilateral meetings were established with each restoration network to better understand their specific concerns, expectations, and points requiring

attention. This process helped improve the communication flow between the project team and the networks and provided greater clarity on the role of the networks as members of the Project Advisory Council and as project beneficiaries. In addition, each network internally designated focal points for the different project engagement spaces, contributing to clearer channels of communication and more effective participation throughout project implementation. In addition, representatives of the biome restoration networks have been participating in ERIP training opportunities and remain actively engaged in both the governance of PLANAVEG and the implementation of Restaura Biomas.

At the subnational level, progress was achieved through technical and policy engagement with priority states (Minas Gerais, Pará, and Mato Grosso) and partner institutions. Multiple coordination, engagement, and exploratory meetings were held, providing a better understanding of the status of environmental regularization initiatives in each context. Progress was made through the kick-off meetings, already completed in Minas Gerais and underway in the other priority states, which have formally launched implementation activities while helping identify context-specific challenges and opportunities. Considering the subnational elections scheduled for late 2026 and the legal restrictions on formalizing new partnerships during the electoral period, this engagement will continue throughout Year 2.

D. Gender Equality

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

The Gender Mainstreaming Plan has been partially updated and is expected to be finalized by December 2026. During the first year of the project, the teams from the co-executors organizations and government partners were mobilized and engaged to support safeguard implementation. This initial phase focused on information sharing, technical discussions, the collaborative development of the impact assessment matrix, and the revision of the Gender Action Plan.

The co-executors partners have been consistently guided on the project's commitment to gender as a cross-cutting priority, with an emphasis on promoting women's participation and recognition throughout the restoration value chain. Gender-related objectives and requirements have been integrated into the Terms of Reference, work plans, and guidance provided to co-executors partners and consultants. As a result, the project has established the foundation needed to advance, during Year 2, the development of a gender baseline, generate evidence to support gender analysis within the restoration value chain, and prepare gender action plans in collaboration with restoration networks (participatory and biome-level platforms), ATER organizations, and federal Conservation Units.

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

During the reporting period, no challenges were identified regarding the implementation of the Gender Mainstreaming Plan. However, some difficulties have been observed among project teams in incorporating gender considerations into the outputs and results of project activities. These challenges have been addressed on a case-by-case basis through technical guidance and clarification.

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

No adaptive management has been necessary so far.

d) 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.

There is a clear willingness among project teams to engage with the gender agenda, further supported by the fact that 80% of the individuals directly involved in project coordination, implementation, and monitoring are women. At the same time, the project recognizes the complexity of advancing gender considerations within participatory and governance spaces, such as CONAVEG and restoration networks. These considerations will be further addressed through the update of the Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP), as part of the project's broader approach to strengthening inclusive governance.

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

In the next year, the project plans to establish a baseline assessment of women's participation in the restoration value chain, using the Value Links methodology (or another appropriate methodology). This approach will provide a mapping of the restoration value chain and support the identification of gender-related constraints, opportunities, and gaps to be addressed through the Gender Action Plan.

In parallel, the project intends to establish a gender working group with representatives from co-executors agencies, government partners, and biome restoration networks to collaboratively develop a strategy based on the RBET (Reach-Benefit-Empower-Transform) approach. The strategy will focus on integrating gender considerations across participatory platforms, territories, biome restoration networks, and ATER services.

E. Knowledge Management

During the FY25-FY26 period, project communication efforts focused on structuring the main assets, processes, and products that will support the production, organization, and dissemination of knowledge throughout Restaura Biomas implementation.

Among the main achievements, the project's Communication Plan was finalized and approved by MMA. This document provides guidance for the project's communication and knowledge management strategy. The project also implemented the Planaveg communication campaign during COP30, contributing to national and international visibility for the restoration agenda and strengthening strategic alignment between Planaveg and Restaura Biomas.

During the period, progress was made in the recruitment and implementation of strategic consultancies for communication, including visual identity and branding, development of the institutional website, and structuring of an image bank and audiovisual content production. The selection process prioritized technical criteria, regional diversity, and gender equity, resulting in a team composed predominantly of women and professionals from different regions of the country.

Communication and coordination workflows with project partners were also established, including meetings with communication and safeguards focal points from partner institutions, strengthening mechanisms for alignment, transparency, and information dissemination.

As part of the knowledge dissemination and stakeholder engagement strategy, the project held the Restaura Biomas Workshop in Brasília, bringing together representatives from government, civil society, and technical institutions from across the country to discuss pathways for large-scale restoration across the six Brazilian biomes. To expand the reach of the workshop outcomes, an institutional video was produced and disseminated, featuring Gabriella Moreira as the project spokesperson and presenting Restaura Biomas' objectives, relevance, and progress to internal and external audiences.

The project also gained international visibility through its inclusion in the 2025 Impact Report of Conservation International - GEF Agency (CI-GEF), published in January 2026. Restaura Biomas was highlighted in the "Project Highlights from 2025" section, which features reference initiatives supported by the GEF across different regions of the world. The publication included an interview with Gabriela Moreira, sharing project results, lessons learned, and perspectives, thereby expanding dissemination among the international restoration and environmental finance communities. The report was promoted by CI-GEF through its institutional channels, including LinkedIn.

In parallel, the team initiated the development of the project's institutional website, the Restaura Biomas visual identity, and the strategic narrative for GEF-8, which will guide future communication activities, media engagement, and dissemination of results. Institutional content for the future project portal was also produced, and communication materials were developed for strategic events, including preparations for SOBRE 2026 (Brazilian Conference on Ecological Restoration promoted by the Brazilian Society for Ecological Restoration - SOBRE).

These initiatives established the foundations for the production, organization, and dissemination of knowledge products, strengthening project visibility and expanding the reach of its messages among partners, decision-makers, and other strategic audiences.

Interpretation and application of GEF guidelines:

During the reporting period, and considering that this was the first year of project implementation, the executing agency, together with the co-executors, dedicated significant efforts to improving and/or structuring internal processes in compliance with GEF guidelines and policies. One of the main lessons learned during this period was that incorporating new guidelines and procedures into already established institutional structures requires an alignment process among different organizational areas, which takes time for coordination, validation, and implementation. In addition, given that the project involves multiple partners, it is essential to invest in continuous guidance and alignment efforts to ensure a common understanding of processes and consistent implementation among all parties involved.

In this context, the review and adaptation of WRI Brasil's Procurement Policy stands out as a key achievement. This document establishes guidelines for the procurement and contracting of services. As this involved adapting an already consolidated

institutional structure, the process required the participation of different teams, including Operations, managers from other programs, the Executive Directorate, and the WRI Brasil PMO, as well as internal discussions to align workflows, responsibilities, and procedures with GEF requirements. The experience reinforced the importance of engaging key areas from the beginning of the process, as well as maintaining continuous communication to ensure consistent implementation. The updated policy was presented to WRI Brasil and the co-executors at the end of November 2025.

Within this same context, related documents and workflows associated with the Policy were also reviewed and adapted, including Terms of Reference (ToRs), their respective preparation processes, Proposal Comparison Matrices (MCP in Portuguese), and Selection Memoranda. This work also highlighted the importance of translating guidelines into practical and clear procedures for implementing teams. To support this process, training sessions and clarification meetings were conducted with both WRI Brasil teams and the co-executors, contributing to a shared understanding of the procedures.

Another relevant aspect relates to the necessary arrangements for accounting for project beneficiaries, considering that data collection involves sensitive personal data. In this context, WRI Brasil has been developing procedures to enable the collection of CPF (Cadastro de Pessoa Física – Brazilian Individual Taxpayer Registry) information in order to eliminate the possibility of double counting, in accordance with the Project Document (PRODOC) and the Brazilian General Data Protection Law (LGPD), including aspects related to data collection, processing, storage, and information security.

In addition, progress was made in structuring the project grievance mechanism. Following an analysis process and engagement with internal and external legal advisors, the decision was made to contract an independent grievance mechanism provider separate from WRI Brasil (the executing agency). This solution will enable an initial screening of complaints by an external entity, contributing to fairness and credibility in the process before cases are forwarded for handling through WRI Brasil's internal procedures.

During the first quarter of the second year of the project, the consolidation of this structure and its presentation to implementing partners are planned, promoting an approach aligned with donor requirements and applicable legislation.

Project institutional arrangements, including project governance:

The project has different governance arrangements, each with distinct objectives, roles, and levels of engagement throughout implementation. During this first year, frequent meetings were held with MMA and the co-executors, as well as interactions with CIGEF as needed throughout key project processes. This engagement was particularly associated with the onboarding process for project teams and with the discussions required to integrate the processes mentioned in the previous section (GEF guidelines) and to develop strategic project instruments, such as the M&E Plan, progress reports, and other key project documents. In this context, one of the main lessons learned was the importance of ensuring continuous engagement of all stakeholders throughout the project cycle, according to their respective roles. This point was highlighted during the meeting held with the Advisory Council in April 2026, during which it was identified that there was an expectation that this governance body would have been engaged at earlier stages during the first year of the project, including prior to the Q3/Year 1 meeting.

The main issues identified relate to gaps in guidance, information governance, and the need for the project teams to adapt to reporting and documentation processes during the first year of the project. In summary, the absence of more detailed definitions in the MOP has resulted in delays in contracting processes, rework, and uncertainty regarding workflows, documentation, and responsibilities among the co-executors. The need for greater clarity regarding the implementation of safeguard policies and procedures for the collection, processing, storage, and sharing of sensitive data in compliance with LGPD was also highlighted. However, we recognize that a learning curve during the first year of complex projects is expected, particularly when adapting policies and processes across multiple implementing institutions.

Additionally, during the first year of the implementation, project teams required time to adapt to the different reporting, documentation, and information management processes associated with the project, including MMA and other reporting requirements beyond the regular progress reporting established under the Grant Agreement. This initial adaptation period required additional coordination and contributed to some delays in implementation activities. As teams become more familiar with the process and responsibilities, greater efficiency in reporting and coordination was progressively gained throughout FY26.

As part of the effort to organize the project's different governance arrangements, a mapping of recurring dialogue spaces was developed, including their objectives, frequency, and respective participants, with the aim of providing greater clarity and predictability regarding the appropriate moments for engaging each governance body. For the second year, the need to make engagement with the different governance arrangements more predictable and consistent throughout implementation is reinforced, including more systematic use of the mapping developed during the first year as a tool to support planning for these engagements.

III: Minor Amendments

CONTEXT	
Result Framework	
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

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	GeoName ID
Amazon Priority Landscape - provisional	-5.5444	-53.92	

Location Description:

Activity Description:

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	GeoName ID
Amazon Priority Landscape - provisional	-3.0548	-47.5622	

Location Description:

Activity Description:

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	GeoName ID
Caatinga Priority Landscape	-7.82	-37.843	3,393,321

Location Description:

Activity Description:

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	GeoName ID
Cerrado Priority Landscape - provisional	-17.884	-53.69	

Location Description:

Activity Description:

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	GeoName ID
Pampa Priority ndscape - provisiona Lal	-27.8330	-53.49	

Location Description:

Activity Description:

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	GeoName ID
Atlantic Forest Priority Landscape	-21.8621	-44.6169	7,593,390

Location Description:

Activity Description:

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	GeoName ID
Pantanal Priority Landscape - provisional	-18.32	-56.649	

Location Description:

Activity Description:

V. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category M and E Document	Title GEF_Core_Indicator_Reporting_Template_July2026 (2)
Document Category M and E Document	Title 20260831_FY26_PIR_GEFID11124_RestauraBiomass