



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General
15 October 2025
English only

**Global workshop on the Forest
Ecosystem Restoration Initiative**
Seoul, 26–28 August 2025

Report of the global workshop on the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative

Introduction

1. The global workshop on the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative was held in Seoul, Republic of Korea, from 26 to 28 August 2025. It was hosted by the Korea Forest Service, with the financial support of the Government of the Republic of Korea through the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative.
2. The workshop brought together experts from Parties in the fields of forest biodiversity and forest ecosystem restoration and relevant stakeholders from around the world with a view to identifying priority areas and implementation modalities for the Initiative for the period 2026–2030 that are aligned with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. During the workshop, participants were able to exchange experiences, best practices and lessons learned emanating from 10 years of implementation of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative (2014–2024).
3. The workshop, which was attended by 33 experts¹ from 17 Parties and 12 organizations, encompassed keynote speeches, panel discussions and breakout group sessions as well as a field visit. A complete list of workshop documents and presentations is available at www.cbd.int/meetings/FB-WS-2025-01 and a list of participants is included in annex III to the present report. The workshop was conducted in English.

Item 1

Opening of the workshop

4. The workshop was opened on 26 August 2026 by the Minister of the Korea Forest Service, In-ho Kim, who delivered a recorded video statement. In that statement, he highlighted the achievements of the Initiative over the past decade, including the restoration of 925 hectares (ha) of forest through the implementation of 12 national-level restoration projects and the development of WePlan-Forests, a scientific decision support tool for planning and implementation of national restoration plans. Mr. Kim reaffirmed the commitment of the Republic of Korea to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the country's contribution to conserving and managing at least 30 per cent of its terrestrial territory by 2030.
5. Welcoming remarks were delivered by the Deputy Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Jihyun Lee, who thanked the Government of the Republic of Korea for its

¹ Delegates from Armenia, Brazil and Fiji had to cancel their participation at the last minute.

generosity and hospitality as well as its steadfast dedication to promoting forest restoration worldwide. The Deputy Executive Secretary underscored the relevance in that regard of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative and emphasized the importance of forest biodiversity as a cross-cutting and integral component of the dynamic underpinning the achievement of all of the targets under the Framework. With a view to encouraging the extension of the collaboration between the Korea Forest Service and the Convention Secretariat, Ms. Lee highlighted the pivotal role of that cooperation in assisting countries in meeting their commitments under the Framework. In closing, she wished the participants a successful and productive meeting.

6. Additional congratulatory remarks were delivered by a member of the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea, Kiyuk Eoh; the Ambassador and Deputy Minister for Climate Change of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, Keeyong Chung; and the Executive Director of the Asian Forest Cooperation Organization, Chongho Park.

7. A representative of the Seoul National University, Hyun Park, delivered a keynote presentation on the main threats to forest biodiversity and solutions for safeguarding forests. He elaborated on strategic responses related to climate adaptive forest management and control of invasive species and presented two case studies of the Republic of Korea, one focusing on endangered species and increasing genetic diversity and the other on restoration efforts and post-wildfire recovery of forest habitats.

Item 2

Workshop objectives, methodology and expected outcomes

8. A representative of the Secretariat outlined the objectives, methodology and expected outcomes of the workshop and provided an overview of the agenda. The representative explained that during the morning of the first day, the workshop would be open to a wider audience of experts from the Republic of Korea and indicated that the segment would focus on the implementation of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative over the decade 2014–2025 as well as the lessons learned from past experiences of working under the Initiative.

9. In the afternoon of the first day of the workshop, the participants would discuss best practices, key success factors and limitations associated with specific topics in breakout groups, as well as national and regional priorities for forest restoration in a plenary session. The second day of the workshop would be dedicated to aligning the Initiative to the global targets, defining the Initiative's unique values and considerations related to the whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches. On the third day, the participants would be invited to participate in a field visit to the Korea National Arboretum and the National Institute of Forest Science organized by the Korea Forest Service.

10. The overall objective of the workshop was to take stock of 10 years of implementation of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative, over the decade 2014–2025, and to identify priority areas and implementation modalities for the third phase of the Initiative that would be aligned with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. Expected outcomes included the following: participants would be well informed about the objectives and scope of work under the Initiative; the linkages between forest restoration and the targets under the Framework would be incorporated into the planning of the third phase; priorities of the work areas that were the most effective and had the greatest impact would be identified; and partnerships among stakeholders would be fostered.

11. The key conclusions arising from the workshop, contained in annex I of the present document, included recommendations and priorities for the third phase of the Initiative related to the work areas that were the most effective and exerted the greatest impact.

Item 3

Overview of 10 years of implementation of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative

12. The aim under item 3 was to create a common understanding of the implementation of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative over 10 years. In accordance with that aim, a representative of the Secretariat provided an overview of the mandates under the Convention for implementing the Initiative, the design of the Initiative and key outcomes over 10 years, while highlighting the catalytic role of small-scale restoration projects and the support provided to global policy development as well as the partnerships established.

13. The first panel discussion addressed the achievement associated with the key programmes of the Initiative, including small-scale restoration projects, capacity-building and decision support tools. In that regard, two videos covering restoration projects in Chile and Fiji were streamed.

14. The panellist from Chile shared a presentation on a national project funded by the Initiative which had contributed to the development of a socioenvironmental model for the restoration of semi-arid landscapes in Chile. One of the success stories of the project was the participatory monitoring, which was carried out jointly with communities to allow for comparison of the status quo with future development. In his presentation, the panellist from Ecuador shared the results of and the lessons learned from the implementation of the Restoring Hope for Ecuador project with respect to developing restoration scenarios focusing on reducing the impact of soil erosion in his country, including spatial monitoring with the support of the United Nations Biodiversity Lab, the development of the national ecosystem restoration dossier for Ecuador and the key outcomes of the soil erosion impact analysis.

15. Statements on key achievements were also made by key partners of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative. The representative of the International Union for Conservation of Nature provided information on the Bonn Challenge, established by the International Union and the Government of Germany, its catalytic role in the launching of the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration and its success as evidenced by the receipt of over 70 pledges from more than 60 countries committing to restoring approximately 210 million ha of degraded land. The International Union for Conservation of Nature provided and had contributed to the development of tools and methodologies such as the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology, the Restoration Barometer and the massive open online course on ecosystem restoration. A representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) shared the results of the successful cooperation between the Forest and Landscape Restoration Mechanism of FAO and the Convention Secretariat, such as a joint capacity-building and development programme for ecosystem restoration and joint activities under the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration.

16. Following the panel discussion, a representative of the Secretariat delivered a presentation on key lessons learned from implementation of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative over the past decade. In the first phase of the Initiative (2014–2020), the focus was on the development of methodological tools and in-person capacity-building. Through the short-term action plan on ecosystem restoration, adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, and Convention on Biological Diversity technical series publications, an enabling environment was provided to Parties and stakeholders for the design of restoration targets. During the second phase of the Initiative (2021–2025), marked by the adoption of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the transition to global engagement, support was provided for the development of the massive open online course on ecosystem restoration and several online webinars were conducted so that a wider audience could benefit from trainings.

17. Under the Initiative, support was provided for the activities of the voluntary technical partnership supporting the implementation of the road map towards planning and reporting on Target 2 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework related to: developing the *Resource*

*Guide to Target 2 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework*² and mobilizing technical partners as well as the subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centres established under the Convention. Lessons learned included the following: the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative would benefit from stronger alignment with the Framework; and there should be more targeted support of relevant policies for Parties, as the use of tools, resources and opportunities were dependent on Parties' needs and capabilities. Overall, despite being relatively small, the initiative had, in the past, successfully assisted Parties in developing the capacity to incorporate ecosystem restoration as a part of Aichi Biodiversity Target 15 in their national biodiversity strategies and action plans and apply knowledge products within the context of forest ecosystem restoration.

18. In four breakout groups, workshop participants reflected on best practices, key success factors and limitations and how the efficiency and impact of activities implemented by the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative could be enhanced. Discussions were structured around four thematic topics: direct country support through small-scale projects; regional and subregional engagement and capacity-building; knowledge products and technical tools; and communication, dissemination and uptake.

19. When discussing small-scale projects, participants highlighted the sustainability and scalability of the projects as presenting a recurring challenge. Projects succeeded in engaging communities and youth but often lacked adequate institutional support and documentation. Participants emphasized the need for integrated approaches across sectors, training and empowerment of local actors and explicit recognition of traditional knowledge. While national Governments and subnational authorities were seen as critical partners in scaling up, competitive selection and equitable distribution of resources remained important considerations. Linkages to reporting frameworks, such as frameworks for Target 2, were underlined.

20. In addressing how regional and subregional mechanisms, alongside capacity-building efforts, could support the scaling of ecosystem restoration, participants stressed that collaboration at regional levels through technical and scientific cooperation support centres and existing organizations helped countries learn from each other and build on shared ecological and socio-economic contexts. Grouping of countries based on common needs or regions based on shared vegetation types was viewed as more effective than purely geographical divisions. While capacity-building was considered fundamental, systematic capacity needs assessments at global, national and local levels were recommended, with inclusive participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth. Moreover, it was recommended that capacity-building should extend beyond tree planting to include issues such as invasive species management and post-fire recovery and that attention should be given to both technical and institutional capacities.

21. In the discussions centred on knowledge products and technical tools, while the diversity of tools developed under the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative and other initiatives was recognized, concerns regarding ownership, data quality and long-term sustainability were highlighted. Fragmentation of systems and limited accessibility for developing countries and indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as insufficient integration of cultural values, were among the key challenges identified. Opportunities included ensuring country ownership from the outset, synchronizing training programmes with available tools and products and promoting interoperability across multilateral environment agreements. It was underlined that tools should be tailored to context, support decision-making and adaptive management and remain accessible to local communities.

² *Delivering Restoration Outcomes for Biodiversity and Human Well-being: Resource Guide to Target 2 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework* (Rome, FAO; Montreal, Canada, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity; Washington, DC, Society for Ecological Restoration, 2024). Available at www.fao.org/ecosystem-restoration-monitoring/about/gbf-target-2/guide/en.

22. Communication was recognized as a cross-cutting issue. Barriers included complex technical language, a lack of translations and poor Internet connectivity in many areas. It was noted that projects often suffered from limited visibility. Recommendations included developing a range of audience-specific communication strategies, such as policy briefs and educational materials for children, and ensuring participatory approaches, including engagement with indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth. Diversified channels of communication were recommended, including radio, podcasts, social media and offline brochures, in addition to educational curricula. Greater integration of Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative-related communication with outreach under the Convention was encouraged, together with whole-of-society campaigns and visual materials that were more engaging.

Item 4

Threats to forest biodiversity and key pathways to the conservation and sustainable management of forests

23. Main threats to forest biodiversity and common challenges to and pathways for forest biodiversity conservation were discussed in a panel discussion. Panellists addressed national and regional trends and risk and opportunities for forest biodiversity conservation, among other topics.

24. The representative of Kenya shared the fact that, while the country native forests were vital water towers, carbon stores and biodiversity havens, they faced mounting threats from deforestation, fuelwood dependence, illegal logging, wildfires, invasive species and climate change. Kenya was responding by pursuing ambitious restoration and conservation strategies, which included growth of 15 billion trees by 2032, empowering communities through support for co-management and nature-based livelihoods, advancing clean cooking solutions and implementing innovative initiatives such as digital monitoring, water funds and integrated restoration schemes.

25. The representative of Türkiye explained that wildfires in that country, while once concentrated in Mediterranean regions, were now spreading nationwide owing to climate change and human-driven events, with nearly 90 per cent of fires linked to human activity. Türkiye had responded by developing a comprehensive science-based wildfire management system which combined prevention, preparedness, rapid response, recovery and regional cooperation and was supported by advanced technology, regional cooperation, capacity development, community engagement and large-scale reforestation efforts.

26. A representative of the Saami Council shared information on how the Saami people, indigenous to northern Scandinavia and parts of the Russian Federation, engaged in a deep, traditional and sustainable relationship with forests. The relationship was maintained through the role played by the forests in reindeer grazing, foraging and hunting and selective wood harvesting, with all of those activities guided by traditional ecological knowledge so as to preserve biodiversity. At the same time, the cultural and spiritual significance of the forests for the Saami people shaped their practices and underpinned support for community-based conservation.

27. In a presentation on the Asian Forest Cooperation Organization, the representative of the organization clarified that it was a treaty-based intergovernmental organization bringing together 15 Asian countries and two observers to jointly implement sustainable forest management, forest restoration and climate adaptation projects. It emphasized transformation of established forestry technologies and policies into concrete action through capacity-building, community livelihood support, forest disaster risk management, forest land restoration and conservation, as well as regional cooperation to help its Parties meet international climate and forest-related goals.

Item 5**Aligning the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework**

28. Agenda item 5 was split into two topics: (a) aligning the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework; and (b) defining the unique values of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative.

Topic A: aligning the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

29. Three participants were invited to share information on how forest commitments were integrated into their countries' targets or revised national biodiversity strategies and action plans, including on data and capacity gaps and opportunities for capacity development.

30. The representative of Peru explained the participatory process through which the country had developed its national biodiversity strategy and action plan, including five strategic objectives to be achieved by 2050. The plan integrated clear commitments for forest conservation, restoration and sustainable use that were aligned with global goals and targets and other Rio conventions, for example, the commitments to restore 20 per cent of degraded surfaces through nature-based solutions and 10 per cent of areas affected by climate variation. The representative presented a robust set of mechanisms encompassing governance operational measures, research and finance aimed at ensuring sustainable forest management.

31. The representative of Tunisia delivered a presentation on the forest-related commitments integrated into her country's national biodiversity strategy and action plan, which were fully aligned with global targets and other Rio conventions. Key actions included reforestation with native species adapted to arid and semi-arid climates, restoring oasis forest systems and integrating trees into agropastoral systems, building ecological corridors to improve habitat connectivity and implementing soil and water conservation measures. The representative showcased an adaptive management and restoration project aligned with the plan of Tunisia.

32. In a presentation, the representative of Indonesia indicated that commitments on forest restoration were set forth under target 2 of the country's national biodiversity strategy and action plan and encompassed various restoration objectives and management systems covering terrestrial and marine ecosystems. Indonesia had established a baseline for area under restoration in 2020 with targets and indicators for different time horizons until 2045. The representative delivered a presentation on the governmental and non-governmental institutions involved in forest landscape restoration and shared an example of a restoration project and information on the country's funding framework and gaps and challenges.

33. Consideration of this topic concluded with a presentation by a representative of the Secretariat on a joint initiative on forest biodiversity implemented by members of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests. Under the initiative, countries were assisted in the coherent implementation of forest-related commitments and an analysis was carried out of forest-related issues detailed in revised national biodiversity strategies and action plans received since the adoption of the Framework. A preliminary analysis of 54 plans produced the following findings: the subject of forests had been addressed in all of the documents reviewed; climate change emerged as the most frequently mentioned threat; improving sustainable forest management was identified as a key strategy; and financial and data-related constraints were the most-reported obstacles.

Topic B: defining the unique values of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative

34. The key objective under topic B was to identify the areas where the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative could make the biggest impact, taking into consideration the five-year timeline for delivering the 2030 targets of the Framework.

35. The session began with a presentation by a representative of the Secretariat on the interlinkages between forests and the targets of the Framework and on the strategic review of and update to the expanded programme of work on forest biodiversity,³ to be considered at the twenty-seventh meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, as well as other relevant processes under the Convention.

36. In the panel discussion that followed, panellists identified, from the perspective of their respective country or organization, unique values of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative that should be leveraged during the third phase of the Initiative, considering, especially, that many countries, organizations and initiatives were implementing forest restoration and capacity-building activities. The main unique values shared included the role of the Convention in addressing biodiversity-specific challenges by linking forest restoration with commitments included in national biodiversity strategies and action plans and other international processes related to the Rio conventions, building on the existing efforts by regional restoration actors and the engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the context of the new programme of work on Article 8 (j) and other provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity related to indigenous peoples and local communities. Maintaining close communication with national focal points under the Convention and tailoring the capacity-building programme to specific regional needs, for example, those of small island States, were highlighted by panel speakers. Over 10 years, unique experience had been gained under the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative in supporting countries in advancing forest restoration, which should be further strengthened through scientific and technical guidance.

37. Participants were invited to discuss priorities for the third phase of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative with respect to supporting Parties in three different areas, based on the unique values identified: (a) informing national and global policy related to forest ecosystem restoration; (b) capacity development needs, technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer; and (c) strengthening partnerships. For this purpose, four breakout groups were formed, grouping together participants according to their regional affiliation to allow for discussions with a regional focus.

Summary of breakout group discussions on how the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative could support national and global policies related to forest restoration (Target 2) and other related issues

38. In discussing how the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative could support national policies, participants from the Asia-Pacific region highlighted the need to work at the grass-roots level, for example, through promoting rights-based, bottom-up approaches that empowered indigenous peoples and local communities, thereby assisting Governments in localizing and harmonizing restoration goals. The group highlighted the need for facilitating harmonization of forest-related policies across Governments, scaling up successful local practices and providing guidance on land tenure and customary rights, integrating biodiversity, climate and land degradation considerations into restoration programmes, contributing to the development of national biodiversity action plans and supporting implementation based on regional policy analysis.

39. Participants from the Latin American and Caribbean region recommended, for policy support, increasing awareness related to the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, increasing efforts aimed at mainstreaming biodiversity in sectors, strengthening empowerment of indigenous peoples and local communities and civil society organizations and raising advocacy and awareness on restoration as well as financing for restoration measures.

40. Regional priorities for the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative in Africa could be centred on strengthening policy and regulatory frameworks for forestry and forest ecosystem restoration, while contributing to decision-making under the Convention on Biological Diversity and other

³ See documents [CBD/SBSTTA/27/5/Add.2](#) and [CBD/SBSTTA/27/INF/9](#).

international processes. Key areas of support included advancing the African Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative, assisting with the finalization and implementation of the regional biodiversity strategies and action plans under the auspices of the African Union and enhancing the capacity of the African group of negotiators. The Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative could facilitate exchanges among policymakers on the revision of national policies, updates of national biodiversity strategies and action plans and regional policy dialogues. Moreover, the Initiative could support African partners in engaging effectively within the context of the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, with particular emphasis on using and monitoring the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative platform, and also support African partners in implementing the newly established United Nations Decade for Afforestation and Reforestation in line with Sustainable Forest Management (2027–2036).

41. Participants from the Western European and other and Eastern European regions suggested that the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative could support the development of scientific assessments in a format similar to the format of those assessments produced by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, which provided clear and actionable knowledge for policymakers. Those participants highlighted the need to better understand the interactions of forest activities across multiple targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and called for practical guidance to help countries align their national forest policies with the Framework. The group stressed that, at the global level, the Initiative could contribute to guidance on operationalizing forest-related targets, with a particular focus on rights-based approaches and the full and effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities.

Summary of breakout group discussion on regional priorities for technical and scientific cooperation and capacity development activities

42. Regional priorities for the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative in Africa regarding capacity development, technical and scientific cooperation and technology transfer could focus on strengthening regional expertise in the forestry sector and forest ecosystem restoration. This would include supporting regional assessments of capacity needs, promoting the integration of forestry into national and regional biodiversity strategies and action plans and assisting in the development of curricula and scholarship programmes related to forestry and restoration. Building on tools developed in earlier phases, such as WePlan-Forests and Restoring Hope, the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative could facilitate dissemination of capacity-building initiatives to enhance their effective use. In partnership with FAO under the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, the Initiative could contribute to regional capacity development for monitoring and reporting on Target 2 and other relevant targets. Further, under the Initiative, regional events and exchange visits could be organized to promote innovative tools and techniques, thereby accelerating technology transfer across Africa.

43. The group of participants from the Asia-Pacific region concluded that capacity-building for forest ecosystem restoration should be targeted at and include all levels of government, with a view to supporting policy development and knowledge exchange and strengthening biodiversity-focused restoration. Moreover, given capacity needs, efforts should focus on enhancing communication and media skills and improving monitoring, evaluation and reporting as well as adaptive management skills. The group suggested that indigenous peoples and local communities should be empowered to initiate and lead their own restoration activities and recommended that access to knowledge, results and lessons learned derived from the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative should be consolidated and improved.

44. The group of representatives from the Latin American and Caribbean region identified three priority areas for capacity development needed to advance forest ecosystem restoration. First, there was a need for accreditation and certified project management within government institutions to ensure robust planning, implementation and oversight of restoration initiatives. Second, efforts were required to strengthen knowledge on restoration indicators, improve access to restoration financing

and enhance capabilities in ex situ conservation. Third, scientific cooperation was essential for advancing restoration-related research, facilitating technology transfer for effective monitoring and supporting evidence-based decision-making. Addressing those capacity needs was critical for enabling countries in the region to implement restoration efforts efficiently and sustainably.

45. In discussing capacity development, participants from the Western European and other and Eastern European regions noted the role of the Antalya International Forestry Training Centre in advancing forestry practices and post-fire management. They highlighted the value of training courses on ecosystem integrity, such as those offered in the United Kingdom Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, in equipping stakeholders with the knowledge needed for effective restoration. Those participants underlined the importance of building capacity through targeted training for indigenous peoples and local communities to enable them to integrate their knowledge systems and lead restoration efforts in their indigenous and traditional territories.

Summary of breakout group discussion on partners that could be invited to contribute to the implementation of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative

46. Participants from the Latin American and Caribbean region noted that partnerships for forest ecosystem restoration could be strengthened through the engagement of a wide range of actors at regional, bilateral and multilateral levels. Regional initiatives, including the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization and the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, provided important platforms for coordination and knowledge exchange among countries sharing common challenges and opportunities. Subregional technical and scientific cooperation support centres, together with organizations such as the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture, played a crucial role in delivering technical expertise and facilitating implementation on the ground. Bilateral cooperation contributed to targeted financial resources, technology transfer and capacity-building. At the global level, collaboration within the context of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (including REDD+), the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa and the Convention on Biological Diversity ensured that restoration efforts were aligned with international commitments and benefit from synergies among the Rio conventions. Multilateral, development and regional banks were essential partners in mobilizing large-scale financing and leveraging investments for long-term sustainability, while the private sector introduced innovation, entrepreneurship and market-based solutions. Joint action through regional platforms such as Initiative 20x20 would reinforce political momentum, promote accountability and encourage the scaling up of restoration across the region.

47. From the perspective of participants from the African region, regional priorities for the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative regarding knowledge management and partnerships could focus on strengthening strategic collaborations and enhancing the dissemination of information to support forest ecosystem restoration. This could include developing partnerships with regional and subregional initiatives such as the African Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative and the African Union Development Agency-New Partnership for Africa's Development, as well as other processes, to implement activities under the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative, including policy development and capacity-building events. The Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative could support resource mobilization for the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, particularly implementation of Target 2, by facilitating donor round tables and promoting biodiversity mainstreaming within donor frameworks. Moreover, the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative could equip national focal points under the Convention and partners with effective communication tools, such as tool kits, flyers and policy briefs, and facilitate the sharing of good practices through regional platforms, field visits, knowledge exchange events and support for revisions of national biodiversity strategies and action plans.

48. In reflecting on partnerships, participants from the Asia-Pacific region discussed collaboration options with a wide range of organizations across different sectors including science, research and

policy development, finance and media, and organizations focusing on indigenous peoples and local communities, gender and youth, such as the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact, the Global Alliance of Community Forestry, the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, the Centre for International Forestry Research and World Agroforestry, the Alliance of Bioversity International and the International Center for Tropical Agriculture, the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, the Asia Pacific Forest Genetic Resources Programme, RESULT Asia-Pacific, the Asian Development Bank, the Global Environment Facility and the World Bank.

49. Participants from the Western European and other and Eastern European regions identified a range of potential partners in supporting the implementation of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative in their regions. Those potential partners included knowledge-sharing and research initiatives such as the Mediterranean Forestry and Natural Resources Management programme, forest certification schemes such as the Forest Stewardship Council, the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification and Pro Sylva and regional networks including the Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation Programme and the European Forest Genetic Resources programme. Global advocacy and coordination actors such as the Global Forest Coalition, along with multilateral and intergovernmental organizations including the European Union and the International Resource Panel, were highlighted as key contributors.

Item 6

Whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach

50. The representative of the Central African Republic shared that community forestry was increasingly recognized as a key mechanism for sustainable forest management, strengthening customary land rights, protecting biodiversity and improving local livelihoods. Formalized under the 2008 Forest Code and the 2015 implementation decree, it provides communities with legal authority over their forest resources, supported by a technical commission responsible for reviewing applications and ensuring compliance. Experience has demonstrated that success relies on recognizing traditional governance, ensuring equitable participation and benefits, enhancing capacity and securing clear user rights. This approach shifts forest conservation from centralized control to community empowerment, integrating local knowledge, reinforcing governance and reducing illegal activities, thereby improving conservation outcomes that align with community needs.

51. Discussions under agenda item 6 focused on defining the role that diverse stakeholder groups could play in the effective implementation of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative. In that context, several panellists shared insights on stakeholder engagement approaches within their organizations or constituencies.

52. The participant from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland shared the perspective of the UK Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, a scientific research institution underpinning global environmental policy development and conservation action. The Centre conducts research on forest ecosystems and forest genetic resources to support sustainable management and biodiversity conservation and provides scientific data and monitoring and modelling tools which inform climate-resilient restoration strategies and policy decisions for forests in the United Kingdom and globally.

53. The ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, established as a technical and scientific cooperation support centre under the Convention on Biological Diversity, provides expertise, capacity-building and knowledge-sharing platforms to help member States apply science-based approaches to biodiversity conservation, monitor progress on national targets and align regional initiatives with the global Framework. The ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity promotes a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach by facilitating coordinated action among national agencies, local governments, civil society organizations and private sector actors to implement biodiversity policies and strategies across South-East Asia.

54. The representative of the Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration explained that the Partnership was a voluntary network of Governments, organizations, companies and communities working to restore degraded and deforested landscapes worldwide. She elaborated on the subject, explaining that forest landscape restoration was defined as a process whose aim was to enable ecological functionality to be regained and human well-being to be enhanced in deforested or degraded landscapes. Forest landscape restoration was not an end in itself but rather a means of enabling vital ecological and social functions to be regained, improved and maintained, which would lead in the long term to greater resilience and sustainability of landscapes. The Partnership facilitated knowledge-sharing, technical guidance and capacity-building, supported the development of national and regional restoration strategies and tracked progress towards achieving global restoration targets, including those under the Bonn Challenge and the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration.

55. The representative of the Federation of Community Forestry Users Nepal shared information on how the Federation empowered local communities to sustainably manage and conserve forests in Nepal by supporting community-based forest governance, capacity-building and advocacy for forest rights and biodiversity conservation.

56. The representative of the Society for Wetland Biodiversity Conservation Nepal gave a presentation on the Mundhum initiative for biocultural diversity restoration in the sacred Himalayan landscape of the country's indigenous and traditional territories, as well as community engagement activities to raise awareness about the importance of wetlands and their customary sustainable management and livelihood promotion actions to encourage the sustainable use of wetland resources in support of indigenous and local communities and livelihoods.

Item 7

Other matters

57. A representative of the Korea Forest Service presented an outline of the programme for the excursion to the National Arboretum and the National Institute of Forest Science, scheduled for the last day of the workshop. Participants would be invited to visit the wildfire disaster control centre and listen to a presentation on policies of the Republic of Korea on forest resource management using information and communications technology.

58. Participants were invited to fill out an evaluation form online. A summary of the evaluations is contained in annex II of the present document.

Item 8

Closure of the workshop

59. The workshop was closed at 5 p.m. on 27 August 2025 following the closing remarks of the representatives of the Secretariat. The field visit took place on 28 August 2025.

Annex I

Key conclusions and recommendations

1. Key conclusions from the workshop

1. The discussions on best processes and key success factors and limitations showed strong interlinkages among projects, tools, communication and capacity-building. An integrated approach was essential, where projects generated practical lessons, tools provided monitoring and evaluation support, communication ensured dissemination and uptake and capacity-building enabled long-term sustainability. Institutional anchoring at both national and regional levels was seen as indispensable. The comparative advantage of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative lay in combining those elements under a single framework, supporting countries in a holistic manner.
2. The workshop reaffirmed the significant contributions of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative to ecosystem restoration over the past decade. Key areas for reinforcement included:
 - (a) Ensuring the sustainability and upscaling of projects;
 - (b) Securing long-term ownership and maintenance of tools;
 - (c) Developing inclusive, audience-specific communication strategies;
 - (d) Strengthening regional collaboration alongside systematic capacity-building;
 - (e) Extending partnerships to engage other organizations focused on capacity-building, technical and scientific cooperation and donors, as appropriate.
3. Participants agreed that lessons from the Initiative's first decade should guide its next phase and contribute to effective implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

2. Recommendations for the next phase of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative

4. The key recommendations for the third phase of the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative emerging from the group discussion revealed the need for strong interlinkages among future activities, including projects, tools, communication and capacity-building. For the third phase to be successful, an integrated approach would be essential through which projects would generate practical lessons, tools would provide monitoring and evaluation support, communication would ensure dissemination and uptake and capacity-building would enable long-term sustainability. Institutional anchoring at both national and regional levels was seen as indispensable. The comparative advantage of the Initiative lay in combining those elements under a single framework, supporting countries in a holistic manner. Recommendations based on the four pillars of the Initiative, namely, informing policy, scientific and technical exchange and capacity-building, supporting and learning from local actions and communication and outreach, are set out below.

Informing policy

- (a) Leverage and mainstream within national biodiversity frameworks: the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative should support countries in the development or implementation of their national biodiversity strategies and action plans, which were seen as overarching policy documents. Moreover, support could focus on mainstreaming the forestry sector within national or regional strategies and plans;
- (b) Promote policy exchange and harmonization: the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative should facilitate the harmonization of forest-related policies. Furthermore, support could be given to exchanges between countries (through policymakers) concerning policy revision processes, policy updates and policy dialogues;

(c) Promote a rights-based approach to land and tenure: policy guidance must be provided on critical issues such as land tenure and customary rights for indigenous peoples and local communities in their territories. Policymaking should incorporate a rights-based approach;

Scientific and technical exchange and capacity-building

(d) Conduct systematic and inclusive capacity needs assessments: systematic capacity needs assessments could be conducted at the global, national and local levels. Those assessments should be inclusive, ensuring the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth;

(e) Expand technical scope beyond tree planting: capacity-building should go beyond basic tree planting to cover advanced technical issues. This would include skills related to invasive species management, post-fire recovery and genetic resources as well as addressing the currently limited capacity for biodiversity-oriented restoration;

(f) Facilitate regional collaboration and peer-to-peer learning: collaboration at regional levels through technical and scientific cooperation support centres and existing organizations would help countries learn from each other. The Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative should support exchanges of best practices, peer-to-peer learning and scientific collaborations including through organizing field visits between countries and knowledge-sharing events. To ensure continuity and sustainability of expertise, a regional pool of trainers could be developed;

(g) Integrate traditional ecological knowledge with scientific knowledge: the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative should promote culturally appropriate capacity-building with a view to strengthening indigenous peoples and local communities in their ability to integrate their knowledge systems with scientific knowledge, taking into account free, prior and informed consent and full and effective participation;

Supporting and learning from local actions

(h) Enhance sustainability and scalability of small-scale projects: the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative should take into account the recurring challenges related to the sustainability and scalability of small-scale projects by ensuring that projects secured long-term ownership and maintenance. Scaling up would require strong support from national Governments and subnational authorities, which were seen as critical partners;

(i) Employ integrated approaches and robust institutional support: the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative should design project implementation by ensuring integrated approaches across sectors. Participants noted that projects often lacked adequate institutional support. Implementation should therefore prioritize securing the necessary institutional anchoring at both national and regional levels, which was viewed as indispensable for sustainability;

(j) Prioritize training, empowerment and traditional local knowledge integration: projects supported through the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative could focus on the training and empowerment of local actors, including indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth. Capacity-building for implementation by local authorities was seen as key to scaling up projects;

(k) Strengthen linkages to global monitoring and adaptive management: the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative should focus on activities that contributed to reporting to global frameworks such as the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, in particular on Target 2;

Communication and outreach

(l) Diversify communication channels and develop audience tailored communication strategies: the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative should use diversified communication

channels to increase outreach and project visibility and develop communication strategies that moved beyond complex technical language and addressed barriers such as the lack of translations;

(m) Ensure participatory approaches: communication strategies should adopt participatory approaches that actively involved indigenous peoples and local communities, women and youth. Communication should be viewed as cross-cutting and integrated with other elements, such as projects and tools, to ensure dissemination;

(n) Strengthen integration with other outreach campaigns: greater integration of Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative communication with outreach by the Convention on Biological Diversity and other initiatives should be encouraged. This should include executing whole-of-society campaigns and developing visual materials that were more engaging. Active awareness-raising on the United Nations Decade on Ecosystem Restoration was recommended;

(o) Equip partners and improve knowledge-sharing: the Forest Ecosystem Restoration Initiative should provide and equip national focal points and partners with effective communication products (such as tool kits, flyers and policy briefs). Furthermore, there was a need to improve access to knowledge, results and lessons learned derived from the Initiative.

Annex II

Summary of the results of the workshop evaluation

Satisfaction with the workshop

	<i>Overall agenda and structure of the workshop</i>	<i>Presentations (on all topics covered)</i>	<i>Panel discussions</i>	<i>Group work</i>	<i>Level of interaction and discussion among participants</i>	<i>Applicability of information provided to own area of work</i>
Very satisfied	9	12	9	16	10	12
Satisfied	5	1	6	16	3	2
Neutral	–	1	–	7	2	–
Dissatisfied	–	1	–	3	–	–
Very dissatisfied	1	–	–	–	–	–

Satisfaction related to organizational aspects of the workshop

	<i>Overall organization</i>	<i>Quality of venue, logistics and support provided</i>	<i>Quality of workshop moderation and work facilitation</i>
Very satisfied	12	11	12
Satisfied	2	4	2
Neutral	1	–	1
Dissatisfied	–	–	–
Very dissatisfied	–	–	–

Allocation of time per session

Too short	6
Appropriate	8
Too long	1

Annex III

List of participants

Parties

Cambodia

Meng Monyrak

Central African Republic

Cléoface Landry Mabessimo

Chile

Paulina Stowhas Salinas

Ecuador

Andrés Ricardo Factos Mendoza

Indonesia

Sugeng Budiharta

Kenya

Faith Nyokabi Wambugu

Madagascar

Ramenason Rasolonirina

Nigeria

Sikeade Oluwakemi Egbuwalo

Palau

Kiyara-mae Eluil Swanson

Peru

Evelin Sofia Tito Vera

Philippines

Princess Mariel Razon

Russian Federation

Alexandr Voropaev

Saint Lucia

Donatian Gustave

Tajikistan

Khisoravshokh Shermatov

Bonui Sharifzoda

Tunisia

Siheem Ben Hadj Ameer

Türkiye

Muhammed Hakan Çakmak

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Stephen Cavers

Indigenous peoples and local communities

Chemichemi Foundation

Margaret Kaigongi

Kenya

Grassroot organization for promotional endeavour (GOPE)

Gopinath Majhi

India

Saami Council

Karin Nutti Pilflykt

Norway

Society for Wetland Biodiversity Conservation Nepal

Kamal Kumar Rai

Nepal

Stakeholders

Federation of Community Forestry Users Nepal, Fundación Ambiente y Recursos Naturales and CBD Women's Caucus

Bharati Kumari Pathak

Nepal

Organizations

Alliance of Bioversity International and the International Center for Tropical Agriculture

Riina Jalonen

ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity

Amiel Sarne

Asian Forest Cooperation Organization

Molina Nolie

Tongil Kim

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Christophe Besacier

Matheus Teixeira Pires Do Couto

Global Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration and World Wide Fund for Nature

Anita Toledo Barros Diederichsen

International Tropical Timber Organization

Soomin Lee

**International Union for Conservation of
Nature**

Paula Priest

Korea University

Hwan-ok Ma

**United Nations Development Programme
Tajikistan**

Dilovar Zainidinov

Korea Forest Service

Sangick Lee

Hyunju Lee

Hwa Young Park

Wonjae Choi

Eunseong Lee

Jungyo Lee

Kae-sun Chang (Korea National Arboretum)

**Secretariat of the Convention on
Biological Diversity**

Jihyun Lee

Jamal Annagylyjova

Regina Kipper