

## Plan to Accelerate Actions on Land Restoration & Sustainable Agriculture

### Solution:

---

Axis: **3. Transforming Agriculture and Food Systems** ▾

Key objective: **8. Land restoration and sustainable agriculture** ▾

Solution: Accelerating Actions on Land Restoration & Sustainable Agriculture in the Global South

Host initiative: Global EverGreening Alliance (Restore Africa and Restore Asia)

Scope:

- **Geographic:** Degraded Land across the Global South
  - **Sectoral:** Multiple, including Private and Public Financing, Governments across the Global South, Technical & Research Institutions, NGOs & Project Developers
  - **Other aspects:**
- 

### Levers assessment: *(each lever is described in the guidance document)*

- **Risk-informed decision-making:** **Medium maturity** ▾
  - *Rationale:* Some progress exists through monitoring platforms and dashboards, but fragmentation and lack of harmonisation reduce completeness, consistency, reliability and accessibility. Decision-making still often lacks integration of risk data, especially at grassroots levels.
- **Technology shifts:** **Medium maturity** ▾
  - *Rationale:* While digital monitoring tools and platforms and dashboards are emerging, access remains limited, inconsistent and often not tailored for local use. Technology adoption is uneven across regions and not yet transformative for restoration implementation.
- **Knowledge & Capacity building:** **Medium maturity** ▾
  - *Rationale:* Active initiatives exist (e.g., AFR100 Land Accelerator, training programs), but reach is still limited. Grassroots actors need stronger, continuous support and coordination to become investment-ready and technically proficient.
- **Inclusive decision-making governance & design:** **Medium maturity** ▾
  - *Rationale:* Global dialogues increasingly recognise Indigenous Peoples and local communities, but their voices remain underrepresented in actual finance flows, policy processes and programmatic design. Structures for meaningful participation are still emerging.

- **Standards & Taxonomies:** Medium maturity ▾
    - *Rationale: With the possible exception of carbon standards, there are no widely agreed standards for restoration outcomes, indicators, or verification protocols. Further, in relation to carbon standards, differences between methodologies and standards are not widely understood. This creates uncertainty for investors and policymakers and undermines credibility.*
  - **Supply:** Medium maturity ▾
    - *Rationale: There is a growing supply of grassroots and entrepreneurial restoration projects, but they are predominantly fragmented, small-scale, and often lack investment readiness. Supply aggregation is still in its infancy.*
  - **Demand:** Medium maturity ▾
    - *Rationale: Investor interest is increasing, but restoration is not yet a mainstream asset class. Inconsistent messaging and lack of confidence in data limit demand from private and institutional investors.*
  - **Public/private finance:** Medium maturity ▾
    - *Rationale: Despite commitments, finance for restoration remains far below what's needed. Barriers include risk perception, lack of large-scale bankable projects, lack of visibility and understanding of investable options, and absence of blended finance structures.*
  - **Partnerships and collaboration:** Medium maturity ▾
    - *Rationale: Strong networks exist (e.g., AFR100, GEA members, UN Decade partners), and collaboration is active. However, silos remain between finance, policy, and grassroots actors, which limits system-wide efficiency.*
  - **Policy & regulatory:** Medium maturity ▾
    - *Rationale: Many countries have restoration targets and policies, but gaps exist in enforcement, incentives, and alignment with the needs of investors and grassroots realities. More coherent legislative frameworks are required to mobilise action.*
  - **Public opinion:** Medium maturity ▾
    - *Rationale: Awareness of land restoration and climate adaptation is growing, especially among youth movements and in climate dialogues. However, it is not yet a high public priority in many regions, limiting political and investor pressure.*
-

## Expected impact of this plan on the 2030 targets (if any):

[Please articulate briefly how this plan will contribute to accelerate the delivery of 2030 targets (if any) by addressing key implementation blockers. Please also share further details on the expected impact of this plan, including its contributions to the Global Stocktake (GST), SDGs or other processes]

This plan will accelerate global efforts on land restoration and sustainable agriculture by directly addressing key barriers and aligning the actions of stakeholders.

In particular, the plan will address identified barriers to mobilising finance at scale, barriers to effective legislative and policy reform, barriers to development and delivery of large-scale investable land restoration and sustainable agriculture programs, and barriers to consistent and verifiable monitoring of opportunities, progress and results.

1. **Harmonized** Programmatic Design and Delivery: This pillar addresses the barrier to the development and implementation of large-scale investable land restoration and sustainable agriculture programs.

- Action: Coordinate and align efforts of initiatives to ensure effective harmonized design and delivery of large-scale investable land restoration and sustainable agriculture programs.
- Result 1: Develop a robust, de-risked portfolio of large-scale investable land restoration programs which leverage the strengths and interests of existing initiatives and key stakeholders, with a focus on improved livelihoods for small-scale farmers and pastoralists.
- *Result 2:* Support at least 20 million small-scale farming and/or pastoralist households to restore more than 20 million hectares of degraded land, expand regenerative practices, increase carbon sequestration and address biodiversity loss across the Global South.

2. **Mobilising Finance at Scale:** This pillar addresses the barrier to mobilising finance for large-scale investable land restoration and sustainable agriculture programs.

- *Action:* Coordinate and align efforts of initiatives to ensure consistent messaging, the creation and promotion of informative materials and unified engagement of funders and investors to provide clear guidance on investable opportunities.
- *Result:* Cause and/or facilitate mobilisation of the USD 5 Billion target, shifting capital from risk-averse to high-impact investment. This supports the creation of reliable mechanisms for capital deployment and sustained operation.

**3. Legislative and Policy Reform:** This pillar tackles the barrier of inconsistent and risky policy/legislative environments.

- *Action:* Coordinate and align efforts of initiatives to support the creation of stable and consistent policy environments in at least 20 countries.
- *Result:* These reforms will incentivise investment, significantly reduce policy and legislative risks, and ensure that restoration is integrated into national strategies. This commitment will also contribute to measurable progress under the Global Stocktake, reinforcing national strategies that align with the 2030 Climate Solutions Implementation Roadmap.

**4. Consistent and Verifiable Monitoring (MRV- Measurable, reportable, and verifiable):** This pillar directly addresses the barrier of fragmented, non-verifiable monitoring of opportunities, progress, and results.

- *Action:* Advance alignment across fragmented monitoring efforts by establishing consistent core metrics and negotiating guidelines, agreements and processes for improved interoperability and sharing of data.
- *Result:* Stronger data systems will improve investor confidence, guide effective policymaking, and provide verifiable evidence of impact, which is essential for compliance and attracting long-term capital.

**5. Inclusive Capacity Building and Livelihoods:** This pillar ensures the effectiveness and sustainability of the interventions at the local level.

- *Action:* Coordinate and align efforts of initiatives to build the capacity of grassroots actors, Indigenous peoples, and local communities to implement and sustain restoration practices.
- *Result:* This ensures inclusive and participatory action, directly strengthening livelihoods, resilience, and equity. The successful implementation of restoration and regenerative practices at the grassroots level contributes significantly to multiple Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including Climate Action (SDG 13), Life on Land (SDG 15), Zero Hunger (SDG 2), and Clean Water (SDG 6).

Output	Action Scope	Action	Type of action	Implement ation Lever	Responsible	Time horizon	Stakeholder engagement <sup>1</sup>	Committed Stakeholders
<p>Harmonised, collaborative and investable projects targeting 10s of millions of hectares for restoration</p> <p>Pipelines of high-quality, credible opportunities attractive to institutional and private investors.</p>	Investable large-scale Programmes	Aggregate smallholder and grassroots projects into large, investable programmatic portfolios.	Existing ac... ▾	Partn... ▾	Taskforce 1	Nove... ▾	Multi-stake... ▾	GEA, Ambition Loop
Restoration and regenerative	Finance & Investment	Develop consistent investor	New action ▾	Risk-i... ▾	Taskforce 2	Nove... ▾	Multi-stake... ▾	GEA WWF

<sup>1</sup> Such as national governments, local and regional governments, regulators & public agencies, utilities & system providers, large companies, small and medium enterprises, investors and private finance institutions, MDBs, academic and technical institutions, youth, indigenous peoples and women-led groups, multi-stakeholders platform (non-exhaustive)

Output	Action Scope	Action	Type of action	Implement ation Lever	Responsible	Time horizon	Stakeholder engagement <sup>1</sup>	Committed Stakeholders
agriculture options reframed, visible and accepted as reliable, safe, and investable solutions.		messaging and marketing, and create improved understanding and visibility of land restoration opportunities.						UN Decade
Governments create/reform and implement policies that incentivise sustainable land practices and restoration.	Policy & Governance	Support governments to design and implement consistent policy and legislative frameworks for restoration.	New action ▾	Policy... ▾	Taskforce 3	Nove... ▾	Multi-stake... ▾	AFR100
Greater policy alignment between national targets, investor interests, and local entrepreneurial action.	Policy & Governance	Align national restoration targets with investor interests, community-led and entrepreneurial initiatives.	New action ▾	Policy... ▾	Taskforce 3	Nove... ▾	Multi-stake... ▾	AFR100
Robust, interoperable systems for tracking progress across ecosystems and regions.	Monitoring & Data	Harmonise fragmented monitoring platforms into interoperable systems.	New action ▾	Partn... ▾	Taskforce 4	Nove... ▾	Multi-stake... ▾	UN Decade, Ambition Loop
Data that is trusted by investors, governments, and grassroots actors.	Monitoring & Data	Standardised indicators and metrics for restoration, carbon	New action ▾	Risk-i... ▾	Taskforce 4	Nove... ▾	Multi-stake... ▾	Ambition Loop, AFR100

Output	Action Scope	Action	Type of action	Implement ation Lever	Responsible	Time horizon	Stakeholder engagement <sup>1</sup>	Committed Stakeholders
		sequestration, ecosystem health, socio-economic benefits.						
Integrated Data Dashboards for Restoration and Sustainable Agriculture	Monitoring & Data	Data platforms or dashboards that aggregate and present progress, impacts, risk, and outcomes.	Existing ac... ▾	Techn... ▾	Taskforce 4	Nove... ▾	Multi-stake... ▾	UN Decade, Ambition Loop
Transparent Verification Protocols for Restoration Outcome	Monitoring & Data	Transparent verification protocols so that outputs are credible and usable for carbon/finance markets, or for reporting (e.g. under NDCs or GST).	Existing ac... ▾	Stand... ▾	Taskforce 4	Nove... ▾	Multi-stake... ▾	GEA, Ambition Loop
Increased Capacity-Building	Grassroots Capacity &	Provide training, mentorship, and	New action ▾	Knowl... ▾	Taskforce 5	Nove... ▾	Multi-stake... ▾	AFR100, GEA, WWF

Output	Action Scope	Action	Type of action	Implementation Lever	Responsible	Time horizon	Stakeholder engagement <sup>1</sup>	Committed Stakeholders
for Restoration and Sustainable Agriculture	Advocacy	investment-readiness support to local entrepreneurs.						
Stronger representation of local voices in global climate dialogues	Grassroots Capacity & Advocacy	Amplify local and Indigenous voices in global dialogues.	New action ▾	Public... ▾	Taskforce 5	Nov... ▾	Multi-stake... ▾	WRI, GFG, WWF
			▮ ▾	▮ ▾		▮ ▾	▮ ▾	
			▮ ▾	▮ ▾		▮ ▾	▮ ▾	

## What are the Barriers to Acceleration?

### 1. Delivery/uptake of Land Restoration and Regenerative Agriculture practices at the grassroots

The fundamental issue is the mismatch between the large-scale financial requirements and standardisation needs of global investors and the fragmented, diverse, and inherently local nature of effective grassroots land restoration efforts.

#### Key Issues:

- Financial Mobilisation and Scale:** There is a significant challenge in mobilising large-scale funding and directing it efficiently to small, dispersed grassroots initiatives. Investors seek *large-scale* opportunities (demand aggregation) while restoration occurs on *small, local plots*. This leads to a disconnect.

- **Perceived Risk and Investor Bias:** Investment in smallholder farmers and pastoralist communities is viewed as high-risk by investors. This is due to a lack of standardisation, limited verifiable data on returns, and the difficulty of due diligence across many small entities (*Addressing Investor Perceptions*).
- **Fragmentation and Duplication:** Existing capacities and efforts at the local level are often fragmented, leading to duplication and inefficiency instead of a unified, scalable approach (*Leveraging Existing Capacities*).
- **Lack of Investable Design:** Many grassroots efforts are structured as projects or grants rather than as reliable, scalable, and investable programmatic opportunities that meet the requirements of private capital (e.g., clear returns and exit strategies).
- **Compliance and Quality Control:** The absence of consistent standards for restoration efforts (MRV) prevents projects from easily qualifying for nature-based solutions investment, as they cannot guarantee quality and compliance.
- **Visibility and Communication:** A lack of vision and effective communication obscures the links among restoration, biodiversity, and livelihoods, particularly in less visible ecosystems (such as mountain landscapes). This makes it harder to build public and investor support and combat scepticism (*Combating uncertainty and negative publicity*).

**Solution: Collaborative Investable Programmatic Approaches** - The solution advocates for a large-scale collaborative investment model that bridges the gap between grassroots efforts and global capital.

How the Solution Addresses the Barrier:

- **Aggregation and Standardisation:** The model aggregates demand from thousands of smallholder efforts into a single, large-scale program, and simultaneously standardizes the supply (the restoration methods and data) to meet investor requirements.
- **Risk Mitigation and Trust:** By implementing a coordinated framework and leveraging technology for trust (e.g., consistent MRV), the program de-risks capital. This transforms fragmented, high-risk efforts into a coordinated, low-friction, high-integrity investment opportunity.
- **Inclusion and Scalability:** This programmatic approach is designed to include small grassroots organisations, enabling them to contribute meaningfully to globally relevant efforts. It provides a structured mechanism for scaling impact and investment simultaneously.
- **Defined Investment Pathway:** It shifts the focus from sporadic, project-based funding to investable, programmatic opportunities designed from the outset to deliver financial and ecological returns, satisfying investors' needs while driving sustained grassroots adoption.

## 2. Mobilising financial support for land restoration and regenerative agriculture

To scale up land restoration and regenerative agriculture, it is essential to mobilise significant financing from both public and private sources — with the private sector expected to contribute the majority. Key considerations include:

- **Creating Certainty for Investors:** Establishing high-quality, credible investment opportunities that are free from reputational risks and brand damage.
- **Improving Visibility and Accessibility:** Clearly defining what constitutes a high-quality, investable opportunity and ensuring investors know how to access these opportunities.
- **Building Investor Confidence:** Demonstrating effective risk management and the likelihood of success in restoration and regenerative agriculture investments.
- **Guaranteeing Long-Term Value:** Providing reliable assurances around long-term management, risk mitigation, quality standards, and financial returns — and ensuring investors understand and trust these guarantees.
- **Channeling Funds to the Grassroots:** Designing mechanisms that enable large-scale funding to reach grassroots actors efficiently and equitably.

**Solution:** The key is to launch a targeted advocacy campaign that rebrands land restoration for institutional investors, positioning it as a mainstream asset class rather than a niche philanthropic cause. This involves creating clear, consistent messaging that highlights de-risked financial products, competitive returns, and tangible impact, and promoting it through high-profile investment summits, investor-centric prospectuses, clear information to navigate options and risks, and case studies of successful pilots to build confidence and demonstrate the scalability and reliability of these opportunities.

## 3. Ensuring consistent, stable and conducive political and legislative environments

Creating an enabling environment for large-scale investment in land restoration and regenerative agriculture requires addressing several key challenges:

- **Policy and Legislative Uncertainty:** Frequent changes in government or policy can create instability and undermine investor confidence, posing risks to long-term restoration efforts.
- **Lack of Clarity on Enabling Conditions:** There is often limited understanding of what constitutes a stable, safe, and conducive political and policy environment for investment in land restoration.
- **Limited Government Awareness:** Many developing country governments may not fully recognise the benefits and direct impacts of land restoration and regenerative agriculture, particularly in the context of carbon markets. This includes confusion between these approaches and REDD+ initiatives, which have different legislative and policy requirements.
- **Insufficient Legislative Support:** There is a lack of proactive efforts to adapt or create legislation and policies that incentivise and support large-scale investment in land restoration and regenerative practices.

**Solution:** Clear visibility and consistent understanding from Governments about the benefits and direct impacts of land restoration and regenerative agriculture, including from nature-based carbon removals programs and other investable approaches, and support to develop consistent legislation and policies which incentivise investment and uptake of restoration and sustainable land practices

#### 4. **Ensuring consistent, reliable and verifiable monitoring of opportunities and progress, drawing on all appropriate data sets**

Monitoring and progress tracking have remained the main challenge across various forms of land restoration practices. Many platforms currently exist but lack consistency and coordination.

- **Inconsistency in Frameworks:** Different platforms and initiatives use their own metrics, definitions, and reporting standards. This makes it incredibly difficult, if not impossible, to aggregate data, compare progress across regions, or draw reliable, large-scale conclusions. A 'successful restoration hectare' in one system might not meet the criteria in another, leading to a blurry, non-verifiable global picture.
- **Data Fragmentation and Silos:** The data collected—which could include satellite imagery, on-the-ground ecological surveys, socio-economic data, and more—is locked within separate, proprietary, or closed systems. This prevents the

essential cross-pollination of knowledge. If one platform discovers an effective monitoring method, that information (and the underlying data) isn't easily accessible to others.

- **Lack of Collaboration and Alignment:** There's an "enormous need for alignment, collaboration and consistency." The current environment fosters competition or simple parallel work rather than a shared, open-source approach to monitoring. This leads to duplication of effort, with multiple groups solving the same technical problems independently, wasting time, resources, and donor funding.

**Solution: A Collaborative, Open-Access Data Ecosystem** - a model where no single entity "owns the solution," but rather everyone contributes to and benefits from a common, accessible data pool.

How the Solution Addresses the Barrier:

- **Shared Foundational Framework:** The priority is developing a universally accepted, consistent monitoring framework. This means agreeing on core indicators (e.g., biodiversity, soil carbon, water retention), data-collection protocols, and verification and reliability standards. This ensures that all collected data speaks the same language.
- **Open Data Access and Interoperability:** All data—from all appropriate data sets—should be fed into an open or highly accessible system. This doesn't mean *losing* individual platforms; rather, it means making them interoperable. Data must be easily packaged, analyzed, and disseminated to different audiences (policymakers, investors, on-the-ground managers) as required, but the source data remains open for validation and use by the entire restoration community.
- **Enhanced Verification and Trust:** When data is consistently collected, openly accessible, and subject to peer review and cross-platform validation, the monitoring becomes more verifiable and reliable. This builds the trust necessary to attract and sustain large-scale investment in land restoration initiatives, as funders can confidently track their impact.

-

## **Delivery Mechanism: Taskforces -**

Five taskforces will be established as a delivery mechanism for the five pillars. They will not be vehicles for more discussion or for delivering reports—they will drive, coordinate, and deliver the concrete, measurable outputs of the solution for each pillar.

The taskforces will collaboratively develop a plan to create clear and consistent messaging and engagement/advocacy strategies within a strict timeline. They will produce tools, educational and promotional materials that can be used as they lead and coordinate engagement with funders and investors through media, events and direct engagement.

To ensure their success, each initiative will be required to provide at least one representative (1 per pillar they wish to support) from their organisation, with dedicated time each week to deliver the solution.

Task Force	Primary Objective	Key Tangible Outcomes (Deliverables)
1.Programmatic	To deliver investable large-scale Programmes	Harmonised, collaborative and investable projects targeting 10s of millions of hectares for restoration  Pipelines of high-quality, credible opportunities attractive to institutional and private investors.
2. Finance & Investment	To de-risk projects and create standardized, bankable financial products for large-scale capital.	A Standardized Investment Prospectus Template: A fill-in-the-blank document for projects, outlining risk mitigation strategies, financial projections, and required investment A Blended Finance Facility Model: A designed and legally structured fund that uses public/philanthropic capital to absorb first loss, unlocking private investment A Pilot Investor Cohort: A curated group of 5-10 (??) committed investors to fund the first wave of aggregated projects

3. Policy & Governance	To create an enabling environment that incentivizes restoration and protects investors and communities.	<p>A National Policy "Menu of Options": A concise document recommending specific policy changes (e.g., tax incentives, land tenure security, streamlined permitting) for governments to adopt.</p> <p>A Draft Model Land Stewardship Agreement: A legal template defining rights, benefits, and responsibilities for investors, communities, and farmers.</p> <p>Public-Private Partnership (PPP) Framework: A model contract for governments to engage private capital in restoring public lands.</p>
4. Monitoring & Data	To provide irrefutable, transparent proof of impact and financial performance for investors.	<p>Developing and strengthening a Unified Digital MRV Platform: A functional tech platform that integrates satellite monitoring, farmer-reported data, and third-party verification to track project progress.</p> <p>A Set of Certified Impact Metrics: A shortlist of standardized, investor-ready metrics (e.g., Soil Health Index, Water Retention Score, Carbon Tonnes).</p> <p>Annual Impact &amp; Performance Report: A publicly available report for investors showcasing the aggregated financial and environmental returns of the portfolio.</p> <p>Work with the UN Decade's Monitoring task force (led by FAO) as they manage the official Framework for Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring (FERM) which is being used to track target 2 of the GBF.</p>
5. Grassroots Capacity & Advocacy	To ensure funding reaches the ground effectively and local actors are empowered as partners.	<p>An Accredited Implementer Network: A vetted list of grassroots organizations trained and certified to receive investment and deliver projects reliably.</p> <p>A "Community of Practice" Platform: A regular forum (virtual or in-person) for grassroots actors to share knowledge, troubleshoot challenges, and provide feedback to other task forces.</p> <p>A Grant-Making Mechanism: A streamlined process to disburse catalytic "seed funding" to help local organizations become investment-ready.</p>

# Integration of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs)

The integration of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) into the Solution is a strategic imperative, foundational to achieving sustainability targets. This comprehensive approach prioritizes Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) and genuine co-governance, recognizing IPLCs' Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) and long-term stewardship. The rights-based framework ensures actions are locally relevant, culturally appropriate, and effective, structured across three primary pillars.

**1. Governance and Advisory Structures:** This aspect embeds IPLC TEK and rights-holder perspectives into strategic decision-making, respecting the [UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples \(UNDRIP\)](#).

Key mechanisms include:

- Global Steering/Advisory Task Force: Permanent seats for IPLC network representatives as Co-Governors, with decision-shaping roles in policy vetting, strategic priorities, and monitoring frameworks.
- National Policy Reform Working Groups: Mandatory inclusion of IPLC representatives as Policy Architects to co-design environments that recognize customary land tenure and resource management.
- MRV Technical Panel: Community data stewards and TEK specialists as Knowledge Holders, defining and validating culturally relevant indicators for monitoring systems.

**2. Programmatic Design and Investment:** This element transforms grassroots efforts into high-integrity, investable opportunities through IPLC-led processes ensuring full resource ownership and control.

Critical requirements include:

- Programmatic Co-Design Teams: IPLCs as mandatory co-designers and Program Owners, aligning projects with community-determined livelihood needs and restoration priorities.
- FPIC Requirement: All projects targeting the 20 Million Hectares must document FPIC through Local Implementation Agreements, granting IPLCs as Rights-Holders the power to withhold consent and ensuring informed decision-making in their own language.
- Direct Funding Channels: Investment flows directly to IPLC-governed entities (e.g., community land trusts), making IPLCs primary Implementers while ensuring local financial benefits and capacity building.

**3. Capacity Building and Data Systems:** This enabling pillar strengthens IPLC participation in monitoring and finance systems while safeguarding traditional knowledge.

Key actions include:

- Participatory Monitoring Systems: Support systems compliant with the [CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance](#), positioning IPLCs to facilitate participatory monitoring, serve as custodians with authority over baseline data and TEK, and enable impact verification and benefit tracking.
  - Financial Literacy Training: Tailored programs for small-scale households covering carbon finance, biodiversity markets, and investment risks, empowering IPLCs as Informed Partners to negotiate fair terms and participate as equity partners.
-