

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2772	
GEF Agency project ID		3444	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Building a Comprehensive National Protected Areas System: A Financial and Operational Framework	
Country/Countries		Chile	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		1- Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		National Commission for the Environment (CONAMA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), The Nature Conservancy (TNC) as project partners	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		8/22/2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		8/28/2008	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		August 2013	
Actual date of project completion		January 2016	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.312	.312
	Co-financing	.14	NA
GEF Project Grant		5.0	4.91
Co-financing	IA own	.15	.57
	Government	31.5	14.858
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	1.56	1.161
Total GEF funding		5.312	5.222
Total Co-financing		33.35	16.589
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		38.662	21.811
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 2016	
Author of TE		Jose Galindo and Eduardo Fuentes	
TER completion date		1/9/2017	
TER prepared by		Molly Watts	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Mathias Einberger	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	-	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		-	-	ML
M&E Design		S	-	S
M&E Implementation		S	-	MS
Quality of Implementation		S	-	MU
Quality of Execution		S	-	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global environmental objective of the project is the “Conservation and sustainable management of biological diversity, associated cultural patrimony, and environmental goods and services that support national regional and local development.” (Request for CEO Endorsement p.11)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project’s development objective was that “A financially sustainable new National Protected Area System is designed and under initial implementation in Chile.” (Request for CEO Endorsement p.11) The project planned to achieve this by working towards 4 outcomes:

- 1: The Legal, strategic and operational framework is functioning for the sustainable financing of a new integrated National System of Protected Areas (SNAP)
- 2: Revenue Generation Mechanisms have increased Funding Levels of SNAP PAs
- 3: New partnerships in place to share SNAP management costs with public funding entities and productive sectors
- 4: Institutional and individual capacities enhanced for planning, managing and investing funds in a cost effective manner across SNAP PAs

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

The project’s Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives and Outcomes remained the same, however some outputs were modified or eliminated. For example, output 1.3: Priority sites for the conservation of biodiversity identified for future inclusion in the SNAP, was eliminated, as the work had already been done by Chilean Ministry of the Environment (MMA). The project also modified output 1.1: Legal and Regulatory Framework developed and approved to support the implementation and financing of the SNAP. Instead of working to elaborate, finalize and gain approval of a General Law of SNAP as initially planned, it eventually sought to provide inputs and strategic guidance to authorities for the design of the law. (TE p.21)

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

The TE rates relevance for this project as “relevant” and this TER gives a rating of Satisfactory. The project was relevant to GEF strategies, specifically the GEF-4 Biodiversity Long term objective 1: Catalyzing the Sustainability of Protected Areas strategic program 1: Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level. The project objective is to develop and implement a sustainable financial strategy for a new Protected Area System.

The project was also relevant to Chile’s policies and strategies related to biodiversity. The project was a key input to Chile’s National Protected Areas Policy (NPPA) of 2005, which dictated setting up a comprehensive National Protected Area System to provide an effectively managed and representative PA estate. The project also addressed specifically the 2007 National Protected Areas Policy Action Plan, which had as a priority the consolidation of the existing PA estate and the securing of funds needed for effective implementation of SNAP.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates effectiveness as Satisfactory. This TER rates effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory. The project was able to deliver on many key products, however others were only partially completed, and some key results proposed in the original log frame, such as the creation by law of a National System of Protected Areas (SNAP), have not yet been achieved. While there was a significant increase between 2006 and 2015 in financing levels of the institutions responsible for protected area management, surpassing targets for this indicator, it is not clear that this was a result of the project, and CONAF, which received the greatest increase in funding, did not perceive this to be a project result. Additionally, key targets related to improvements in Management Effectiveness Tracking Tools scores were not met over the course of the project, as there were no significant differences in scores at the end of the project compared to project start, although on qualitative elements there was significant improvement. Capacity Development scores did improve significantly however, especially on the individual and institutional dimensions, reaching 85% and 79% of targeted improvement levels.

The project’s development objective was that “A financially sustainable new National Protected Area System is designed and under initial implementation in Chile.” (Request for CEO Endorsement p.11) At

the objective level, achievement of outcomes was measured using improvements on Management Effectiveness Track Tools scores. The project planned to achieve this by working towards 4 outcomes:

1: The Legal, strategic and operational framework is functioning for the sustainable financing of a new integrated National System of Protected Areas (SNAP). One project target was a general law of SNAP presented for approval to the National Congress by end of 2009 and approved and operational by end of the project. A draft bill creating the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Service (SBAP) and the National Protected Area System (SNAP) was approved by the Chilean Senate's Environment Committee in December 2014, and by Senate on March 4, 2015. (2015 PIR) 3 out of 4 strategic objectives proposed by the project were included in the bill currently being processed in the Senate. Additionally, the National Protected Areas Committee (CNAP) had been formed and was operational by the end of the project, and had adopted the main lines of action developed by the project, thus effectively meeting the target that institutions related to PAs incorporated in SNAP are operating under common standards and under the management of the SNAP Executive Coordination Unit.

2: Revenue Generation Mechanisms have increased Funding Levels of SNAP PAs. The TE considers three out of five planned outputs under this component to be fully achieved, and the other two to have been partially achieved. As part of this objective, the project undertook an economic valuation of the ecosystems covered by Chile's protected areas as planned. The TE reports that the project partially achieved the planned output of creating mechanisms and strategies to increase public budget allocations to PAs and SNAPs, as no significant variation in budget allocation could be found as a result of the tools generated by the project. The project did create two documents to support 2016 budget negotiation processes. In terms of creating mechanisms to increase generation of income in protected areas, at the time of the TE there was a proposal facilitating arrangements for the generation of income in terrestrial and marine PAs. In terms of the planned outcome to create new income mechanisms to generate funding sources for public SNAP PAs, the TE considers this output partially completed. The project also prepared technical proposals laying the basis for compensation schemes in biodiversity, and the proposal of facilitating arrangements for the generation of income. The project also produced a proposal for a Conservation Fund. In terms of creating new instruments to channel resources in a sustained way to the Protected Areas of the SNAP private subsystem, the project created 4 documents, 2 related to ecosystem services, and 2 related to compensation schemes in biodiversity. Finally, the project achieved concrete results in implementing demonstrative financing actions in different subsystems of PAs and ecoregions of the country for replication.

3: New partnerships in place to share SNAP management costs with public funding entities and productive sectors. The terminal evaluation considers two of the four main planned outputs under this component to have been achieved. Specifically, the project was successful in creating guidelines for optimizing revenue from public development and promotion funds to support protected area funding. The guidelines created are being revised and edited to be included in the next publication of the Agricultural Development Institute (INDAP). Additionally, the project created a National Protected Area Committee, which the TE notes as one of the most significant changes in interinstitutional coordination brought about by the project, and as one of the best opportunities to ensure project sustainability. Partially completed outputs were the integration of SNAP and its subsystems into development

strategies, overcoming poverty and improving the quality of life at the national and regional levels, and the creation of SNAP National and Regional Awareness Programs. In terms of the former, a methodological proposal was presented to insert Protected Areas and supporting areas into Territorial Organization Plans at the regional level. The proposal is under review and editing by the Undersecretary of Regional and Administrative Development of Chile and the Ministry of Environment, and there is the potential for it to be used. For the latter, the project’s main product was the organization of colloquiums as part of a citizen awareness and diffusion program, which were applauded by the project partners and are noted by the TE as one of the most practical contributions of the project in terms of communication.

4: Institutional and individual capacities enhanced for planning, managing and investing funds in a cost effective manner across SNAP PAs. The terminal evaluation considers two of the four planned outputs under this component to have been fully achieved. The project fully met targets for training of key personnel in the SNAP and PA subsystems for cost-efficient management and reduction of threats to biodiversity. The TE states that an estimated 350 people were trained in different tools and skills for conservation and management of protected areas, and the training was applauded by CONAF and park rangers. The output of creating a capacity building program for the SNAP and a post-project implementation strategy was also achieved. Technical reports were prepared to support the formalization of park ranger positions, and a continuing education program for SBAP professionals was also developed. One partially achieved output was related to technical guidelines for management effectiveness and financial sustainability of SNAP PAs. Though technical documents were approved, there has been no formal training for their use. The final output was a project management system. The TE reports that the project lacks clear tools to evaluate compliance, and though a project M&E plan was developed and the relevant tracking tools were implemented, there was no process for capture and systemization of lessons learned, and no project document or strategy created.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Unable to Assess
-----------------------	--------------------------

The TE rates efficiency as Satisfactory, but does not present information related to project efficiency. The project was extended by two years, and the project PIRs report that the establishment of the SNAP “has taken longer than expected because of a series of institutional changes.” In its description of project financial management, the TE notes that disbursements were slow in the project’s first phase, with a significant improvement in the second phase. Due to lack of information this TER is unable to assess project efficiency.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	---------------------------

The TE does not provide an overall rating for project sustainability, but does provide ratings on the four dimensions of sustainability. This TER rates sustainability as Moderately Likely.

Financial- The TE rates this as moderately likely. There are other projects with related initiatives, which could ensure follow-up of the project’s intervention. In 2009 the Ministry of Finance established a specific budget glossary for the National System of Protected Wild Areas of the State (SNASPE), providing detailed information on the annual budget of the SNASPE.

Socio-political- The TE rates this as moderately likely. The project did important work in raising stakeholder buy-in, for instance in holding the colloquiums as part of a citizen awareness and diffusion program, which were applauded by the project partners. The TE notes that NGOs TNC and WCS were involved in project implementation, with WCS contributing open standards for Protected Area management, which was a valuable instrument according to all project partners. Despite this, the TE notes that more NGO participation could have been valuable for project sustainability.

Institutional- The TE rates this as moderately unlikely, however there is no discussion of this rating. The TE notes however, that the most important opportunity for project sustainability is the creation of the National Protected Area Committee, made up of the relevant institutions. The Committee has been an important step in terms of inter-institutional coordination.

Environmental- The TE rates this as moderately likely, but does not provide information to support this rating. This TER is unable to assess environmental sustainability.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

According to the project's terminal evaluation, slightly less than 50% of promised co-financing materialized. The National Tourism Service (SERNATUR) and the Ministry of Public Works both contributed less than half of what they had promised, while the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) and the Municipality of Alhué contributed almost 1.5 and 3 times of what was committed, respectively. In the case of SERNATUR, a loan from IDB was canceled.

The TE notes that the contribution from WCS strengthened execution of the project, while co-financing from Alhué supported activities in lands that were of great interest to the municipality and the population. It is also notable that the largest shortfall in co-financing was in output 2.5: demonstrative actions implemented for replicability in the SNAP. However, the TE notes that this shortfall did not significantly affect execution of the demonstrated actions defined in the project revision.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was extended by two years following the mid-term review, one year of which was dedicated to continuing activities, another 6 months were dedicated to ensuring continuity of the project's actions by the new authorities, and the final 6 months for project close out. (TE p.21)

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE describes national ownership as being low in the first stage of the project, but improving significantly after the mid-term evaluation and project revisions. The project was executed by the Ministry of Environment of Chile (MMA), which the TE notes as the actor who showed the greatest commitment and ownership in the project’s second stage. The TE notes that the relationship between UNDP and MMA was complex at first but improved significantly after project revision and a change in the project coordinator. The government did provide co-financing, although it was less than the promised amount.

6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
<p>The TE rates M&E Design as Satisfactory, however there is no discussion of M&E Design. The project document includes a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan which includes all relevant monitoring and evaluation activities, including annual project performance reviews, and independent external mid-term review and final evaluation, as well as a dedicated budget of \$200,000 USD, or 4% of the \$5 million USD GEF budget (excluding team staff time and travel). The project’s results framework includes relevant indicators at every level. For this reason, this TER rates M&E Design at entry as Satisfactory.</p>	
6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
<p>The TE rates M&E Implementation as Satisfactory. The TE notes that in the project’s first phase a lack of internal monitoring caused disruptions in the project, and that the project was not meeting the agreed upon obligations made in the project documents. However, the TE notes that the situation changed drastically in the project’s second phase, during which a position dedicated to project monitoring was created and filled, and during which the new National Director of the project requested and carried out monthly monitoring, with the participation of the Minister of the Environment. Instruments used for project monitoring included the project’s triannual Plan, Project Implementation Reports, and GEF scorecards. Considering the shortcomings in project monitoring in the project’s first phase, and the apparent gains following revision after the mid-term evaluation, this TER rates M&E Implementation as Moderately Satisfactory.</p>	

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
--	-----------------------------------

The implementing agency for this project was UNDP. The TE rates quality of project implementation as satisfactory, and discusses quality of project implementation and execution together. The TE notes that there were several disagreements between UNDP, the Ministry of the Environment as the project executing agency, and the project coordinator, which led to delays and project difficulties, yet without causing further problems after the project midterm. Some elements of the project implementation never materialized, such as a planned steering committee and technical support committee, neither of which met during the project. (TE p.37) Due to the lack of oversight on implementation, but recognizing the stated improvements in the project's second half, this TER rates quality of project implementation as Moderately Unsatisfactory.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
---	-----------------------------------

The executing agency for this project was Chile's Ministry of the Environment. The TE rates quality of project execution as satisfactory, and as noted above, discusses quality of project implementation and execution together. As with most elements of the project, the TE notes significant improvement in the project's second phase. However, the project seems to have suffered from a fair level of turnover, as during the eight years of project execution there were 2 project coordinators and 4 project directors. Due to these shortcomings in the project's first phase, this TER rates quality of project execution as Moderately Unsatisfactory.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented,

sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

No environmental changes have been noted as a result of the project.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

No socioeconomic changes have been noted as a result of the project.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The TE notes notable advances in the level of institutional capacity as a result of the project within the Ministry of the Environment. Capacity Development scores did improve significantly, especially on the individual and institutional dimensions, reaching 85% and 79% of targeted improvement levels.

b) Governance

A draft bill creating the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Service (SBAP) and the National Protected Area System (SNAP) was approved by the Chilean Senate’s Environment Committee in December 2014, and by Senate on March 4, 2015. (2015 PIR) 3 out of 4 strategic objectives proposed by the project were included in the bill currently being processed in the Senate. Additionally, the National Protected Areas Committee (CNAP) had been formed and was operational by the end of the project, and had adopted the main lines of action developed by the project.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts were noted as a result of the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been

mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

Good practices that emerge from GEF SNAP come mainly from what was done in the second phase of implementation, such as agreeing among all partners on multi annual plans of tasks, times, budgets and responsibilities; Building good monitoring and evaluation plans, based on the multi annual plan; To have monitoring done by MMA, UNDP and the Project management unit; Working with international NGOs that provide expertise and funds, seeking to provide useful tools to partners at the time of implementing the SNAP, and not to approve regulatory instruments before beginning to prepare such tools.

- But there are also lessons learned from things that should not have been done. For example, projects that propose profound changes in environmental institutionality should consider long-term processes, high uncertainty and complexity. Therefore, a project in itself should not be the beginning and end of the process, but should be focused as a key component that plays a catalytic role, but that must be strategically constructed and articulated with new projects and initiatives over time. The political CDP of the project should not have been left aside, contemplating only a central role to the UAP.
- Projects linked to the approval of mechanisms beyond their control will likely have delays in their implementation. This is a high commitment, which is necessary within the construction of a country's environmental institutionality, but at the same time is risky and therefore expectations should be conservative.
- The lack of an initial itinerary, detailing what one wants to do at the level of products and activities from year one, can distort execution and distract resources.
- Much more can be done than seen in GEF SNAP by the implementing agencies to technically equip implementers for a quick start and for the use of appropriate monitoring and tracking tools.
- By delaying the midterm evaluation, the execution of the second phase was cut too short and the products did not reach maturity sufficiently. In the case of projects showing problems in execution, advancing the midterm evaluation should be considered.

As a preventive measure to allow sufficient time to execute the necessary corrections to re-route it.

- It must be ensured that PRODOC does not preclude execution by NGOs, which, with their experience, especially internationally, can help achieve objectives without having to "rediscover the wheel". PRODOC does not have to be inflexible either. It should allow certain margins of movement, especially when it comes to projects that try to modify institutionality. They could have benefited much more from them, especially their technical assistance and capacity to mobilize resources.
- GEF projects cannot be islands. UNDP as the Implementing Agency and the relevant ministries must emphasize the relationship between their GEF projects and their other activities and programs. In general, much more could also be done to promote south-south exchange and cooperation with other countries in the region that simultaneously executed similar projects.
- Project design should consider change management sufficiently, and not underestimate the complexity inherent in the resilience of individuals and institutions to change. The technical conformation of the teams and their time of dedication should be consistent with this complexity.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

A recommendation to UNDP is that in future projects involving institutional changes, the institutional process is considered in stages. For example in this case, rather than transferring responsibility for the management of protected areas to one actor, as it was transferred from CONAF to the Ministry of the Environment, the various actors could have retained their existing responsibilities and competencies, while a structure would be created control and promotion of the protected areas. Over time if the conditions are right, the system could be transferred to a single entity.

It is not a good idea to tie the project's results to the approval of laws or regulatory frameworks that it is not in a position to modify. If a project is linked with the approval of laws or regulations, it should be one of several possible scenarios, which should be considered from project start.

In projects with limited duration such as GEF projects, it is not appropriate to attempt to execute results one at a time. Valuable time is lost, as some products require time to mature. Greater initiative and flexibility must be shown to adapt to challenges posed by a highly dynamic environment.

Capacity building requires time, and cannot be limited to courses and talks. Instead measures of changes in people's behavior must be tracked. Thus related indicators should focus on changes in behavior rather than attendance at courses and talks.

UNDP and the national project team must have a good day-to-day monitoring system of the project and must use the mechanisms in their power to follow the originally proposed monitoring and evaluation plan. Waiting until the mid-term evaluation to do so can be a waste of valuable human, financial and time resources.

It is not a good idea to delay mid-term evaluations, as it cuts short a project's second phase, which should have time to correct problems from the first phase, and for changes to mature.

It seems desirable that a multi-year plan of products, activities, responsible actors, indicators, assigned budget and deadlines should be agreed with the project partners and UNDP at the beginning of the project. These plans appear to be a valuable guide, while helping to avoid distractions in the use of human, financial, and time resources.

NGOs and especially international NGOs have a lot of accumulated knowledge and also provide valuable co-financing. Therefore, projects should be free to make them partners in implementation and otherwise.

UNDP as an Implementing Agency, in collaboration with the relevant ministries, should ensure early on in the design and implementation of projects that they are effectively linked to other initiatives that are complementary and thus enhance the achievements of their portfolios.

It is essential to support the success of the National PA Committee, for which there is a clear need to seek new initiatives and projects that follow up on what has been achieved so far, and to ensure that the main products and results are kept alive. It is recommended that this Committee develops a portfolio of projects for the medium and long term, across the range of SNAP issues (planning and deployment, effective management, monitoring, control, financing, etc.). To approve, inter-institutionally, the draft of the National Plan of Action of PA (2015-2030) is fundamental in that.

The current situation of marine and coastal-marine PAs is certainly critical. Clearly it is the weakest space that currently has the conservation of PA of the country, and one of those that is under greater pressure in terms of the integrity of its resources. SERNAPESCA and MMA should work to replicate in other regions what is being done in Region II, in order to link marine PAs with regional governments and thus facilitate the reduction of threats.

There are key areas such as the Fourth World Marine Conservation Congress (IMPAC4), in which Chile is a host, which would be an opportunity for collaboration between SUBPESCA, SERNAPESCA, UNDP and MMA and should generate visibility and political motivation to update and adequately equip the Marine and coastal-marine conservation in the country.

The tools developed by the Project constitute an important asset to strengthen the negotiating capacity of the conservation actors, in front of the national instances that have decision-making power regarding the allocation of resources for the PAs. These tools deserve to be used. For this reason, it is recommended to invest in arming and equipping negotiating teams in the different institutions related to PAs, that have the capacity to use these tools and put them in function of increasing the public budget dedicated to the PAs. These teams could eventually be part of the structure and operation of the National PA Committee.

The MMA has an Information and Environmental Economics Unit. Ideally, this unit could incorporate within its priorities the monitoring and use of the instruments left by the project.

In the course of time it is fundamental that the different tools developed are updated and revised periodically. They should not be allowed to lose their validity, since the objective outlined considers that

they are available to guarantee an agile takeoff of the system once the bill has been approved. This role would be within the scope and possibilities of the Information and Environmental Economy Unit.

The budgets that are developed for PAs can hardly be used to support and justify new allocations to actors like DIPRES.

Open standards are a first step towards transparency of the additionality and impacts of conservation investments. However, it is necessary to strengthen the financial planning cycle, showing results in terms of conservation, economic impact and cost effectiveness of investments in PA.

The allocation of financial resources of the state is ultimately a manifestation of the political priority given by a country to conservation. It is therefore recommended to maintain a permanent line of strategic communication and public awareness about the importance of maintaining PAs. The project has developed multiple communication tools, but has not implemented them in full, so it would be expected that the different institutions and particularly the National PA Committee will take priority.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains an extensive assessment of relevant outcomes and some assessment of impact.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent, however all ratings provided are satisfactory, even when the discussion does not seem to support a satisfactory rating.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report provides some discussion of sustainability and project exit strategy, but does not consider the four dimensions of sustainability separately or in much depth.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are supported by the evidence and are comprehensive	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs, and actual co-financing figures, though not by activity	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The project provided ratings for M&E design and implementation, but only provided a discussion of M&E implementation.	MU
Overall TE Rating		MS

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).