Final Evaluation Report for GEF 88249 Project

"Supporting civil society and community initiatives to generate global environmental benefits using grants and micro-loans in the Mediterranean Ecoregion of Chile".

Developed by:

Aarón Cavieres C. National Consultant, Assessment Leader

> Jorge Leiva Valenzuela International Consultant

Santiago, December 28th, 2020

Acknowledgements

The evaluation team would like to thank all the people who gave their time and effort to make this work possible. First, we would like to mention the CMS project implementation team and the UNDP staff in Santiago, who always facilitated the development of the activities of this evaluation and provided us with all the requested information.

We would also like to thank the officials of the Ministry of the Environment and other public institutions for their collaboration in the interviews.

Finally, we must mention the representatives of the community organizations and beneficiaries of the project, as well as the entities that advise them, for their excellent predisposition to participate in this process.

Contents

| Ackı | nowledgements | 2 |
|------|---|---------|
| Proj | ect Summary Sheet | 6 |
| Exec | cutive Summary | i |
| | Evaluation ratings table | iii |
| | Summary of conclusions, recommendations, and lessons | iv |
| List | of Acronyms | 9 |
| 1. | Introduction | 1 |
| | 1.1. Purpose and scope of the evaluation | 1 |
| | 1.2 Methodology | 2 |
| | Methods and procedures for collecting and analyzing information | 4 |
| | Gender inclusion, human rights, indigenous peoples, and marginalized groups | 5 |
| | Criteria for sampling sites and stakeholders of the project | 6 |
| | Strengths and limitations of the methodology | 9 |
| | Working plan | 10 |
| | 1.3 Evaluation report structure | 10 |
| 2. | Project description and development context | 11 |
| | 2.1. Project start and duration | 11 |
| | 2.2. Issues the project addressed | 11 |
| | 2.3. Immediate and development objectives of the project | 11 |
| | 2.4. Established benchmarks | 12 |
| | 2.5. Key stakeholders | 13 |
| | 2.6. Expected results | 14 |
| 3. | Findings | 16 |
| | 3.1. Project design and formulation | 16 |
| | 3.1.1. Logical framework analysis (AML) and results framework analysis (project logic and strategy; indicators) | ן 16 |
| | 3.1.2. Assumptions and risks | . 21 |
| | 3.1.3. Indicators | . 22 |
| | 3.1.4. Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same area of interest) incorporated into | |
| | project design | 23 |
| | 3.1.6 Repetition focus | 24 |
| | 3.1.7 UNDP comparative advantage | 24 |
| | 3.1.8. Links between the project and other interventions within the sector | 24 |

| 3.1.9. | Management arrangements | 25 |
|-------------------|---|-----------|
| 3.1.10. | Project Change Theory (PCT) | 25 |
| 3.1.11. | Additionality of the GEF Project | 29 |
| 3.1.12. | Environmental and Social Safeguards | 30 |
| 3.2. Pr | oject execution | 30 |
| 3.2.1 A implen | daptive management (changes in project design and project results during nentation) | 30 |
| 3.2.2. region) | Partnership agreements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country or 37 | |
| 3.2.3. | Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management | 40 |
| Period | 2015-2017 | 40 |
| Period | 2017-2020 | 40 |
| 3.2.4. | Project financing | 42 |
| 3.2.5. | Monitoring and Evaluation: input design and execution (*) | 50 |
| 3.2.6. implen | Coordination of implementation and execution (*) of UNDP and partner for nentation and operational matters | 51 |
| 3.3. Pr | oject results | 52 |
| 3.3.1. | Overall results (achievement of objectives) (*) | 52 |
| 3.3.2. | Relevance (*) | 56 |
| 3.3.3. | Effectiveness and efficiency (*) | 57 |
| Effectiv | /eness | 57 |
| Efficier | лсу | 59 |
| 3.3.4. | National involvement | 60 |
| 3.3.5. | Integration | 60 |
| 3.3.6. | Sustainability (*) | 61 |
| 3.3.7. | Impact | 62 |
| Cross-c | cutting Aspects | 64 |
| 4.1. Re | elationship with the FPA and PPS-CHILE | 64 |
| 4.1.1 | Zoning and resource targeting. | 64 |
| 4.1.2 selectio | Governance of the initiative at the national level and mechanisms and criteria for on of community projects and initiatives, considering a gender perspective | the 65 |
| 4.1.3 commu | Governance, territorial organization and management model and the role of unities, considering gender perspective. | 66 |
| 4.1.4 other i | Basis for scalability (of impact on a territorial and model scale) and influence on nitiatives and policies. | 67 |

4.

| | 4.1.5 | Impacts on resilience |
|---|-----------|--|
| | 4.1.6 | Conclusions and additional scopes69 |
| | 4.2. G | ender Issues |
| | 4.3. A | pproach to Native Peoples70 |
| | 5. Co | onclusions, recommendations, and lessons71 |
| | 5.1. Co | onclusions71 |
| | 5.2. Re | ecommendations |
| | Genera | al |
| 6 | Appen | dices 78 |
| | Appen | dix 1: TOR |
| | Appen | dix 2: Matrix of results |
| | Appen | dix 3: Evaluation questions |
| | Appen | dix 4: List of reviewed documents82 |
| | Appen | dix 5: List of interviewees |
| | Appen | dix 6: Interview agenda |
| | Appen | dix 7: Selection Criteria for Interviewed Actors |
| A | ppendix 8 | : Analysis of Project Change Theory Results91 |

Project Summary Sheet

| Project name Supporting civil society and community initiatives to generate global environmental benefits grants and micro-loans in the Mediterranean Ecoregion of Chile | | | benefits using | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|---------------------|
| ID of GEF project | 88249 | Financial Summary | Approved by GEF | Executed to Final Evaluation (*) | % |
| ID UNDP number | 77514 | In cash | | | |
| | | GEF grant | 3,311,614 | 2,924,931 | 88% |
| Country | Chile. | Co-financing (USD) | | | |
| country | Chile | UNDP/EU | 1,000,000 | S/I | S/I |
| | | MMA | 10,000,000 | 1,114,333 | 11% |
| | | Beneficiaries | 1,000,000 | 0 | 0% |
| Region | Latin America and the Caribbean | Subtotal cash co-financing | 12,000,000 | 1,114,333 | 9% |
| - | | Co-financing in kind (USD) | | | |
| | | MOE | 2,219,772 | 862,398 | 39% |
| Area of interest Multifocal: Biodiversity, Climate Change Mitigation, Soil Degradation | | Beneficiaries | 3,000,000 | 131,126 | 4% |
| Focal area objectives (OP/SP) | GEF-5/BD-2, CCM-5, LD-1, LD-3 | Subtotal in-kind | 5,219,772 | 993,524 | 19% |
| Project Gender | | Total Co- financing | 17,219,772 | 2,107,857 | 12% |
| Marker | GM-2 | Total Project Resources | 2,531,386 | 5,032,788 | 25% |
| Implementing Partners | Ministry of the Environment (MOE) | Other involved partners | CONAF, FIA, community o | INDAP, FOSIS, rganizations and N | CORFO, CPL, IGOs |
| Date of Signature PRODOC 06-11-2014 | | Starting | date | Date of Project Closu | Operational re |
| Mid-t | erm Evaluation | PRODOC | 06-11-2014 | According to PRODOC | 30-11-2019 |
| PRODOC | 05-05-2017 | Real | 06-11-2019 | Real | 28-02-2021 |
| Real 01-04-2017 | | Substantive Review | 27-02-2019 | Report of follow-up visit | 01-04-2016 |
| Final evaluation date | | Final Evaluation Team | | | |
| PRODOC | 06-08-2019 | Jorge Lei | va V. | Aarón Ca | vieres |
| Real 01-10-2020 | | International Consultant National Consultant, Assessment Leader | | ant, er | |

(*): as of July 31, 2020

Executive Summary.

This consultancy is the Final Evaluation of the full-sized GEF project titled "Supporting Civil Society and Community Initiatives to Generate Global Environmental Benefits Using Grants and Micro-Loans in the Mediterranean Ecoregion of Chile" (hereinafter CMS), which was requested by the Country Office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). UNDP acts as the implementing agency for the Global Environment Fund (GEF) and the Ministry of the Environment (MMA) is the national implementing entity which is responsible for the project. The objective of the evaluation was to verify the achievement of project objectives and outputs, and at the same time, to gain an understanding of the determinants that affected their achievement and to draw lessons learned from experience to improve design practices for future projects. A complementary analysis was also carried out - requested by the UNDP country office - to compare the operation model, similarities, and differences between the UNDP Small Grants Programme (PPS-Chile), the Environmental Protection Fund (EFP) and the CMS. This analysis was carried out to determine their strengths, achievements and weaknesses that could be considered in future financing mechanisms for environmental projects in which communities have a leading role.

The declared objective of the CMS is to develop, demonstrate and integrate the achievement of global environmental benefits by community organizations in the management - with a landscape approach - of seriously threatened territories in the Chilean Mediterranean ecoregion. To achieve this objective, the project aimed to install multi-stakeholder management structures at the territorial, ecoregional and national level. Through these structures, the project would implement community-based territorial planning projects on a landscape scale - in coordination with other government agencies and local authorities - to conserve biodiversity, and improve upon ecosystem services and carbon sequestration, through activities such as reforestation with native forest, protection of water sources, restoration of degraded soils, and implementation of "agro-ecological" farming activities. Simultaneously, the empowerment and strengthening of these communities in the decision-making process of the activities developed in the territories would be achieved. Additionally, capacities for the planning and execution of small projects are achieved. Landscape-scale planning could be disseminated through the establishment of communities of practice and an additional Environmental Protection Fund (EFP 2.0) that would include a mechanism to transfer funds from different public services to the EFP 2.0 (while giving them this landscape approach).

The project duration will last five years and will result in a coverage of nearly 2 million hectares, focused on the regions of Valparaiso, Metropolitan, O'Higgins, Maule, Bio Bio and Araucania. Execution problems, and the consequences of the social manifestations since October 2019, and after that the COVID-19 pandemic, forced us to extend this project until February 28th, 2021, that is, the execution would last 76 months instead of the 60 months originally planned. The total project budget was USD 20.5 million, of which USD 3.31 million was granted by the GEF and the co-financing committed consisting of the Government of Chile, UNDP and CMS beneficiaries amounted to USD 17.22.

The final evaluation was conducted between July 2020 and October 2020 and was executed by a national consultant (Evaluation Leader) and an international consultant. The methodology used was that defined by UNDP / GEF for their final evaluations which also incorporated gender and indigenous people's issues.

As a result, 70 relevant stakeholders were interviewed, including the project implementation team, officials from the MOE and other public services at the national and regional levels, representatives of community organizations, technical advisors, municipalities, and final beneficiaries of the CMS. From a total of nine Territorial Scale Initiatives (IET), seven IETs, containing 16 of the 34 community

projects, and executed within the regions of Valparaíso, Metropolitana, O'Higgins, Maule, Ñuble, Bio-Bio and Araucanía, were analysed in this evaluation. The COVID-19 pandemic imposed restrictions on travel within the country, so field visits and face-to-face interviews were not possible. Therefore, semi-structured interviews had to be conducted online and by telephone. The latter was the most common means used by community organizations and beneficiaries. To address these constraints, the evaluators selected a sample of projects and interviewees that were diverse in their roles, gender, ethnicity, and territorial scale. The number of samples was higher than usual, which minimized informant bias due to the impossibility of having a face-to-face approach for the works carried out.

The final evaluation showed that the major achievement of the project was the strengthening and empowerment of the participating community organizations. They valued the experience positively due to the capacity improvements and community organization empowerment, as well as the enhancement in their immediate needs regarding water scarcity and food production with respect to the environment. The execution of this component revealed great successes and considerable continuity throughout the development of the project. This situation resulted in a very significant advance in the development of methodologies for strengthening and empowering the rural population in the management of self-managed development projects. This will undoubtedly be very useful for future projects and national initiatives in support of the rural population. However, achievements on improving biodiversity, ecosystem services, and carbon sequestration are very limited. The activities carried out in the project are mainly agricultural, therefore, they are not relevant or projected for the conservation of the various species and habitats of the Mediterranean Ecoregion. Conversely, the types of land and property on which such activities were carried out are not equivalent to the types of land and property predominant in the 352 thousand ha covered by the IET. The project design explains an important part of these limitations in progress towards the results. The project focuses on small farmers, who mostly own land that is devoid of the ecoregion's ecosystem assets. This created difficulty in designing activities pertinent to the project's objective and, therefore, there were difficulties in developing experiences scalable to the ecoregion. In the case of carbon, the advances are from a pilot plot, where 1.6% of the established sequestration goal was achieved. In addition, the project document contained inadequate indicators and targets that were virtually impossible to meet, considering the level of financial and human resources that would be needed to be deployed on the field to successfully achieve these goals.

The execution of activities lacked adequate planning - especially during the first phase of the project (2015-2017) - and during the implementation of an effective project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system to follow up on the change in environmental and social variables that were intended to be introduced. After the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE), the methodology for selecting territories to intervene improved considerably in terms of their environmental, social and productive characteristics. Planning also improved by integrating professionals to implement community projects and project activities more effectively, which significantly increased project implementation capacity. The M&E aspects also improved, but were focused on technical assistance tasks, meeting goals and deadlines, and other conditions for implementing community projects and other outputs. This meant that there were no criteria, indicators or instruments for the monitoring and systematic collection of information that connected the environmental and socio-economic improvements generated by the project at territorial levels of action (with progress indicators that measured the contribution of the different levels to the global objectives of the project).

As a final balance, the project implemented nine territorial development initiatives (five in Stage I and four in Stage II), 38 community projects (10 in Stage I and 28 in Stage II) and 16 FPA projects, including Integral Territorial Management Plans (PGTI) and participation in a clean production

agreement, in the Commune of San Nicolás, in Ñuble Region. The regions involved in the territorial initiatives were Valparaíso (Quintero-Puchuncaví), Metropolitan (Alhué), O'Higgins (Cachapoal and Pumanque-Lolol Model Forest), Maule (Achibueno River Basin, Putú and Huenchullamí River Wetlands), Bio-Bio-Ñuble (Cayumanque, San Nicolás-Ninhue) and Araucanía (Araucarias de Alto Malleco Model Forest).

Regarding inter-institutional coordination, this was only partially achieved in the field work, and was largely dependent on the will of the official involved. Although this problem is generalized in the country, it was observed that this coordination was very punctual and with extremely limited documentation. The efforts to improve the FPA worked by achieving a special contest that complemented the project's territorial initiatives, but it was not possible to change the type of approach to implement this instrument, nor was it possible to achieve transfers from other public sector institutions.

Finally, project disbursements reached 88% of GEF resources, leaving an outstanding balance of approximately USD 387,000 as of July 2020.

Therefore, the sustainability of the project results remains uncertain. Although the advances in result 4 are very relevant and the indicators have been fully met, weaknesses in the advance towards the other results do not allow for a better expectation. Indeed, there are significant constraints on progress in biodiversity conservation, carbon sequestration and, most importantly, forest and agro-ecosystem services. Moreover, at the time of the evaluation, no project exit strategy had been developed, nor had the lessons learned from this experience been systematized. Similarly, institutional articulation and coordination has shown little progress and those advances are at a very early stage, requiring time and many implementation steps to be consolidated. These are all central points for determining the real possibilities of scaling up and/or replicating the experience at the national level and for developing public policies that can be adopted, both by the MMA and by its main partners in this area.

Evaluation ratings table

The project qualifications are shown in the table below.

| Criteria | Commen | ts |
|---|-------------------------------|----|
| Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately satisfactory (MS), Moderately unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly unsatisfactory (HU) | | |
| Overall Quality of M&E | 3 (Moderately unsatisfactory) | |
| Design of M&E at the beginning of the project | 3 (Moderately unsatisfactory) | |
| Execution of the M&E plan | 3 (Moderately unsatisfactory) | |
| Execution of the Implementing Agency and the Executing Organization: Highly satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately satisfactory (MS), Moderately unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly unsatisfactory (HU) | | |
| Overall quality of project implementation and execution | 4 (Moderately satisfactory) | |
| Execution of the Implementing Agency | 4 (Moderately satisfactory) | |
| Execution of the Executing Organization | 3 (Moderately unsatisfactory) | |

| Criteria | Commen | its |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Results: Highly satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately satisfactory (MS), Moderately unsatisfactory (M Unsatisfactory (U), Highly unsatisfactory (HU) | | oderately unsatisfactory (MU), |
| Overall quality of project results | 3 (Moderately unsatisfactory) | |
| Relevance: relevant (R) or no relevant (NR) | 2 (Relevant) | |
| Effectiveness | 3 (Moderately unsatisfactory) | |
| Efficiency | 3 (Moderately unsatisfactory) | |
| Sustainability: Likely (L), Moderately Likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU), Unlikely (U) | | |
| Overall likelihood of sustainability | 2 (Moderately Unlikely) | |
| Financial resources | 2 (Moderately Unlikely) | |
| Socio-economical | 2 (Moderately Unlikely) | |
| Institutional framework and governance | 1 (Unlikely) | |
| Environmental | 3 (Moderately Likely) | |
| Impact: Considerable (C), Minimal (M), Negligible (N) | | |
| Overall project results | 2 (Minimal) | |

Summary of conclusions, recommendations, and lessons

| conclusions | recommendations | learned lessons |
|---|--|---|
| The design of the project explains an important part of the limitations in the progress towards its results. On the one hand, there are very ambitious indicators and goals that are impossible to achieve. On the other hand, the project's focus on small farmers, who have land that is mostly devoid of ecosystem assets and habitats in the ecoregion, | To define indicators in the project design, great care must be taken so that they are compliant and measurable. One way to minimize this problem is by conducting extensive consultations with expert institutions on the identified issues during project development. | It is extremely important to create appropriate indicators for the desired results of any project, since very ambitious goals can lead to serious delays in project implementation, such as having to request authorization from the GEF to change poorly conceived indicators. |
| designing activities relevant to the project's objective and, therefore, the project was unable to develop experiences that could be scaled up to the ecoregion. | The design of projects must pay close attention to the extent to which the territorial assets of the central subjects with whom they work are relevant and sufficient. This is so that the interventions can generate a staggered aggregation of benefits that supports progress towards the | At the time of their implementation, projects must be carefully analyzed, paying particular attention to determining the mechanisms that lead to the generation of the benefits that they propose, so as to generate a relevant strategy for this |

| | objective and towards obtaining global environmental benefits. | purpose and the appropriate M&E mechanisms |
|---|---|--|
| The project did not develop criteria for identifying assets, or criteria for action, that were relevant to the scales of the conservation and restoration processes it sought to address (territory, locality, and property). This weakness meant that the actions developed did not pay attention to these assets and therefore did not generate, by aggregation, benefits for the conservation of the macro-region's biodiversity, and therefore, neither did they generate global benefits. | Projects working at various spatial levels must develop criteria and methodologies that allow them to identify the way in which the conservation object(s) are expressed at different scales, so as to identify them and incorporate them into the interventions, in order to be able to generate global benefits in a staggered manner, from the most local territorial levels, towards the most aggregated levels | Conservation assets are not distributed homogeneously in the matrix, which leads to the need to develop methodologies relevant to each type of asset and each scale |
| The shortcomings observed in moving towards outcomes 1, 2 and 3 limit the possibility that the methodologies developed in outcome 4 will incorporate relevant biodiversity conservation criteria, or carbon capture/emission avoided. | | |
| The processes of city-countryside migration (and also of return to the rural community) showed positive examples of leadership, openness and renewal of practices among local communities, giving a broader vision of the social and environmental phenomena affecting the communities. | Reverse migration processes (city - countryside) should be seriously considered in the design of projects aimed at rural and peasant areas, in order to incorporate new visions and types of roles among local beneficiaries. | Reverse migration leaderships can bring greater understanding and initial openness to projects that seek to introduce change and complex issues among rural communities. |

| neievant changes are observed III | The new projects should include | Rigorously documenting |
|--|--|--|
| the role of women in organizations | from their design the realization of | background information and |
| at the rural level. They show high | studies that make a comparison | the development of gender |
| levels of participation and often | between the beginning and end | strategies from the beginning |
| occupy leadership roles. | situation. In addition, they should | of the projects will allow the |
| | provide an understanding of both | initiatives developed to |
| | the causes of the initial situation, | better reflect the vision and |
| | as well as the changes introduced | needs of women, their |
| | and the keys to such changes. | visions and interests and |
| | | allow future projects to use |
| | | this experience from the |
| | | design stage. |
| | | |
| The design of the CMS | Projects with a strong operational | Underestimating the number |
| contemplated a very small and | character and wide areas of | and type of professional |
| centralized professional team in | intervention must have sufficient | support a project needs can |
| Santiago. There was no | technical teams on site from the | have a negative impact on |
| counterpart in the regions where | beginning of the project and with | the installation stage of the |
| the project was implemented. This | the necessary implementation | project and produce |
| resulted in high travel costs and | capabilities. These must achieve | inefficiencies that will impact |
| low field operations, which meant | the replicability and scalability of | the approach and results of |
| major implementation problems | the intervention models | the projects. |
| during the first phase of the | developed. | |
| project. | | |
| conclusions | recommendations | learned lessons |
| | | |
| M&E system | | |
| M&E system The project's M&E system was | For complex projects such as CMS. | The establishment of a good |
| M&E system The project's M&E system was adequate to verify progress in | For complex projects such as CMS, it is recommended that an M&E | The establishment of a good M&E system will allow |
| M&E system The project's M&E system was adequate to verify progress in implementing project activities and | For complex projects such as CMS, it is recommended that an M&E person be assigned to design a | The establishment of a good M&E system will allow projects to measure not only |
| M&E system The project's M&E system was adequate to verify progress in implementing project activities and products, but was insufficient to | For complex projects such as CMS, it is recommended that an M&E person be assigned to design a system that not only defines | The establishment of a good M&E system will allow projects to measure not only their performance, but also |
| M&E system The project's M&E system was adequate to verify progress in implementing project activities and products, but was insufficient to track and verify desired changes in | For complex projects such as CMS, it is recommended that an M&E person be assigned to design a system that not only defines procedures for monitoring outputs | The establishment of a good M&E system will allow projects to measure not only their performance, but also to have certainty regarding |
| M&E system The project's M&E system was adequate to verify progress in implementing project activities and products, but was insufficient to track and verify desired changes in the different dimensions at the | For complex projects such as CMS, it is recommended that an M&E person be assigned to design a system that not only defines procedures for monitoring outputs and activities, but also develops an | The establishment of a good M&E system will allow projects to measure not only their performance, but also to have certainty regarding the contribution of the |
| M&E system The project's M&E system was adequate to verify progress in implementing project activities and products, but was insufficient to track and verify desired changes in the different dimensions at the local and territorial levels. | For complex projects such as CMS, it is recommended that an M&E person be assigned to design a system that not only defines procedures for monitoring outputs and activities, but also develops an M&E plan that defines a set of | The establishment of a good M&E system will allow projects to measure not only their performance, but also to have certainty regarding the contribution of the various outputs and partial |
| M&E system The project's M&E system was adequate to verify progress in implementing project activities and products, but was insufficient to track and verify desired changes in the different dimensions at the local and territorial levels. | For complex projects such as CMS, it is recommended that an M&E person be assigned to design a system that not only defines procedures for monitoring outputs and activities, but also develops an M&E plan that defines a set of indicators and results that are | The establishment of a good M&E system will allow projects to measure not only their performance, but also to have certainty regarding the contribution of the various outputs and partial results to the overall |
| M&E system The project's M&E system was adequate to verify progress in implementing project activities and products, but was insufficient to track and verify desired changes in the different dimensions at the local and territorial levels. | For complex projects such as CMS, it is recommended that an M&E person be assigned to design a system that not only defines procedures for monitoring outputs and activities, but also develops an M&E plan that defines a set of indicators and results that are specific to each level of the project | The establishment of a good M&E system will allow projects to measure not only their performance, but also to have certainty regarding the contribution of the various outputs and partial results to the overall expected results of the |
| M&E system The project's M&E system was adequate to verify progress in implementing project activities and products, but was insufficient to track and verify desired changes in the different dimensions at the local and territorial levels. | For complex projects such as CMS, it is recommended that an M&E person be assigned to design a system that not only defines procedures for monitoring outputs and activities, but also develops an M&E plan that defines a set of indicators and results that are specific to each level of the project and directly related to the overall | The establishment of a good M&E system will allow projects to measure not only their performance, but also to have certainty regarding the contribution of the various outputs and partial results to the overall expected results of the projects. |
| M&E system The project's M&E system was adequate to verify progress in implementing project activities and products, but was insufficient to track and verify desired changes in the different dimensions at the local and territorial levels. | For complex projects such as CMS, it is recommended that an M&E person be assigned to design a system that not only defines procedures for monitoring outputs and activities, but also develops an M&E plan that defines a set of indicators and results that are specific to each level of the project and directly related to the overall project results. | The establishment of a good M&E system will allow projects to measure not only their performance, but also to have certainty regarding the contribution of the various outputs and partial results to the overall expected results of the projects. |
| M&E system The project's M&E system was adequate to verify progress in implementing project activities and products, but was insufficient to track and verify desired changes in the different dimensions at the local and territorial levels. | For complex projects such as CMS, it is recommended that an M&E person be assigned to design a system that not only defines procedures for monitoring outputs and activities, but also develops an M&E plan that defines a set of indicators and results that are specific to each level of the project and directly related to the overall project results. | The establishment of a good M&E system will allow projects to measure not only their performance, but also to have certainty regarding the contribution of the various outputs and partial results to the overall expected results of the projects. |

| The CMS managed to reintroduce the concept of community work among local organizations, demonstrating that significant improvements can be achieved for the collective. It also strengthened local organizations and advisory bodies in technical and management aspects, as well as improving the self-esteem of their members, demonstrating that they can plan and manage their community projects. | The design of GEF projects should always include a community organization development component, so that they contribute to strengthening these organizations in their technical and management capacities. | Trained and empowered communities can greatly increase the effectiveness and sustainability of the projects in which they participate. | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Inter-institutional coordination and the adoption of new approaches to the FPA were limited in scope, this coordination being subordinated to the interest of the official involved. Regarding the FPA, the approach remains the same as before the project, with modest progress being made with the launch of special contests. | The MMA must promote an articulation with the Ministries, services and municipalities involved in the different IETs to establish mechanisms that respond to the interest of different communities in order to continue advancing and support them in a process that leads to the "graduation" of these, to continue their route more autonomously; | The goals and assumptions of modifying laws and reorganizing areas of the State located in other Ministries require a political effort that far exceeds the capacities of the teams in charge of project implementation; Coordination tasks of public stakeholders require a coordinating agent who, as a minimum, is in a hierarchical, high and central position in the governmental structure; | | |
| Differences and Similarities between CMS, FPA and PPD | | | | |
| The FPA and the PPS have similarities in that both require beneficiaries to compete for funding and both have very local impacts. However, the FPA functions as a fund that defines the environmental issues to be addressed in each competition, where public officials select the projects that are finally awarded. On the other hand, the PPS has a more participatory organization made up of a board of directors that includes public services and OSC. | The differential and aggregate impact on the issues of self- esteem, community work and organizational development, which generate the longest duration of the projects; the higher financial amounts, the participation of users in the definition of the issues to be addressed in the projects; and the sustained and close technical support throughout the development of the project should be studied. | The local governance model implemented in the PPS and strengthened in the CMS, means great advances in organizational development, empowerment and development of innovations relevant to the local reality. | | |
| conclusions | recommendations | | | |

| Gender and indigenous peoples | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| The project was concerned with generating a study on the situation of indigenous and peasant women of different ages in the intervened territories during 2016. However, this valuable information was not translated into a strategy to address the issue, nor into the planning of concrete plans and activities, but rather the gender issue was relegated to the number of women participating in the CMS. | It is suggested that any studies conducted be quickly transformed into concrete actions that address the needs of these groups. | An early analysis of the conditions of women and other marginalized groups will enhance the inclusive approach that UNDP has been promoting. | |
| Although there was no formal strategy on the indigenous issue, perhaps the approach was more culturally relevant. The CMS successfully provided cultural translators and strengthened small indigenous consulting firms that transferred knowledge to community organizations in very successful projects, as in the case of Predregoso, where the sustainability of actions seems to have a good chance. | Early studies on the needs and potential of these groups are suggested to develop a strategy to effectively incorporate them into project activities. | | |
| Sustainability | | | |
| Citizens' expectations of the October 2020 plebiscite and the upcoming municipal, presidential, and gubernatorial elections in 2021 could change the level of priorities for CMS-related programs and activities in the short and medium term. | It is suggested to install an agenda agreed with the partners, based on the project's exit strategy, so that the issue remains installed in the institutions, even if they do not have priority in the short term. | The lack of a specific agenda among the partners keeps the issue alive, which would be very difficult to reinstall if the activities were to cease. | |

List of Acronyms

| Acronym | Meaning |
|----------|---|
| CMS | Project "Supporting civil society and community initiatives to generate global environmental benefits using grants and micro-loans in the Mediterranean Ecoregion of Chile" |
| ASCC | Agency for Sustainability and Climate Change |
| ATLAS | UNDP Management System |
| CMS | Sustainable Mediterranean Communities |
| CONADI | National Indigenous Development Corporation |
| CONAF | National Forestry Corporation |
| CORFO | Development Corporation |
| COVID-19 | Coronavirus |
| CPL | National Council for Clean Production |
| CS | Members Committee |
| DDHH | Human Rights |
| DIRECON | Undersecretary of International Economic Affairs |
| FIA | Foundation for Agricultural Innovation |
| GEF | Global Environmental Fund |
| FOSIS | Solidarity and Social Investment Fund |
| FPA | Environmental Protection Fund |
| GEF | Global Environmental Facility |
| IET | Territorial Scale Initiatives |
| INDAP | Institute of Agricultural Development |
| INFOR | Forestry Institute |
| MAPS | Mitigation Action Plans and Scenarios |
| MMA | Ministry of the Environment |
| OC/OBC | Community Organizations/Community-Based Organizations |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organization |
| PIR | Project Implementation Report |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |

| PPG | Project preparation grant |
|-----------|--|
| PPS-CHILE | Small Grants Program executed by the UNDP-Chile office |
| SGP | Small Grants Programme, executed by UNDP at the global level |
| PRODOC | Project document |
| ROtl | Review of Outcomes to Impacts |
| RRNN | Natural resources |
| RTA | Regional Technical Advisor |
| SERNATUR | National Tourism Service |
| SMART | Specific, Measurable, Affordable, Relevant, Time-limited |
| SSEE | Ecosystem Services |
| SUBDERE | Undersecretary of National Development |
| TDR | Terms of reference |
| UNCCD | United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification |
| UNEG | United Nations Evaluation Group |
| UTCUTS | Land use, land use change and forestry activities |

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

This consultancy is the Final Evaluation of the full-sized GEF project titled "Supporting Civil Society and Community Initiatives to Generate Global Environmental Benefits Using Grants and Micro-Loans in the Mediterranean Ecoregion of Chile" (hereinafter CMS), which was requested by the Country Office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). UNDP acts as the implementing agency of the Global Environment Fund (GEF) and the Ministry of the Environment (MMA) is the national implementing entity and responsible for the project.

The final evaluation of the project is carried out from two perspectives. On the one hand, it covers the regular issues evaluated in a GEF project, i.e., project design (indicators, intervention logic, stakeholder consultations, etc.), implementation (financial aspects, M&E, reporting, etc.), integration with other development activities (government priorities, UNDP country program), sustainability, and the achievement of the desired project results. It should be noted that although the project had a mid-term review in 2017 and a subsequent substantive review (2019), the final evaluation constitutes a full review of the project cycle (design, implementation and closure), which also analyzes whether the project was able to implement the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation, the results of the evaluation and the relevance and quality of the substantive review.

The second perspective of analysis seeks to provide background information to determine the achievements and weaknesses of the instruments used in the project to support rural populations and territories in the search for global environmental benefits, while generating local socioeconomic and environmental benefits and considering the integration of the gender and indigenous peoples perspective.

Accordingly, based on the analysis of the evaluation, the aim is: i) to obtain the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned from the project and to verify the achievements of the project implementation; and ii) to obtain conclusions, recommendations and lessons regarding the instruments and practices used to support the territorial communities, which can serve both for the regular operation of the PPS, and for the modalities that are available for use by the graduated countries.

Thus, the final evaluation aims to contribute to the improvement in the formulation and execution of new cooperation projects by the GEF, UNDP and national implementing partners and regarding the formulation of new programs focused on community organizations.

According to the first perspective of analysis, this evaluation analyzes and weighs the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact probability using the ratings table from the evaluation methodology of UNDP projects. Conversely, to address the second perspective of analysis, a comparative study between the methodologies and results achieved by the PPS-CHILE programs, FPA and the CMS project will be carried out. For this purpose, such initiatives were compared in terms of:

- zoning and resource targeting;
- governance of the initiative at the national level and mechanisms and criteria for the selection of projects and community initiatives, considering the gender perspective;
- governance and management model (bottom-up, or vice versa), territorial organization and communities' roles, considering gender perspective;
- exchange of good practices and knowledge management among stakeholders;

- basis for scalability (probability of impact at territorial and model scale) and influence on other initiatives and policies;
- probability of impacts on resilience.

The evaluation period covers from November 6, 2014 to July 30, 2020, with a geographical coverage between the regions of Valparaíso to Araucanía, which include a portion of the so-called "Mediterranean Ecoregion" of Chile that extends from the coastal zone of the Antofagasta Region to the Araucanía Region. Specifically, the CMS intervened mainly in the regions of Valparaiso (Quintero-Puchuncaví), Metropolitan (Alhué), O'Higgins (Cachapoal and Pumanque-Lolol Model Forest), Maule (Achibueno River Basin, Putú and Huenchullamí River Wetlands), Bio-Bio-Ñuble (Cayumanque, San Nicolás-Ninhue) and Araucanía (Araucarias del Alto Malleco Model Forest). Finally, the final evaluation took place between July 1 and November 18, 2020.

1.2 Methodology

According to the TDR of the consultancy, it is verified if the expected results of the project were achieved, as established in its logical framework. It is worth mentioning that, although the project had a mid-term evaluation and a substantive review, the scope, activities and objectives of the final evaluation are "self-contained", i.e., the present evaluation is carried out in a complete and extensive manner, considering the changes of previous evaluations and the response of the CMS to the proposed changes.

The general objective of the consultancy is to evaluate the design and implementation of the project, in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and probability of impact, and to contrast the expected results in the Project Document (PRODOC) with those which are actually achieved. Adaptive management - changes introduced to the project -are part of this analysis and are developed in the respective section of the report.

Although the specific objectives of the evaluation are not explicitly specified, they could be summarized as follows, as indicated in Appendix F of the TDR, which refers to the content of the evaluation report:

- 1. To assess the relevance of the original project design;
- 2. To analyze and evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the results;
- 3. To identify the adaptive management strategies implemented to adapt the project intervention to changes in the national context;
- 4. To assess the components that would allow for the replicability and scalability of the project results;
- 5. To document and provide feedback on lessons learned;
- 6. To document the institutionalization of the processes promoted by the project;
- 7. To value the role and contributions of the partners and their influence on the achievement of the objectives.
- 8. To analyse similarities and differences between CMS and FPA and their adherence to PPS-CHILE guidelines and practice.

The methodology of the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office's "Guide to Conducting Final Evaluations of UNDP-Supported and GEF-funded Projects, 2012" was used. The general objective of the consultancy is to evaluate the design and implementation of the project, in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact, and to contrast the results expected in PRODOC

with those achieved. Adaptive management - changes introduced to the project - is part of this analysis, which is developed in the corresponding section of the report.

The methodology is based on results and Theory of Change, to obtain a direct relationship between inputs and obtained results. In addition, it identifies the contribution in the improvement of the intervened systems, in terms of environmental, financial, regulation and control, strengthening, etc. The evaluation is participatory, so all those involved in the process were able to give their perspectives on the design and execution of the project, as well as to identify areas for improvement.

To ensure the reliability of the stakeholders' testimonies, the interviews were conducted in a strictly anonymous manner, to protect the sources of information. The evaluators followed the ethical standards of the UNEG, with respect to the customs, gender, culture, and ethnicity of the interviewees.

Incorporation with the project - both in its design and implementation- was the verification of issues on gender inclusion, human rights, marginalized groups, and native peoples, according to UNDP guidelines.

Additionally, the different stages of the project, financial and adaptive management, use of M&E tools, etc. were analyzed using an analysis plan that integrates all dimensions of the project, detailed in Appendix 3.

To analyze the achievement of results, a matrix of indicators and final project goals was prepared, which were assessed according to UNDP's final evaluation guide, as shown in Table 1.

| Goal/Objective/ Result | Indicator | Baseline | Final Project Goal (PRODOC) | Goal situation during evaluation | Final evaluation comments | Rating for achievements |
|---------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Objective: | | | | | | |
| Result 1 | | | | | | |
| Result 2 | | | | | | |
| Result 3 | | | | | | |
| Result 4 | | | | | | |

Table 1: Matrix of results achievement evaluation

The criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability were determined according to the scale of the UNDP methodology, which is shown in Table 2. The concepts associated with each scale are in Appendix 1.

Table 2: General assessment of the project and its criteria

| Criteria | Comments | | |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately satisfactory (MS), Moderate unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (I), Highly unsatisfactory (HU) | | | |
| Overall M&E quality | (score on a 6-point scale) | (Description of achievements) | |
| Design of M&E at the beginning of the project | (score on a 6-point scale) | (Description of achievements) | |
| Execution of the M&E plan | (score on a 6-point scale) | (Description of achievements) | |

| Criteria | Comm | ents | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Execution of the Implementing Agency a Moderately satisfactory (MS), Moderately | Execution of the Implementing Agency and the Executing Organization: Highly satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately satisfactory (MS), Moderately unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (I), Highly unsatisfactory (HU) | | | |
| Overall quality of project implementation and execution | (score on a 6-point scale) | (Description of achievements) | | |
| Execution of the Implementation Agency | (score on a 6-point scale) | Description of achievements) | | |
| Execution of executing organization | (score on a 6-point scale) | (Description of achievements) | | |
| Results: Highly satisfactory (HS), Satisfact Unsatisfactory (I), Highly unsatisfactory (H | tory (S), Moderately satisfactory (MS), IU) | , Moderately unsatisfactory (MU), | | |
| Overall quality of project results | (score on a 6-point scale) | (Description of achievements) | | |
| Relevance: relevant (R) or no relevant (NR) | | (Description of achievements) | | |
| Effectiveness | (score on a 6-point scale) | (Description of achievements) | | |
| Efficiency | (score on a 6-point scale) | (Description of achievements) | | |
| Sustainability: Likely (L), Moderately Likely | y (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU), Unli | kely (U) | | |
| Overall likelihood of sustainability risks | (score on a 6-point scale) | (Description of achievements) | | |
| Financial resources | (score on a 6-point scale) | (Description of achievements) | | |
| Socio-economical | (score on a 6-point scale) | (Description of achievements) | | |
| Institutional framework and governance | (score on a 6-point scale) | (Description of achievements) | | |
| Environmental | (score on a 6-point scale) | (Description of achievements) | | |
| Impact: Considerable (C), Minimum (M), N | Impact: Considerable (C), Minimum (M), Negligible (N) | | | |
| Overall project results | (score on a 6-point scale) | (Description of achievements) | | |

Methods and procedures for collecting and analyzing information

The type of information analyzed corresponds to the common practices for this type of evaluation:

- Provided by the project team (reports, studies, interviews, among others);
- Contextual information (government policies and plans, institutional programs, studies on issues of interest to the project, among others);
- Information integrated with other activities and policies (similar complementary projects under implementation, UNDP and government policies, municipal plans, budgets of organizations, municipalities, and ministries).
- Baseline information and project status.
- > Reports and studies from other independent entities that generated triangulations.

The methods for information collection are described below:

Document review: analysis of the project document, project progress reports and other publications of the project activities (consultancies, baseline studies, technical publications, media publications, etc.) Appendix 4 provides an overview of the scope of the preliminary documentation requested from the project team and UNDP;

- Key informant interviews: The interviews were conducted with project team, UNDP, government officials, NGOs, municipalities, and community organizations, among others. A series of open-ended and semi-structured questions were developed for the interviewees.
- Focus group interviews: the project includes groups of key stakeholders, thus group interviews will be carried out to visualize the project's work with the different stakeholders.

Due to the current situation of the COVID-19 pandemic, the interviews were conducted online or by phone, so it was not possible to visit pilot project samples.

To analyze the information collected, triangulation or cross-checking of information was used to verify key project implementation situations. This information was crossed with information obtained from interviews, progress reports and other publications. Thus, the conclusions obtained would be balanced and as objective as possible to avoid informant bias.

Interviews with key project stakeholders provided information and alternative views to those provided by the project team and UNDP. These interviews were applied to as many stakeholders as possible to compensate for possible subjectivity and informant bias. The opinions expressed by informants were contrasted with other sources of information, such as reports from other institutions, background information, and the opinions of other informants. It is worth mentioning that, to protect the confidentiality of the source, the interviews conducted (individual and group), were confidential and did not involve project staff or UNDP.

To visualize the adaptive management of the project, PRODOC and its assumptions, risks, indicators, results, etc., were contrasted with the actual progress of the project and the strategies developed to address the changing context of the country. The purpose was to verify that the necessary adjustments had been made to meet the objectives and expected results of the project. The same exercise was carried out to determine the relevance and participation of stakeholders.

Gender inclusion, human rights, indigenous peoples, and marginalized groups

Evaluation questions and interviews included specific issues affecting women, indigenous peoples, and other marginalized groups benefiting from the project. The analysis was not limited to the number of these stakeholders participating in the project activities, but also focused on responding to specific issues that can be addressed by the project and developing a strategy and planning for this stakeholder group. In addition, an analysis was conducted to obtain information on the specific focus of these groups and to follow up on the activities planned to address these issues.

Comparative analysis between the methodology of the CMS project, FPA and PPS-CHILE $^{\rm 1}$ of UNDP

To analyze the differences and similarities between these instruments for involving communities and civil society organizations, a review was conducted on the documentation of their objectives, methodologies, organization and scope, as well as on the level of participation of the beneficiaries in the decision-making process of the implemented projects. Evaluations of the FPA were also reviewed. Finally, during the interviews, questions were asked about the implementation modalities, organization of the beneficiaries and their level of involvement in the elaboration and execution of the initiatives implemented for the 3 instruments, as well as the scope and sustainability of the results achieved.

¹ This name is used in the report to refer to the Small Grants Program (PPS), which is the name adopted in Chile by UNDP's global program called SGP.

Financial Analysis

The financial analysis was based on expenditure and co-financing figures provided by the project team, contained in the annual CDR and on information from UNDP ATLAS system for the period of January 2015 - July 2020. This exercise attempted to determine general aspects of budget execution, such as project staff expenditure in relation to the total budget, the evolution of expenditure per year and per product, expenditure on consultants, etc. Annual audits were also reviewed and compliance with UNDP procurement rules was verified. This included interviews with UNDP and project procurement staff, as well as a review of some of the major procurements. The evaluation question matrix (Appendix 3) provides an approximation of the type of information to be reviewed and its sources.

Criteria for sampling sites and stakeholders of the project

The project implemented nine IETs, which involved 34 different projects, involving nearly 700 people. Therefore, a sample of seven IETs with diverse environmental and social problems was chosen to provide an acceptable representation of the landscapes, climates, biodiversity, groups, and economic activities covered by the project, as well as the implementation stage: Stage 1 (pre-MTR) and Stage 2 (post-MTR), in order to verify the differences in management and approach in both stages of the project. The main criteria used in the selection were the following:

- 4 IETs considered successful in their results, in which it is estimated that over 60% of the objectives (qualitative or quantitative) have been achieved or are about to be achieved. In addition, there is a high mobilization of communities, municipalities and government entities;
- 1 IET that did not work and showed conflict, little interest, or there were many contradictory activities;
- > 2 IETs with a modest achievement in its results (less than 50% of the expected)

The sample included 16 individual projects detailed in Tables N° 3 and N° 4. The sample was intended to incorporate, in a balanced way, the participation of men, women, youth, indigenous and non-indigenous communities². The number of interviews with local and community stakeholders (municipalities, regional government agencies, community-based organizations, and local NGOs) consisted of 32 people, while interviews with government and UNDP staff included 27 people, excluding the project's Phase I and Phase II implementation teams. Table 3 shows a summary of the regions and type of experiences analyzed.

The performance criteria used for the selection of the IETs to be interviewed was based on a ranking developed by the project³. The selection of interviewees was discussed with the same implementation team, which provided a list of public officials, organizations and beneficiaries who participated during the period of 2015-2017.

The institutional stakeholders are diverse and numerous, therefore only those that showed greater involvement at the national and regional level were included, such as CONAF, INDAP, and FOSIS.

The number of interviewees totaled 70 people, the details of which are described in Table 5. The complete list of interviews can be found in Appendix 5.

²See Appendix for details on the criteria

³ BASIS FOR INTERVIEWS (v02)

| N⁰ | Region | IET | Community Project | Beneficiary |
|----|------------------|---|---|---|
| 1 | Valparaíso | Quintero – Puchuncaví | Participatory planning and accompaniment of community projects for biodiversity and soil conservation | Puchuncaví Rural Social and Cultural Tourism Group |
| 2 | Metropoli tan | Alhué | Establishment of an agro-ecological and beekeeping production system through the improvement of the soil and native forest | Villa Alhué Agricultural Community |
| 3 | O'Higgins | Pumanque- Lolol | Participatory planning and accompaniment of community projects in the communes of Pumanque and Lolol | Pichilemu Sustainable Development Center ⁴ |
| 4 | O'Higgins | Pumanque- Lolol | Rincón El Sauce, through sustainable management of livestock and its environment, adapts to climate change | Board of Neighbors Agua Santa Rincón El Sauce |
| 5 | O'Higgins | Pumanque- Lolol | Nilahue Cornejo moves towards a sustainable location | Board of Neighbors La Familia Nilahuina |
| 6 | Maule | Achibueno River Basin (Linares) | Participatory planning and accompaniment of community projects in coastal basins of the Putú and Huenchullamí river wetlands system | Maule-Mataquito Defense and Conservation Group |
| 7 | Maule | Achibueno River Basin (Linares) | Protection of the natural and cultural heritage of Putú | Los Pinos de Putú Advancement Committee |
| 8 | Maule | Achibueno River Basin (Linares) | Protection of natural resources for sustainable agricultural and forestry production | Board of Neighbors Vega de Salas |
| 9 | Maule | Achibueno River Basin (Linares) | Soil improvement for sustainable agro-ecological production | Pejerrey Senior Committee (COMADULPEJE) |
| 10 | Ñuble | San Nicolás | Water is life for Peña Santa Rosa | Peña Santa Rosa Farmers' Committee |
| 11 | Ñuble | San Nicolás | Hill water. Water recovery and conservation for agro-ecology | Coipín Farmers' Committee |
| 12 | Biobío- Ñuble | Cayumanque Ecosystem and its surroundings (Florida, Quillón, Ránquil) | Protection and restoration of the native forest around influence of the Cayumanque Hill | Association for Sustainable Territorial Development Ránquil-Quillón-Florida |
| 13 | Biobío- Ñuble | Cayumanque Ecosystem and its surroundings (Florida, Quillón, Ránquil) | Sustainable water management and agro-ecological practices in Coipué Alto | Board of Neighbors Coipué Alto |

Table 3: Details of the project sample reviewed and their relationship with the IETs

⁴ Although CEDESUS is an NGO that participated in the development of the IET, it is listed as a community project by the CMS

| N⁰ | Region | IET | Community Project | Beneficiary |
|----|------------------|---|--|---|
| 14 | Biobío- Ñuble | Cayumanque Ecosystem and its surroundings (Florida, Quillón, Ránquil) | Water management and development of sustainable agricultural practices | Los Mayos Advancement Committee |
| 15 | La Araucanía | Araucarias del Alto Malleco Model Forest (Curacautín, Lonquimay) | High mountain Pehuenche orchards | Folil Pehuen Senior Club |
| 16 | La Araucanía | Araucarias del Alto Malleco Model Forest (Curacautín, Lonquimay) | Consolidation of the local governance system and strengthening of sustainable practices in Llames, Llanquen and Pehuenco Norte | Board of Neighbors Llames |
| 17 | La Araucanía | Araucarias del Alto Malleco Model Forest (Curacautín, Lonquimay) | Riches of the northern sector of Lonquimay: recovering the native forest | Association BM Araucarias del Alto Malleco |

Table 4: Number of stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation

| Region | IET im; | sample/% EIT plemented | Numbo of the imp | er of projects e sample/% blemented | Number of beneficiaries interviewed | Total IET implemented | Total implemented projects |
|--------------|------------|------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Valparaíso | 1 | 100% | 1 | 33% | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| RM | 1 | 100% | 1 | 50% | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| O'Higgins | 1 | 100% | 3 | 43% | 5 | 1 | 7 |
| Maule | 2 | 100% | 4 | 50% | 7 | 2 | 8 |
| Biobío-Ñuble | 1 | 100% | 2 | 100% | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Ñuble | 1 | 100% | 3 | 33% | 4 | 1 | 9 |
| Araucanía | 1 | 100% | 2 | 29% | 5 | 1 | 7 |
| Sub-total | 8 | 100% | 16 | 42% | 27 | 8 | 38 |

Table 5: Type and number of stakeholders interviewed

| Institution/Organization Account | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| ADEMA | 3 | | |
| ADTS | 1 | | |
| Puchuncaví Rural Tourism Group | 1 | | |
| Peumayén de Nerquihue Group | 1 | | |
| ASCC Ñuble | 1 | | |
| ASSCC | 1 | | |
| CC Coipin | 1 | | |
| CEDESUS | 1 | | |
| Alhué Agricultural Community | 1 | | |

| Alhue Community | 2 |
|---|----|
| CONAF | 2 |
| CORFO | 1 |
| Ex-UNDP NY | 1 |
| FOSIS | 1 |
| INDAP | 1 |
| INDAP Araucanía | 1 |
| INFOR | 1 |
| INFOR Biobío | 1 |
| JJVV LLames | 1 |
| Ministry of the Environment | 11 |
| Municipality of Curacautin | 1 |
| Municipality of San Nicolás | 1 |
| Municipality of Lonquimay | 1 |
| PDTI Lonquimay | 1 |
| Prodesal Constitución | 1 |
| PRODESAL Linares | 1 |
| United Nations Development Programme | 4 |
| Seremi MMA Maule | 2 |
| Seremi MMA O'Higgins | 1 |
| Verra | 1 |
| Other community organizations/beneficiaries | 22 |
| Overall total | 70 |

Strengths and limitations of the methodology

One of the main limitations for this evaluation, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, is the inability to make field visits to directly verify the project's progress or to interview stakeholders face-to-face. Conversely, communities generally have limited internet access (which is also the case with cell phone signals), so it was impossible to conduct all of the planned interviews. Finally, it should be noted that the commitment of stakeholders to the interviews is lower when it is not face-to-face, which caused some delays for some interview dates.

Conversely, most stakeholder testimonies are qualitative and subjective, so there is a risk of "informant bias" that could distort the reality of the project.

To mitigate these risks, many people of diverse status and gender were interviewed, resulting in a high number of interviews (about 64 stakeholders in seven IETs). The diversity of the interviewees comes from the roles played by each of them in their community and their position within the project. Conversely, the testimonies were confirmed with secondary information such as previous work done by recognized institutions for some of these groups, project reports, etc. The high number of interviewees made it possible to triangulate the information from the different sources consulted, reducing informant bias, and ensuring a representative number of stakeholders, in the event that all the interviews could not be conducted.

To address the gender and indigenous group issues, specific questions were asked about: i) how the project addressed these dimensions; ii) whether there were demands from these groups to be incorporated into the IET; and iii) whether there were specific activities for them.

The evaluators decided not to develop online questionnaires, because in their experience they have found that the response rate is relatively low (about 20%). In addition, these questionnaires would probably be answered only by people with stable access to the Internet, which would exclude many community groups, generating a bias in the collection of information.

Working plan

The evaluation had five stages that can be clearly identified:

Phase 1 (July 1, 2020): Inception meetings of the consultants with UNDP, MMA, and the project execution team, where the main scopes of the evaluation and the dates of the main milestones and deliverables are discussed. The main stages of project implementation and its challenges were also discussed in general terms.

Phase 2 (July 1-20, 2020): Reception and review of documentation by UNDP and the project execution team. In this stage the final methodology, the sample of IETs, the projects for review and the number of interviewees were defined. This stage included the initial report of the final evaluation and the schedule of interviews to be carried out.

Stage 3 (July 25 - September 25, 2020): Round of interviews beginning with in-depth discussion with UNDP and project officials (approximately two days of design analysis, indicators, mid-term evaluation and progress by product, project closure, etc.). Interviews with different stakeholders were then initiated, according to the topics included in the evaluation matrix.

Stage 4 (September 27 - November 18, 2020): Preparation of the final evaluation report draft followed by a round of comments and adjustments to the text to deliver the final version of the report.

Stage 5 (November 30 - December 7, 2020): Elaboration of the final evaluation report considering the comments received and adjustments of the text to deliver the final version of the report.

1.3 Evaluation report structure

This report has six sections. The cover page provides general information about the project (amounts, identification codes, implementing and executing agencies, timelines, etc.), followed by an executive summary of the project, the main findings, recommendations and conclusions, as well as the overall project rating and a list of abbreviations used in this report.

In Section 1: Introduction, you will find the scope and objectives of the evaluation work, as well as a detail of the methodology used and the main milestones of this work.

Section 2 focuses on the analysis of the country's development context regarding the problem being addressed and how to solve it. The expected time frame for project implementation, overall and development objectives, expected results and key indicators, as well as coordination and partnership arrangements with key stakeholders are detailed in this section.

Section 3 shows the evaluation findings, which cover design, implementation (financial and activities), results obtained and their sustainability. The project rating is at the end of this section.

The evaluators developed a special section (Section 4), which addresses cross-cutting issues of gender and indigenous peoples. It also includes a comparison between the participation mechanism, structure and participation model used by the project versus the modalities used by the Small Grants Programme (PPS-CHILE), implemented by UNDP and FPA.

Section 5 shows all the conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned. Finally, Section 6 includes the appendices, with the TdR of the consultancy (Appendix 1), the project's Logical Framework Matrix (Appendix 2), the evaluation question matrix (Appendix 3), the interview schedule (Appendix 6), persons interviewed (Appendix 5), list of documents reviewed (Appendix 4), selection Criteria for Interviewed Actors (Appendix 7) and analysis of Project Change Theory Results (Appendix 8).

2. Project description and development context

2.1. Project start and duration

The Project Document (PRODOC) was signed on October 3, 2014, with a duration of 60 months; that is, from March 2014 to March 2019.

The first hiring was made on January 15, 2015 and the office was operating since July 2015. The Project initiation workshop was held on April 15, 2015, with the first meeting of the Partners Committee (SC) taking place on July 13, 2015.

In April 2017, the Mid-Term Evaluation (EMT) was carried out and later, in September 2018, the Substantive Project Review (SR) was carried out, which justifies the request for a 9-month extension of the project, until August 2020.

The extension of the project duration is well justified, and is detailed by result and products, through concrete commitments with specific dates. The indicators and the Logical Framework were adjusted, and a roadmap was created relevant to the requested extension.

2.2. Issues the project addressed

The project aims to address the combined problem of the progressive fragmentation and cumulative degradation of the valuable ecosystems of the Mediterranean ecoregion - with the consequential loss of biodiversity (BD) - as well as its agro-ecosystems. This leads to a decrease in ecosystem services (water filtration, carbon capture, genetic diversity of plants, etc.), soil degradation and decreased productivity, which has increased the vulnerability of the territory to the effects of climate change, thus contributing to the loss of global environmental values, affecting the welfare of the population.

Four major barriers to achieving a long-term solution to the problem are identified:

Barrier 1: Inadequate capacities of community-based organizations (OCs) to identify and adopt sustainable use practices and systems at scale in productive territories in areas of high biodiversity value or that are critical to the production of ecosystem services;

Barrier 2: Poor understanding of OCs and (lack of) competence to maintain carbon stocks at territorial level;

Barrier 3: Communities lack the means and/or motivation to plan, manage and/or coordinate community productive territories to conserve biodiversity, mitigate climate change, optimize ecosystem services and increase long-term productivity;

Barrier 4: Weak support/systemic frameworks to enhance community efforts through the sharing of lessons and other information and experience.

2.3. Immediate and development objectives of the project

The Objective of the Project is: To develop, demonstrate and integrate significant global environmental benefits for community organizations in the management of severely threatened territories within the Chilean Mediterranean Ecoregion.

This would be accomplished by achieving the following four objectives:

- 1. The sustainable management of territories for the conservation of biodiversity;
- 2. The demonstration/promotion of conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through land use, land use change, forestry, and local carbon monitoring systems;
- 3. Maintaining and improving flows of forest and agro-ecosystem services for the livelihoods of local communities; and

4. Community capacity development and knowledge management.

2.4. Established benchmarks

The project indicators contain a portfolio of key indicators that make up the results framework, which are shown in Table 6, as they appear in PRODOC.

| Objectives | Indicators | Project completion milestone |
|---|--|---|
| and | | |
| Objective: To develop, demonstrate and integrate the achievement of important | Number and type of critically threatened territories that have been restored, maintained, improved | By 2018 at least 8 initiatives at the territorial level (>1,200,000 ha) have established management plans based on consensus that are being implemented for the maintenance, restoration and improvement of territorial resilience For the year 2018 a new mechanism of |
| environmenta I benefits by community | mechanisms (PGTMA) established and operational at the territory and ecoregion level (Partners Committee) | the FPA, focused on IETs (FPA 2.0) has financed 38 or more community projects |
| organizations in the management of seriously threatened | A new funding mechanism is being implemented by the MMA to support territorial management activities | An inter-institutional coordination mechanism is functioning to complement FPA 2.0 in the coherent financing of initiatives within the framework of the IETs. |
| territories in the Chilean Mediterranea n Ecoregion. | Number of community-driven projects funded for biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services and carbon sequestration monitoring | Communities have a leadership role in planning and managing IETs and participate with their respective PGTMAs |
| Sustainable land management | Hectares of land where sustainable management for biodiversity conservation is practiced | By the end of 2018, 38 or more vulnerable communities |
| for biodiversity conservation | number of integrated soil management plans formulated and under implementation | certify the production of at least 700,000 ha of land |
| | number of associations and community forest management plans formulated and implemented | directly protect at least an additional 32,000 ha of land through local and private Protected Area schemes |
| | Type of public instruments modified to support community-driven projects at the territorial level | At least 4 public instruments (including the FPA) have been modified by 2018 to support community-driven projects within territorial initiatives |
| Demonstratio n and promotion of carbon stock conservation | Community-appropriate methods for monitoring the improvement of CO2 stocks, demonstrated/adopted by communities | By the end of 2018, at least five demonstration plots of 200 hectares each, where forest management is practiced and carbon is monitored and quantified |
| and enhancement through land use, land use change and forestry, and local carbon monitoring systems | tCO₂e sequestered | 29.200 tCO ₂ e |

Table 6: Main CMS indicators

| Maintaining and improving the flow of forest and agro- ecosystem services to sustain the livelihoods of local communities | | By the end of 2017, at least 20 vulnerable communities |
|---|--|--|
| | ha of productive territory under sustainable soil management practices | they have taken a leadership role in planning the sustainable management of an additional 140,000 ha of productive land |
| | ha of degraded soil rehabilitated through soil conservation and natural regeneration managed by the farmer | they rehabilitate at least 10,000 ha of degraded agricultural land |
| Community capacity building and knowledge management | number of participating Ocs trained for strategic planning activities on a territorial scale | At least 103 (78+5+20) OCs have received support and training and successfully implemented projects with |
| | number of best practices and lessons learned disseminated at territorial, ecoregional and national levels | grants worth >US\$10,000 |

2.5. Key stakeholders

The entities interested in the results and products of the project are from the national, regional, and local level and include different types of organizations: public, NGOs, municipalities and civil society.

National, Regional and local level associates on a strategic level:

- Ministry of the Environment: it is the Executing Agency of the project, responsible for the general supervision and coordination of the project;
- Organizations collaborating in the implementation of the project, which have agreed to coordinate their development instruments around the strategic goals defined for the ecoregion, and to join the project's Partners Committee:
 - Institute of Agricultural Development (INDAP): is the main agency for productive support, both technical and financial, at the rural level;
 - National Forestry Corporation (CONAF): is the State Forest Service, and additionally supports the component 2: Demonstration and promotion of conservation and improvement of carbon stocks through land use, land use change and forestry, and local carbon monitoring systems;
 - Foundation for Agricultural Innovation (FIA);
 - Forestry Institute (INFOR);
 - Development Corporation (CORFO);
 - Solidarity and Social Investment Fund (FOSIS);
 - National Tourism Service (SERNATUR);
 - Agency for Sustainability and Climate Change (ASCC);
 - UNDP/EU Programme to Combat Desertification.
- Partners Committee (CS): is the institutional coordinator for this project, centralizing the financial commitment of, among others, central government institutions, facilitating the cofinancing of project proposals and recommending other appropriate funding mechanisms.
- Strategic partners at a territorial level:
 - Community organizations: Indigenous organizations are included in community organizations. These community organizations identify, design, implement, monitor, evaluate, and coordinate small grant projects to obtain territorial management results;
 - Micro, small, and medium farmers: represent about 60% of the owners and 25% of the total area of the ecoregion.

2.6. Expected results

The logical framework matrix (MML) of the project has four major components that result in the commitment of eight results, which have specific products associated:

Component 1: Sustainable Territorial Management for Biodiversity Conservation

Result 1.1. Conservation of Mediterranean forest territories through community actions, with a minimum of 700,000 ha of certified and sustainably managed Mediterranean forest.

Products:

- 1.1.1. Eighteen community-led integrated management plans for key Mediterranean territories;
- 1.1.2. Twenty or more community forest management associations formed;
- 1.1.3. Twenty or more community forest management plans to optimize biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services and productive values throughout the territory;
- 1.1.4. Twenty or more community forest management plans implemented;
- 1.1.5. Forest monitoring guidelines and techniques adapted, developed and disseminated to the community;
- 1.1.6. Certified production of wood and other forest products on at least 700,000 ha of land (>20 projects);
- 1.1.7. Micro-finance mechanisms to increase market access and marketing for producer organizations (this product and 3.2.2 are essentially the same);

Result 1.2. The long-term sustainability of territorial management in the Mediterranean Ecoregion is improved and strengthened at the institutional and financial level

Products:

- 1.2.1 A formal Partners Committee of institutional stakeholders with clear accountability and governance mechanisms;
- 1.2.2 Modified instruments of the Ministry of the Environment to support the strategic objectives of global environmental protection and local sustainable development in the Mediterranean Ecoregion;
- 1.2.3 At least three institutional instruments of participating Committee members that are not from the MMA financial, programmatic, and regulatory revised to support the strategic objectives of environmental protection and sustainable local development in the Mediterranean Ecoregion;
- 1.2.4 An Advisory Council

(CATEM) to provide technical and strategic advice to the Committee.

Component 2: Demonstration/Promotion of Conservation and Enhancement of Carbon Stocks through Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry, and Local Carbon Monitoring Systems.

Result 2.1 Approximately 139,000 tCO2e sequestered or avoided as emissions (over 15 years); 29,200 tCO2e over project duration.

Products:

2.1.1 Five pilot demonstrations of best practices, 200 ha each, for reducing carbon stock emissions or sequestering carbon such as forest fire suppression or prevention, reforestation, restoration, and improved land use planning and management;

Component 3: Maintaining and improving the flow of forest and agro-ecosystem services to sustain the livelihoods of local communities

Result 3.1. Avoided soil degradation and increased resilience of agro-ecosystems to climate change on more than 140,000 ha with improved agro-ecosystem management practices.

Products:

3.1.1. Sustainable Soil Management Practices applied to at least 140,000 ha of productive territory;

Result 3.2. Change from degraded agricultural land to forest use on community land and soil conservation

Products:

3.2.1. Rehabilitation of 10,000 ha of degraded agricultural land;

3.2.2. Micro-finance mechanisms established to support the transition of degraded lands to sustainable management;

Component 4: Community capacity development and knowledge management

Result 4.1. Increased capacity of relevant stakeholders to diagnose and understand the complex and dynamic nature of global environmental problems and to develop local solutions.

Products:

- 4.1.1. Establishment of at least ten cross-cutting thematic Communities of Practice at the territorial level;
- 4.1.2. Ten training workshops throughout the ecoregion on project development and management, the role of land management in achieving Global Environmental Benefits BAM and the role of local communities;

Result 4.2. Improved capacity for knowledge management and collaborative project development for adaptive land management

Products:

4.2.1. Dissemination of results products and learned lessons to community-based organizations (OBC) and community support organizations (OSC) and others;

Result 4.3. Improved capacities of relevant community stakeholders to monitor and evaluate their projects and territorial trends.

Products:

4.3.1. Training program on the identification and monitoring of indicators and participatory monitoring of the project.

3. Findings

3.1. Project design and formulation

This section will discuss only those aspects of project design as described in PRODOC, without considering changes made during project implementation (which will be addressed in Section 3.2).

The project is designed within the framework of Chile's graduation process from the Small Grants Program (known in Chile as PPS). This was coupled with a long period of discussions between the MMA and UNDP. The final part of the approval process took place during a change of government.

In this context, the project is formulated as a tool that provides significant environmental benefits at the global level by community organizations in the management of severely threatened territories within the Chilean Mediterranean Ecoregion. At the same time, the project aims to test methodologies and develop experiences to address various methodological weaknesses and the scope of the FPA, thus generating inputs for the redesign of this instrument. Evidence for the above mentioned is that, among the observed methodological weaknesses of the FPA, for which this project intended to address are the amount of the subsidies, the competitive nature, the poor technical support provided, the poor connection with the local reality in which they are developed (territorial approach), the limited effect on institutional strengthening or on the formation of environmental networks, and weak local ownership. All of the aforementioned issues result in the scarce capacity to generate benefits beyond the local level⁵. In order to face this situation, the project proposes that organized communities act in a coordinated manner in the identification and implementation of appropriate technical innovations (for biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and sustainable soil management). Furthermore, aim to formulate strategies for territorial management, with the help of their institutional partners that include social, economic, and ecological synergetic results, whose objective is to improve resilience in the territories, both locally and globally. To achieve this, community organizations must be supported by a relevant policy and incentive framework. Thus, communities will have the capacities to articulate a vision for the territory, establish strategic objectives, define results, identify pros and cons, formulate action plans, and negotiate and agree on individual contributions to the fulfillment of these plans. This has resulted in a scheme that modifies the current approach to supporting sustainable rural development, from one based on uncoordinated and isolated activities, to a systematic program for disseminating improved knowledge and generating capabilities. It also proposes a new approach to inter-institutional coordination for work at the territorial and community levels by the public agencies responsible for promoting development and conservation initiatives. This approach would overcome, in the long term, the weaknesses of current methodologies to protect and enhance biodiversity, carbon stocks and ecosystem services, both at the level of the Mediterranean Ecoregion and globally.

3.1.1. Logical framework analysis (AML) and results framework analysis (project logic and strategy; indicators)

PRODOC proposes to intervene in the Mediterranean ecoregion of Chile, which covers about 20 million ha, between the locations of Caldera and Araucanía. It is recognized that the project cannot cover the entire ecoregion, hence a strategy is designed to take a sample of territories, in

⁵ PRODOC, page 29

representative areas of the ecoregion, for demonstration purposes of community initiatives and territorial planning implementation, which generate local and global environmental benefits. To advance this perspective, the project: i) focuses on working with small agricultural producers, grouped into community organizations. This is based on the assumption that these farms contain representative samples of the ecosystems of the ecoregion, in sufficient quantity and quality to achieve the results and goals of the project; and ii) designs a strategy to generate local and global environmental benefits on the aforementioned farms, based on work with the rural communities, which combines the generation of capabilities of community organizations, institutional coordination and the coordination of associative-organizational structures and the exchange of experiences. With respect to the assumption of the existence of relevant and pertinent ecological assets in the hands of farmers, PRODOC points out that, in order to achieve progress toward the goals of results 1 and 2; and to a lesser extent, 3, it must "..... achieve effects on a territorial scale in accordance with the global environmental values..." However, the project design does not consider: i) that its core users, the small producer sectors, own only 25% of the ecoregional area, ii) that the area with native ecosystems in the areas to be selected for IET is, by definition, a very small percentage of the total area of most IETs; and iii) that the properties of small producers present in those IETs, in general, have a very limited to no presence of native ecosystems. This creates an entry point situation in which the majority of potential users of the CMS lack areas of value from the point of view of the ecoregion biodiversity. This fact creates a great barrier to advance towards results 1, 2 and partially 3, which could only have been resolved with a very effective adaptive management. In other words, if the assumption that small farmers' farms contain representative samples of the ecosystems of the ecoregion in sufficient quantity and quality to achieve the results and goals of the project are met in a very limited way, the requirements for adaptive management, which focuses on the few farms that meet the assumption, are substantially increased. Additionally, it is evident that even if action is focused on such sites, the scalability of the initiative and the possibility of advancing towards the goals are very limited for design reasons.

Regarding the design of a strategy for the generation of local and global environmental benefits on the aforementioned lands, based on the work with the rural communities, the first step would be to develop a gradual intervention model to build institutional capacity and coordination for sustainable agricultural practices that optimize the effectiveness and efficiency of the use of the resources provided by the institutions. A second stage would consist of the creation of local coordination bodies for planning on a territorial scale. These bodies would identify the technical, financial, and institutional support available to implement initiatives and results agreed upon in a participatory manner by the territory's stakeholders (public, private, NGOs, OC/OSC). The third stage would consist of the dissemination of pilot experiences, through the exchange of experiences and other activities, that would allow their replication in other territories⁶.

Fig. 1 implies a sequence of actions and organization at different levels of influence in the territories, as well as responsibility schemes of the different stakeholders.

⁶ PRODOC page 43.

Fig. 1: Conceptualization of the project model and strategy according to PRODOC.



Source: Prepared by the authors on the basis of PRODOC.

To implement its strategy, PRODOC proposes a structure made up of a Tripartite Committee (CTP) that would be the maximum body of the project, but does not specifically name its members. Due to its similarity to the "Project Council", the present analysis considered the latter as the highest management and strategic decision-making body of the project. It also includes a CS to review and approve territorial initiatives, and two other multi-stakeholder territorial committees (regional scale and EIT scale), whose functions were to coordinate and advise communities on their projects and vision of the territory. Finally, a project team consisting of a National Director, a Coordinator and two support professionals would oversee the implementing of the CMS project in eight pilot

territories. UNDP would be the GEF implementing agency, while the MMA would be the national executor of the project. The institutional arrangement of the project is shown in Fig. 2.

In general terms, the methodology and structure proposed in the project are directly related to its objectives, but unfortunately it is not reflected in the project budget, in terms of considering support staff for each of the IET. Conversely, this structure is based on the assumption that public institutions work in a coordinated manner in the territories, a situation that does not exist in practice.





Fuente: elaboración propia a partir del Prodoc.

The strategy is logical and does not present major contradictions in terms of the steps to be followed to obtain its results. However, even assuming that farmers have relevant ecological assets on their farms that would have been effective, the proposed scope of covering 2 million ha is very high considering the available resources and duration of the project. In fact, San Nicolás is one of the most successful communities in creating and maintaining community organizations and defining landscape-scale objectives in a participatory manner. However, this effort has taken more than 13 years, and the municipality is fully involved in achieving the productive and environmental objectives defined for the community. The area of this community is approximately 49,100 ha. Therefore, in order to fulfill the proposed scope of 2 million ha and the participation of 100

community organizations, about 41 municipalities similar to San Nicolás would be needed, which is unlikely due to the characteristics of the challenge⁷ and the time involved.

The strategy established in PRODOC also emphasizes coordinated participation amongst the various public agents in the territories and recognizes the lack of cooperation amongst them but does not propose mechanisms or specific activities to achieve such coordination.

Conversely, PRODOC considers very different modalities for concepts about territory that are not clear. Examples of the above mentioned are the Conservation Landscapes, Model Forest, Soil, Forest and Water Conservation District, Biosphere Reserves and other conservation figures, totaling about 13 possibilities of territories with different characteristics, which make it difficult to discern priorities.⁸

During the project review, STAP indicated the need to consult specific guidance on this topic with respect to the certification system for agricultural and forest products. This was because the studies carried out to date showed a very weak relationship between certification and impacts on environmental and economic benefits. A project of this type should consider a credible cause-and-effect relationship in its design, indicating the contribution of the certification process to the improvement of environmental indicators. However, this situation was not observed in the project document. The document also recommends the use of certification schemes only in GEF projects that aim to evaluate the environmental impacts generated by the certifications ⁹.

The allocation of micro-credits to beneficiaries is also contemplated, but the strategy is limited to the description of existing institutions and mechanisms. This strategy does not define a clear mechanism for the granting of microcredits, nor does it define the environmental and social objectives to be achieved. The mechanism through which microcredit institutions are incorporated into the structure of the project and its coordination is not mentioned either¹⁰.

The strategy is also based on the creation of a new FPA, with the purpose of channeling the resources of the government institutions participating in the CMS, which would allow the CS to allocate resources for the IET. The FPA is regulated by the Environmental Framework Law (Law 19,300), in which the only restriction is the amount allocated to each project (approximately US\$ 19,000), while those that exceed this amount must be awarded by a public tender in accordance with the general rules generated by the same body¹¹. Although difficult, transfers between public sector institutions do occur, so a law would not be needed to change the nature of the FPA. In this respect, PRODOC's analysis seems to be incorrect. The small amounts allocated by this mechanism,

⁷ According to the information gathered by the evaluators, the municipality of San Nicolás spent approximately 3 years alone in promoting the creation and regularization of community organizations, to which should be added the efforts made by the municipality in training for these organizations. The number of community organizations increased from 5 in 2005 to 25 today, covering practically all of the commune's populated territories.

⁸ See PRODOC page 52

⁹ "Environmental certification and the Global Environment Facility: A STAP advisory document Prepared on behalf of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) by Allen Blackman" (2010).

¹⁰ See PRODOC sections 1.1.6 and 1.1.7.

¹¹ See Law 19,300, art. 66, 67 and 68.
as well as its limited effectiveness and dispersion, are not the result of a legal issue, but are more linked to a conception and form of operation of the FPA defined by its bases or regulations. Acceptance by other institutions will depend largely on the strategy used in its formulation and implementation. However, this situation is not clearly specified in PRODOC.

A key aspect that cannot be overlooked is that PRODOC does not assign any resources to Component 4: "Community Capacity Development and Knowledge Management". Indeed, the effort required to contact, encourage, create, and raise awareness of community organizations and regional public services was completely underestimated in the design of the project. The project did not consider the logistical, personnel, and time requirements involved for this component, which proved to be a key aspect of implementing the project. Eventually, these resources came from co-financing provided by the MMA; however, PRODOC does not specify the allocation of such resources. It could be argued that resources are implicit in the other components. However, in such a case, the challenges to be faced should have been mentioned and a budget should have been allocated. Resources were reallocated from other components to execute these activities, making it very difficult to estimate the effort made to implement this component of the project. Conversely, these gaps make it impossible to track the use of resources by component, which limits addressing efficiency and effectiveness in their allocation.

3.1.2. Assumptions and risks

Although the critical implicit assumption of high-value ecological assets in the hands of small farmers was not met, PRODOC relies on several assumptions that were not realistic at the time of the project.

The capacities of community organizations were overestimated (medium rating). For example, in the Altos de Cachapoal Model Forest the existing organization was severely diminished by budget cuts affecting CONAF (the entity that financed and maintained the Model Forests). In addition, the organization did not have legal status to be a beneficiary of the project. Therefore, a new organization had to be created. This type of situation affected the progress of the project since new organizations that were supposed to have already existed had to be created¹².

Another assumption was that state agencies had the capacity to work together to support community projects in a landscape perspective. Public services have sectoral practices, and it is not easy for them to work together with other services because of legal powers or financing issues. Therefore, to address this issue, high level efforts were needed in each of the main institutions involved in the CMS. In addition, to achieve a joint work situation would have been necessary to train and strengthen the staff of such services on issues of productive landscapes, territorial planning, as well as introducing the concepts of biodiversity, climate change, carbon sequestration, etc. It was also necessary to transfer knowledge to consultants who support entities such as INDAP and its Local Development Program. This is because they relate directly to the communities and support them in property planning, irrigation, and types of crops. The approach of these programs is eminently productive, with little environmental consideration in their development.

¹² See point 1.4 on stakeholder capacities in the "Work Plan GEF Sustainable Mediterranean Communities Project, October 2016 - March 2017"

A third important assumption of PRODOC was the transfer of resources from the various public services to the FPA to finance the IET. This could not be done due to legal problems with the services involved, lack of will, and low visibility of the FPA. Therefore, a deep understanding of the problem to be faced was missing. These issues are highly sensitive and require profound political reform of state institutions, which the MMA does not have the capacity to carry out.

Interviews conducted indicated that the initial assumption about the communities' interest in participating in project activities proved only partially true. This is because many communities are seeking access to financing, beyond the type of project proposed by public services and in particular by INDAP, Local Development Plans and PDTI. This situation did not occur and resulted in several participants disengaging from community projects. Indeed, the interviews conducted showed that many beneficiaries withdrew when the arrival of resources to finance specific projects was delayed.

Another assumption that did not prove true was that communities had an interest in carbon accounting and monitoring. The beneficiaries did have an interest in planting native forest (however, this type of project is secondary to agricultural concerns).

The project improved the management capacities of the communities, but not enough to become independent of external support. As a result, many communities are expecting to receive project proposals from different government or international agencies. Therefore, the assumption that communities would be able to develop their own proposals was overestimated.

3.1.3. Indicators

The set of indicators established in PRODOC is mostly aimed at defining project performance in terms of output, rather than results that make a difference in the social, economic, and environmental situation of the intervened landscapes. In fact, to measure the achievement of the project's objective "To develop, demonstrate and integrate the achievement of significant environmental benefits by community organizations..." focuses on measuring quantities (number of territories intervened, number of governance mechanisms, new FPA, number of projects promoted, number of hectares, number of IET, etc.), and on obtaining products (number of OCS trained). However, it does not focus on the desired effect of the project, such as the conservation of critically threatened ecosystems, or the measurement of new skills acquired by the communities, change of habits or improvements in the coordination between the government institutions and the appropriation of methodologies and work approaches introduced by the project. In addition, the physical indicators established in PRODOC are too ambitious and, as indicated, excessive with respect to the physical land base in the hands of the small producers considered in the project.

Finally, since this is a project classified as GEN-2¹³¹⁴ (significantly promoting gender equity), specific gender indicators should have been included within the results matrix, in addition to specific activities and objectives defined for this approach.

¹³ The gender dimension and project classification are explained in section 2.8.5 of PRODOC.

¹⁴ See "UNDP Gender Equality Strategy 2014-2017," p. 17. In 2009, UNDP launched the "gender marker," which requires UNDP projects to be rated - on a scale of "0" to "3" - according to their contribution to achieving gender equality. According to the scale, "0" means that a project is not expected to contribute significantly to gender equality; "1" means that a project will contribute in some way, but not significantly; "2" means that

The indicator for the "new FPA" is incorrectly formulated and is not consistent with the argument about the proposals to reform the existing FPA, because no bill is mentioned. In effect, the wording of the indicator "a new financing mechanism is functioning..." leads to misinterpretations, so the RS changed it to "a financing mechanism is functioning...." to delimit the scope of the FPA reform.

The present analysis is consistent with that conducted by the EMT in 2017, where deficiencies were found in the PRODOC indicators, focusing its analysis on the issue of ambition and difficulties in measuring them, and made recommendations on lowering the goals, along with including gender indicators and mainstreaming the approach, when it comes to indigenous initiatives.¹⁵.

The indicator for the "new FPA" is not correctly formulated and is not consistent with the argument about reforms to the existing FPA, which does not mention a bill. The wording of the indicator which states "a new financing mechanism is functioning..." could lead to misinterpretations, so the SR changed it to "a financing mechanism is functioning..." to define the scope of the FPA reform.

3.1.4. Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same area of interest) incorporated into project design

PRODOC focuses its analysis of lessons learned on the experiences of PPS-CHILE and FPA, which it incorporates into the project design. The rest of the text is mostly a situational diagnosis of the role of government institutions and their national, regional, and local coordination and the characteristics of community organizations and small farmers¹⁶. The experiences of the PPS-Chile and the FPA indicate that their probable impacts were mainly local, a situation that the design of the CMS tries to overcome with its strategy, but it exceeded its goals by being excessively high in terms of its territorial scope (2 million ha).

3.1.5. Planned stakeholder engagement

The project establishes an operational structure in its design in which the relevant stakeholders of eight territories could work in a coordinated and participatory manner to identify the landscape and its main environmental, social, and economic vulnerabilities. This has the objective of planning and having adequate support instruments (technical and economic) to face the problems and create an environment of resilience for the cultural and economic continuity of the communities in times of global and local climate crisis. Furthermore, it aims to protect globally important biodiversity, maintain and enhance ecosystem services, and perform carbon capture and measurement actions.

The phased strategy defined in the project considers an organization at the territorial, regional and national level. This strategy makes it possible to select and conduct a flow of community project activity, which is framed within territorial planning at the ecoregion level, while at the same time conducting them for sanction in a CS at the national level (see Fig. 2).

The project design identifies key partners for the implementation stage, which agreed to participate in the CS. These are CONAF, FIA and INDAP (Ministry of Agriculture), FOSIS (Ministry of Social

gender equality is a significant objective of a project; and "3" means that gender equality is a major objective of a project

¹⁵ Final Mid-Term Evaluation Report, Prepared by International Consultant Sandra Cesilini and National Consultant Juan Anjari, 2017.

¹⁶ Section 1.3: Reference Projects and Analysis.

Development), CORFO and ACCS (Ministry of Economy) and the UNDP/EU Joint Program to Combat Desertification.

In general terms, the methodology and structure proposed by the project are directly related to its objectives. Unfortunately, this is not reflected in the project's budget, in terms of considering support staff for each of the IETs. Conversely, this structure assumes that public institutions work in a coordinated manner in the territories. However, this situation does not occur in practice.

3.1.6 Repetition focus

The PRODOC has strong weaknesses in terms of scalability and replicating successful experiences. First, as indicated in 3.1.1, design weaknesses threatened scalability strongly. On the one hand, such weaknesses reduce the universe of possible experiences with respect to biodiversity conservation, carbon, and to a lesser extent, ecosystem services, which threatens scalability because it can reduce "scalable cases." On the other hand, the same design weaknesses reduce the territories and lands to which the experiences can be scaled.

In addition, according to this document, the actions for replication are to collect and disseminate best practices and knowledge generated in the EITs. Conversely, the territorial structures would be maintained after the end of the project, according to a regulation included in the new FPA. Thus, according to PRODOC, repetition would occur almost automatically because of such actions. With this, PRODOC omits the need to design an exit strategy by the implementation team and the main stakeholders. However, this exit strategy identifies mechanisms and schemes of participation. It also identifies the responsibilities of each stakeholder to improve the sustainability of project results and continuity of the OCs that managed them.

The same is true for the scalability of global environmental benefits from the cumulative effect of local experiences. The PRODOC assumes that the exchange of these communities' experiences is sufficient to generate a positive effect on biodiversity, GHGs, and soil degradation.

3.1.7 UNDP comparative advantage

The PIF highlights the extensive experience of UNDP in Chile on issues such as decentralization, strengthening of local communities, capacity development and environmental management issues. It also indicates the advantage of UNDP addressing environmental issues on a broader scale and providing the project with guidance and lessons learned from national policies. Conversely, the PIF emphasizes that this organization takes advantage of the experiences and impacts at the local level and transfers them to the institutions that formulate policies for their expansion and replication.

3.1.8. Links between the project and other interventions within the sector

The PRODOC makes a complete analysis of the financing instruments and sector programs of the government agencies involved in the territories, especially those belonging to the Ministry of Agriculture (INDAP, Prodesal, CONAF, INFOR), Ministry of the Environment (FPA) and Ministry of Economy (Tourism, CORFO, ASCC). PRODOC also identifies relevant projects with potential for collaboration, such as the UNDP-EU Project to Combat Desertification, the GEF/CONAF Project on Sustainable Soil Management (MSS), UN-REDD, and PCPF (for capacity development for forest carbon markets). In addition, PRODOC identifies other GEF project activities in state protected areas and buffer zones. It also proposes bimonthly coordination meetings between all these projects

during the first year of implementation. The coordinator of the MSS project should participate in the CMS Advisory Council to ensure technical and operational coordination between the two initiatives. As will be seen in the analysis of project implementation, coordination and complementarity with other initiatives were limited and accidental in most cases.

3.1.9. Management arrangements

As shown in Fig. 2, the project specifies a structure that would allow for stakeholder participation at the local, regional, and national levels. However, this structure is too "heavy" since in most cases the relevant stakeholders are the same people who intervene in the territories and localities. Furthermore, the PRODOC does not establish a budget for the operation of the secretariats of the Multi-Stakeholder Territorial Management platforms (PGTMA) (technical and administrative support). Conversely, the structure designed for the project considered only three support professionals at the national level. This is insufficient to implement the territorial projects. Therefore, a disconnection between the project implementation team and the Secretariats of the PGTMA was observed.

At the top of the project structure, a Tripartite Project Committee (CTP) also called "Project Council" was proposed, where UNDP, MMA and a representative of the beneficiaries would participate. They would supervise the implementation and make strategic decisions for the project. As will be seen below, this body was not implemented. Similarly, a "Partners Committee" (CS) was considered to provide technical and strategic support to the CTP.

In the national implementation modality (NIM), the MMA is responsible for the execution of the project through the Environmental Education and Citizen Participation Division (EduPaC). The GEF implementing agency is the UNDP office in Chile, which provides technical support through its staff and the Regional Technical Advisor (RTA), along with other financial and accounting services.

3.1.10. Project Change Theory (PCT)

The project document does not contain a theory of change that shows a causal relationship between inputs, products, and results which is used in order to understand the chain of results towards project impacts.

While the logic of the project has been extensively discussed in previous sections of this report, this section will proceed to reconstruct the PCT from the inputs already provided by the project, PRODOC, and other documents, along with a detailed analysis of the results framework.

Based on the above analysis, it is considered that the impacts desired by the project would be i) Reduction of the current rate of loss of forest ecosystems in the Chilean Mediterranean ecoregion, which is one of the most threatened globally; ii) Rehabilitation and restoration of forest ecosystems in the Chilean Mediterranean ecoregion; and iii) Improvement of the agro-ecosystem services flow.

In this line, the project aims to develop, demonstrate, and integrate the achievement of global environmental benefits by community organizations within the landscape approach management of seriously threatened territories in the Chilean Mediterranean Ecoregion. To this end, it addresses four components: (1) sustainable management of territories for biodiversity conservation; (2) local monitoring of carbon stocks; (3) improvement of the flow of services by agro-ecosystems in favor of local communities; and (4) community capacity building and knowledge management. Two cross-cutting components are also included: monitoring and evaluation, and project management.

As shown in Table 7¹⁷, when evaluating the results chain, going back through the project's logical framework, from the results to the activities, through products and intermediate results, to verify the relationships between the means and the ends of the different levels of the project's components, taking into perspective the impacts that the project aimed to achieve, it was necessary, from the following point of view:

i) Logical:

- a. Result 2 presents a statement that resembles a product more than a result;
- b. Sub-result 1.2 of Result 1 is very ambiguously worded and does not include change language and the person who would introduce it, so it would have needed to be reformulated during project implementation;

ii) Of the assumptions:

- a. Remaining area of EM in the hands of PP: biodiversity conservation requires landscape-level management that considers the aggregation of actions, in connected landholdings, that contain areas valuable from the point of view of EM conservation-restoration. In this framework, the basic assumption of the project is: 1. that PP have a significant portion of the remaining surface of the EM; and 2. that PP are properties with certain levels of contiguity and continuity. However, the information provided by PRODOC indicates that: 1. the remaining area of EM in the hands of PP is only 2.7%; and 2. the size of the properties of PP are small, averaging about 1 ha and 6-7 ha, at most. This situation makes it almost impossible to advance towards results 1, 2 and partially 3, which would prevent the project from achieving progress towards impacts i) and ii), affecting, moreover, progress towards impact iii). Such unfeasibility, generated by the physical base of the project's users, does not allow thinking about advancing towards results after a period of maturation of the experiences developed in the project, since these will be very reduced in number and, above all, not scalable to the EM;
- b. Capacities and conditions of the MMA to improve the territorial management of the EM: the project bases its strategy on developing a new management model for rural development, which implies that the MMA will be able to lead this process of change. The fact is that the role, and financial and technical resources, of the MMA do not make it possible for it to lead any change. On the contrary, the major sectoral stakeholders - the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Economy - are leading the way, and their financial resources and staffing levels make any attempt at coordination, networking, and leadership by the MMA difficult. In addition, the feudalism of the public sector makes it difficult to build mechanisms for sharing resources;
- iii) Impact drivers: The main impact drivers are associated with:
 - a. Weaknesses observed in the design of support mechanisms, both technical and financial, to sustain existing experiences and replicate them. This situation can be seen in sub-result 1.1 and result 3, both cases in which the PRODOC is clear in indicating the situation to be achieved, but not in indicating on what institutional and public support basis they will be sustained;
 - b. The need for a sector ministerial actor to gather the experience generated by the project and coordinate the work on sustainable rural development; and

¹⁷ The detailed analysis by result is presented in Appendix 8

c. That communities acquire skills and knowledge to make decisions that will enable them to maintain the flow of agro-ecosystem services and participate in joint governance for the development of the territory;

iv) Intermediate results. These would be results that effectively allow giving continuity to what the project establishes. The main ones are:

- a. A territorial management system for production landscapes that conserve biodiversity;
- b. The EM has an improvement in the flow of agro-ecosystem services that are adopted by the owners and relevant actors of the territory; and
- c. Communities apply sustainable forestry and agro-ecological production techniques to safeguard biodiversity, carbon stocks and critical environmental services.

| ble 7 | 7. Project Th | heory of Change Analysis | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| sve | 0 | bjective and results | | | | | |
| thwa | Objective: | To develop, demonstrate and ir | ntegrate the act | nievement of important environmental | l benefits by community organizations in the management of serious | sly threatened territories in the Chile | ean Mediterranean Ecoregion. |
| Ğ, | | Results | Logical | Assumptions | Media chain towards results | Impact Drives | Intermediate results |
| Conservation, restoration and improvement strategy | apes for biodiversity | 1.1. Conservation of Mediterranean forest territories through community actions, with a minimum of 700,000 ha of certified and sustainably managed Mediterranean forest. | Results and products do not have definition problems | Wrong assumptions make it very unlikely that the sub-result will be achieved. | The assumptions underlying sub-result 1.1 make it very unlikely that this sub-result, result 1 and impacts (i) and (ii) will be achieved, and the impact will be seriously affected | | |
| | 1. Sustainable management of landsc conservation | 1.2. The long-term sustainability of territorial management in the Mediterranean Ecoregion is improved and strengthened at the institutional and financial level. | There is a very ambiguous wording of the sub-result | The fragile assumptions regarding the existence of a territorial management system in the EMand institutional and financial management mechanisms can be traced back, but the assumption that the MMA has the institutional and role capacities and conditions to improve the EM territorial management is unsustainable. | i) The assumption regarding the capacities and role of the MMA seriously threatens the possibility of achieving the sub-result, but does not prevent, although it seriously affects, the possibilities of achieving the result and achieving the impacts i) and ii) affecting also iii); and ii) although PRODOC establishes coordination and articulation actions at various points, it is clear, from the point of view of the media chain towards results, that the project should have generated a formal and stable mechanism, independent of the existence of the project, for the coordination of public agencies in charge of rural development and their resources to advance towards the sustainability of the EM. This system is placed on intermediate results, but seems to be more of a weakness of the chain established by PRODOC. | Sectoral Ministry coordinates the institutional action of sustainable rural development taking the experience of the project and with the support of the MMA; To have both technical and financial support mechanisms to | A land management system for production landscapes that conserve biodiversity agreed, coordinated and implemented by local communities, large and medium-sized landowners and relevant government agencies. |
| | 2. Demons conservati carbon sto use chang carbon mo | stration and promotion of on and enhancement of boks through land use, land ye and forestry, and local unitoring systems | The statement of this result, is more like a product than a result. | Wrong assumptions make it unlikely to achieve what the product- result is looking for. | In this case, the chain from means to results is discontinued due to the weaknesses in the construction of the result. This fact is also expressed in the fact that the issue of capturing/avoiding CO2 emissions has a low presence in PRODOC, which does not allow it to be openly placed in the impacts, where it appears implicitly in the services of the agro-ecosystems. | support and replicate existing experiences; 2. There is joint governance between the communities, large and medium owners, and the relevant government agencies in the development of the territory; and | Carbon stocks maintained and enhanced by communities and other relevant stakeholders, through the implementation of a payment system for carbon credits |
| | 3. Maintaining and improving the flow of forest and agro-ecosystem services to sustain the livelihoods of local communities | | Results and products do not have definition problems. | Erroneous assumptions make it very unlikely that the result will be achieved in terms of maintaining and improving the flow of forest services; similarly, there may be a reduced scope for agro-ecosystem services. | The assumptions on which this result is based lead to the consideration that the result with respect to forest services is very unlikely to be achieved; similarly, progress towards agro- ecosystem flows is likely to be more limited than assumed. Based on the above, progress towards impact (iii) is significantly limited. | 3. Communities gain the skills and knowledge to make decisions, manage, monitor carbon stocks and maintain environmental services in their territories | The EM has an improvement in the flow of agro-eccsystem services that are adopted by the owners and relevant actors of the territory. |
| Strategy of strengthening | 4. Commu knowledge | unity capacity building and e management | Results and products do not have definition problems. | No wrong assumptions are appreciated. | Conditioned to the impact of what happens with the other results, it is considered that the chain of means to results is well constructed in this case and therefore this result generates a good support in the chain of means to results, to advance towards the impacts. | | Communities applysustainable forestry and agro-ecological production techniques to safeguard biodiversity, carbon stocks and critical environmental services. |

3.1.11. Additionality of the GEF Project

Although this section was not specifically included in the terms of reference of the final evaluation, nor is this analysis considered mandatory for projects approved prior to December 2018¹⁸, the UNDP country office requested to include this section during the third round of comments for this report. The evaluators felt that this analysis was nevertheless developed during the evaluation and is described in Sections 2 and 3 of this report, so we will only proceed to a conclusive summary of the six areas of additionality described in the UNDP evaluation guide and shown in Table 8 below.

| Additionality of | Description | Comment |
|--|---|--|
| the GEF project ¹⁹ | | |
| Specific Environmental Additionality | GEF provides a wide range of value-added interventions/services to achieve Global Environmental Benefits. | The environmental benefits of the project were strictly local in nature, with very little likelihood of scaling up nationally, nor did it provide verifiable global environmental benefits. |
| Legal/Regulatory Additionality | GEF helps stakeholders make changes that transform laws and regulations in an environmentally sustainable way. | The project does not provide new rules and regulations to improve the environmental status of the Mediterranean ecoregion. |
| Institutional and Governance Additionality | GEF provides support to the existing institution to transform in an efficient and sustainable way. | The project positively supports the MMA and its coordinating role with other institutions, especially INDAP, with which a general framework agreement was reached to work jointly. Similar efforts had been proposed with other services and other agencies, which did not prosper. With respect to the communities, they have been strengthened in their capacity to manage projects and plan small territories. |
| Financial Additionality | GEF provides an incremental cost that is associated with transforming a project with national/local benefits into one with global environmental benefits | PRODOC does not provide information on incremental costs to justify the GEF grant amount (current versus projected costs of project implementation, where the incremental cost difference would be the GEF grant; the baseline appears to be zero). As the strategy stands, the cause-effect relationship of project activities/products to the delivery of global environmental benefits is not clear or defined. |
| Socio-economic Additionality | GEF helps society improve its livelihood and social benefits through GEF activities. | In theory, PRODOC proposed certification of sustainable products, micro-credits, as well as coordination with the private sector to market these types of products. Unfortunately, during the project's implementation, these types of long-term financial instruments were left aside by the executing entity, focusing only on community projects and planning. |

Table 8. Additionality of the Project

¹⁸GUIDANCE FOR CONDUCTING TERMINAL EVALUATIONS OF UNDP-SUPPORTED, GEF-FINANCED PROJECTS, Copyright © 2020 United Nations Development Programme, p 60

¹⁹ IDEM above, Table 17 on page 60

3.1.12. Environmental and Social Safeguards

The "Social and Environmental Risk Screening (SESP)" procedure is a tool that UNDP uses during the design of GEF projects. It consists of a checklist with a series of questions that identify the environmental and social risks of projects during the formulation stage and corresponding measures to mitigate them during implementation. If new information is available during project implementation, or substantive changes are made during the project cycle, this tool should be updated, and the risk reassessed (Low, Moderate, High)²⁰. This tool is also useful for listening to the concerns of individuals/groups who may be affected by project activities, enabling them to discuss and hear their concerns.

In the specific case of this project, it was found that this assessment was made during its development, which the CMS classified as "Category 1" (no further action needed).

Interviews conducted indicated that none of the project's beneficiaries presented complaints or concerns regarding the project's potential impacts.

In the case of indigenous peoples, the CMS held several workshops for consultation and participation of communities.

3.2. Project execution

3.2.1 Adaptive management (changes in project design and project results during implementation)

The project adaptation management can be ordered according to the *existence of two management models*, expressed in that the project has had two different coordination teams.

The first management model, led by a Directorate and an initial Project Coordination Team (DECI), was developed for approximately 22 months, from January 2015 to October 2016.

It took this team approximately six months to initiate formal implementation of the project since the Project's opening workshop was held in April 2015 and the first meeting of the Partners Committee in July 2015. In this regard, it is noteworthy that the opening workshop was not used to address some of the changes later proposed by the EMT, which could have been detected if a quick review had occurred. Therefore, this workshop did not meet the expectations contained in PRODOC. This was because it focused on describing the project and identifying the major problems in the territories, rather than analyzing the project's strategy and indicators for the first annual work plan²¹. During the period of the DECI, the project management showed a lack of planning and progress towards the goals, so UNDP organized a pre-evaluation of the project in April 2016. In this instance, the implementation of activities without strategic planning and minimal budget execution were highlighted. Likewise, the installation of the project in the territories was carried out without

²⁰ "Guidance Note UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (SES), Social and Environmental Screening Procedure", Updated procedure, OPG approved in 2019.

²¹ Report of the Project GEF/UNDP/MMA Sustainable Mediterranean Communities Initiation Workshop, Santiago, April 15, 2015

a clear methodology as well as with workshops that had very broad topics that generated unrealistic expectations and general confusion among the participants²².

A new phase of the project began with a <u>second management model</u> consisting of a Directorate and a definitive Project Coordination Team (DECD)²³, which meant that, after two years, almost the entire coordination team was new.

Soon after the start of the DECD, the EMT was developed in April 2017 (approximately after 2.5 years of implementation). As indicated below, this report signifies the major change in adaptive project management. The EMT makes a set of recommendations shown in Table 6. This is a large number of recommendations (19 in total, if each of the recommendations that make up recommendation 15 is considered separately), which is increased by the level of detail shown, which in certain cases seem like instructions rather than recommendations. Contrary to what is expected, in many cases, the recommendations of the people involved in its design or management did not contribute to the task of simplifying a project that is considered complex.

The main changes proposed by the EMT and subsequently implemented were:

i) the restructuring of the project team and its organization. It should be noted that the structure proposed in PRODOC could not be fully implemented. This was due to its size and the fact that the PGTMA was duplicated in some instances. The technical committee (CATEM) also seemed redundant with the CS. In addition, the CTP, which was the only strategic direction of the project²⁴, was not implemented. This produced a gap in the definition of strategies that was not addressed by the CS. The CS was more of an instance of coordination and technical review of IET. Fig 3 shows the final organization and structure implemented by the project.

ii) updating the results framework. This was done through the RS, which addressed recommendation 1 of the EMT being recorded as its first objective: "*update and adjust the project results framework, and specifically the indicators and targets at the project results level*". This led to adjustments in the logical framework according to the following criteria: a) Adaptive management based on a projection of the number of hectares, families and communities involved, based on an updated "baseline" of the pilot initiatives implemented to date by the project; b) Review of the results-level indicators, adjusting, in some cases, the targets for the end of the project; and c) Incorporation of new indicators on gender and indigenous peoples.

iii) Incorporation of new indicators on gender and indigenous peoples.

iv) development of methodological criteria for the selection of participating communities and community organizations and EITs, providing in the latter case a detailed guideline of the aspects to be considered.

²² Follow-up Visit Report of the Sustainable Mediterranean Communities Project No. 77514 April 2016, U. Monitoring and Evaluation, UNDP Chile.

²³ In strict terms, the project management is maintained until mid 2017, with the current project director then in charge.

²⁴ PRODOC, p.87 on the Tripartite Committee



Fig. 3: Project organization and processes implemented during the 2nd stage

Source: Prepared by the authors based on information provided by the project implementation team

Table 9: Recommendations made by the EMT in 2017

| Reco | ecommendations | | | | | | |
|------|---|------------------------------------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| N° | Objetive and Results | Responsible | Acceptance | | | | |
| 1 | Adjust, validate and manage the approval of the logical framework, according to specific recommendations of the EMT | CP, CS, RTA | A | | | | |
| | Project Implementation and Adaptive Management | | | | | | |
| 2 | Implement and systematize the lessons learned from Pilot Projects I and II, CS, PGTMA and Communities of Practice | CS | A | | | | |
| 3. | Capture, assimilate and disseminate lessons learned from the first phase of the project, after the design of the systematization framework has been developed. To complement this, a roadmap will be developed to disseminate and incorporate the results into the management of the second phase of the project. | CP, UNDP, RTA | A | | | | |
| 4. | Strategy of implementation of the 2nd stage of the Project, including a model of project competition and a strategy of risk management, considering a period of extension of the Project. | CP, DN, CS | A | | | | |
| 5. | Management strategy of the Partners Committee that operationalizes the institutional contribution to the achievement of the objectives and safeguards the sustainability of the results. | CP, DN, CS | A | | | | |
| 6. | Management strategy of the PGTMA: territorial, broad public-private participation, achievement of territorial objectives, operationalization of PGTI and implementation of CATEM . | CP, DN, CS | A | | | | |
| 7. | Strengthen strategies (recommendations 4, 5 and 6) in approaches and mechanisms to safeguard progress and achievement of results. | CP, UNDP | A | | | | |
| 8. | Communication and dissemination strategy that safeguards approaches, strengthens management and achievement of results, and makes the Project visible | CP, UNDP | A | | | | |
| 9. | Strengthen the operational strategy of the monitoring and evaluation mechanism | CP, Profs M&E y F, PNUD, RTA | PA | | | | |
| 10 | Improve project team management | CP, DN, UNDP | A | | | | |
| 11 | Strengthening the Gender and Indigenous Issues Approach in the 2nd Phase of the Project | CP, UNDP, Others | ΡΑ | | | | |
| | Sustainability | | | | | | |

| 12. | Develop a technical and economic strategy for the IET competition, complying with the minimum recommended considerations | CP, UNDP, CS | A |
|------|---|-----------------|----|
| 13. | Risk management mechanism to safeguard the achievement and sustainability of results at the level of strategies to be developed (recommendations 4, 5 and 6), in the pilot projects | CP, UNDP | ΡΑ |
| 14. | Systematize the CMS Project | СР | А |
| 15 | Cross-cutting recommendations | | |
| 15.1 | Deepen the opening of decentralized units with inter-agency content | CP,UNDP, MMA | ΡΑ |
| 15.2 | Generate more and better human capital in social and environmentally sustainable development issues, at the regional, local and national levels and in the media. | | A |
| 15.3 | To plan an articulated agenda with the country's authorities, within the framework of UNDP's strategy with the Government of Chile | | ΡΑ |
| 15.4 | To learn about the programs and projects of international organizations that collaborate with the Chilean Government and civil society, in order to plan a coordinated strategy. | | A |
| 15.5 | Analyze synergy with other international cooperation projects | | PA |

References: 1. Responsible: CP: Project Coordinator; CS: Partners Committee; RTA: Regional Technical Advisor PNUD; DN: National Direction; Profs M&E y F: Monitoring and Evaluation and Finance Professionals; **2. Compliance with the EMT recommendation (color associated with the number):** green: completely fulfilled; yellow: partially fulfilled; and red: not fulfilled; **3. Project acceptance:** A: accepted; PA: partially accepted.

Based on the terms of the EMT, the SR generated a large number of changes by refining texts, modifying the wording of indicators and goals, and adding or merging products. However, not all changes generated precision. There are several that are cryptic, or ambiguous in meaning, which affect the evaluation, such as the goals for indicators 1 and 2 in result 1. In the first case, it refers to areas under land management plans. From an evaluation point of view and as indicated for the M&E system, it is not possible to determine whether the areas subject to such management plans represent progress towards the results. In the case of the second goal, it is not clear when an instrument is coordinated.

Although SR maintained the project's demanding territorial coverage goals, it modified the management levels required to achieve them and indicated real goal feasibility levels as an adaptive management measure. The effect was to lower the effort required to achieve the goals through the types of instrument or required management and by suggesting lower "feasible goal. Thus, the document indicates that the overall coverage of 1.2 million ha stipulated in PRODOC is unrealistic, which in fact was true, so it would be referential and adjusted downwards to approximately 650,000 ha. For result 1, the goal is increased from 700,000 ha to a reference value of 326,000 ha and the goal for result 3 is increased from 150,000 ha. All these changes result in a decrease of

approximately 50% from the original goals and were considered as lessons learned from the project^{25,26}. However, some goals were increased in their demands, such as N°2 of the objective, which changed from "Communities have a leadership role in IET management planning ..." to "in the planning and management of IET...").

However, both the EMT and RS do not face the implicit incorrect assumption of the project design, regarding the existence of relevant and pertinent ecological assets in the hands of the farmers. Thus, these two instruments do not generate adaptive responses to mitigate the negative impact of this erroneous assumption. It is clear that this design problem significantly limited the possibility of advancing towards results 1, 2 and partially 3. Therefore, certain adaptive management measures were crucial to achieve partial progress which, although they would not have allowed the goals to be achieved, would have allowed the project to generate valuable experiences regarding how to integrate the delivery of significant environmental benefits, by community organizations, into the management of severely threatened territories within the Chilean Mediterranean Ecoregion. In this sense, the responses given by the EMT and the RS, with respect to indicators and goals, do not manage to solve the basic problem of the existing design, which as will be seen, will mark the management of the project. However, it should be noted that the methodological proposals provided by the EMT with respect to the selection of the EITs, without being a response to the erroneous assumption indicated, provided an adaptive management path that, had it been used at the local and site levels, would have contributed greatly to mitigate the impact of this design error.

Gender and indigenous indicators were also included. This is a necessary step. However, such indicators do not comply with GEN-2, since they are limited to a percentage of participation and do not address the specific issues and interests for these group.

The main changes defined by SR regarding the results framework and indicators were: *i) objective:* there were no major changes, the wording was modified, with implications for the type of management to be developed, a situation also observed in results 1 and 3.

ii) For result 1: The management of this result is significantly simplified, by reducing or merging products. However, the process and the changes in the wording of the indicators and goals lead to: a) the disappearance of formal regulatory instruments with established procedures, such as forest management plans and the use of forest certification mechanisms; b) due to political impossibility, the modification of instruments to support protection and sustainability, is changed by the coordination of such instruments; and c) the issue of biodiversity disappears from the products, since product 1.1.3 of the SR is eliminated: Twenty or more community forest management plans built to optimize the conservation of biodiversity, ecosystem services and productive values throughout the territory, which sought to contribute ...to the conservation of the diverse species and habitats (of the forest ecosystems) of the Mediterranean Ecoregion. Conversely, a training program in territorial resilience with a landscape and community management approach was added. This reinforces the approach proposed by PRODOC and adds a product referring to the

²⁵ "Substantive Review", Ministry of Environment, Legal Division, Memorandum N° 8612019, February 27, 2019.

²⁶ PIR 2018.

PGTMA at the EIT level. This implicitly clarifies PRODOC's ambiguity regarding the level at which these tools operate.

iii) For result 2: the main changes in this outcome are: a) in the wording of the new output 8 (ex 12), the reference to carbon stock conservation and enhancement practices is removed and focused only on measurement and monitoring; and b) a product is added to establish a carbon baseline;

iv) For result 3: A product that established a microfinance mechanism was replaced by another related to instruments for the promotion and/or marketing of agro-ecological products. According to the project team, the objective of this change was to coordinate these instruments, but the SR does not give any indication on this matter.

v) For result 4: This is the result that probably shows the biggest changes: a) the original product 4.1.1 regarding Communities of Practice, is modified to focusing on community projects. According to the Project Coordinator, the purpose of this change would be to make this place available for the development, management and participatory and community monitoring of projects; b) the original product 4.1.2 "*Ten training workshops throughout the ecoregion on project development and management, the function of territorial management to achieve Global Environmental Benefits BAM, and the role of local communities*" is eliminated. This is a change that may have impacted the limited advances in biodiversity. If this product had not been eliminated, it would have enabled the selection criteria for IETs to be linked to land and property management; and the original product 4.2.1 "Knowledge management products from results and lessons learned disseminated to community-based organizations (OBC) and community support organizations (OSC) and others"...

It seems that an important part of the purpose of this product was integrated into the writing of the new product 13 (see below); and the original product 4.3.1 "*Training program on the identification and follow-up of indicators, and participatory monitoring of the project*"; c) a new product 13 "*Network of sustainable communities for the exchange of experiences and knowledge management*" is added; and d) indicators and goals referring to the participation of women and indigenous people in OC boards are added.

Consistent with the above change, the second objective of SR was to adjust the multi-year work plan that defines activities and budgets for each output and result. The third SR objective addressed part of recommendation 4 by extending the project execution period by nine months (until August 2020).

As a result of these recommendations, one of the first changes made was to implement recommendation 10. To this end, the team changed its mode of operation, decentralizing management by incorporating teams in regions, thus providing much closer support to the IETs.

Finally, it should be noted that the DECD team was affected by the change of government in 2018. This situation impacted the decision-making process, due to the change in management teams and the need for them to internalize the project. Additionally, both teams faced changes in the leadership of EDUPAC during the entire project implementation period. This resulted in difficulties and slowed down project management, aspects that are not easily measured from the perspective of a final evaluation. However, the most relevant change in the environment was the one faced by Chile in October 2019 due to a long and intense period of social manifestations, which deeply altered the functioning of the country and particularly of the public sector, leading to a significant slowdown in the activity of public services, which slowed down the activity of the project. In addition, in March

2020, the country entered into a set of severe restrictions on travel and meetings, as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. This severely limited the project team's ability to carry out a significant portion of the planned actions. It is clear that these last two events, but especially the pandemic, affected the implementation of various activities planned by the project or agreed with the users or partners.

As a conclusion of this section, the changes introduced to the CMS from the recommendations of the EMT and CS - and agreed between the UNDP and the MMA - constituted a major structural reform of the project, both in its organization and approach. However, by not addressing the project's design assumption about small farmers' ecological assets, such reforms did not allow the project to make significant progress in developing valuable experiences with respect to outcomes 1, 2, and partially 3, and certainly did not resolve the severe difficulties of making progress toward the goals of those outcomes.

The MMA and the CMS implementation team had a quick and effective response in the implementation of what was defined by the EMT and the RS. Thus, they reorganized the project structure and expanded the professional and consulting team to intensify support to community projects in the regions. At the same time, they introduced a clear methodology for the objective selection of territories to implement the project's landscape approach. All of the above resulted in a significant acceleration in the implementation of project activities. The project grew from three IETs and 10 community projects implemented between 2015 - mid 2017, to nine IETs and 34 projects, in the period 2017-2020.

3.2.2. Partnership agreements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country or region)

The multi-stakeholder and multi-level participation strategy for implementation, which aimed at developing sustainable development strategies at the EIT level, was accompanied by a two-level approach: The first level is systemic, aimed at establishing the conditions for a new approach to inter-institutional coordination. This also applies to work at the territorial and community level by public agencies in charge of promoting development and conservation initiatives. This systemic approach was poorly developed in the first stage of the project. Therefore, more attention was given to the second stage. The project sought to articulate the instruments of various public services at the national level, for which the project aimed to articulate the instruments of various public services at the national level. This meant that all the key partners identified in PRODOC were integrated early into the CS, except for the UNDP/EU Joint Program to Combat Desertification, which had ended when the project began. However, this did not translate into great advances in instrumental results, nor deeper and longer-term articulation at the national or local-territorial level. Even under the framework of the adaptive goal of "coordinated instruments", indicated as one of the goals of result 1, after the RS, it is not observed that the Sustainable Agriculture Program (INDAP), nor the Fund for Conservation and Sustainable Management of the Native Forest (CONAF), have been coordinated with the project, beyond the fact that the users of the CMS have applied for such instruments, with the support of the project. Without a doubt, the great advance corresponds to the case of INDAP, whose scope and sustainability remains to be seen, and to a lesser extent to ACCS.

The second level of work is analogous to the previous level, but is contingent on the development of the project and operates at the level of the EIT. At this level, the work with the ACCS in conjunction

with the Biofin program in San Nicolás is highlighted. This work was carried out closely with the Municipality. In Lonquimay, since a new mayor took office, there has been articulated work with the Municipality. The same is true for CONAF, through the articulation with the REDD+ - CONAF project in Alhué.

All the key partners identified in PRODOC joined the CS, except for the UNDP/EU Joint Program to Combat Desertification, which had ended when the project began.

Within this framework and considering the operation of the project, the partnerships identified are:

National-Regional Level

- 1. Ministry of the Environment and Regional Services/Support for the management and operation of the project/Presentation of FNDR Projects.
- 2. Ministry of Agriculture
 - i. National INDAP, Partners Committee; Regional INDAP
 - ii. National CONAF, Partners Committee; Regional CONAF
 - iii. National INFOR, Partners Committee; INFOR Bío Bío
 - iv. National FIA, Partners Committee
- 3. National FOSIS, Partners Committee
- 4. Ministry of Economy
 - i. National CORFO, Partners Committee
 - ii. National ASCC, Partners Committee; ASCC Bío Bío
 - 5. Biofin Program.
 - 6. National Committee for Ecological Restoration, which is coordinated by the MMA and is made up of public and academic institutions, NGOs and the private sector

At this level, as indicated, the agreement with INDAP is the only association that is consolidated into an agreement with greater projection, which is contingent on the decisions and disposition of the future authorities of the INDAP and the MMA, where the interest and persistence of the MMA will be fundamental.

Communal level

- 7. Illustrious Municipality of Alhué
- 8. Illustrious Municipality of Pumanque
- 9. Illustrious Municipality of San Nicolás
- 10. Illustrious Municipality of de Lonquimay

The only association that can be projected is with San Nicolás, since this municipality has developed extensive work to support rural associations, which is the framework for the work of the CMS.

Territorial level (Community Organizations and Support Organizations)

- 11. Puchuncaví Rural Social and Cultural Tourism Group
- 12. Community Advancement Board
- 13. The Sustainable Effort of Santa Julia
- 14. Valle Alegre Neighborhood Council
- 15. Villa Alhué Agricultural Community
- 16. BM Cachapoal Association
- 17. Pichilemu Sustainable Development Center
- 18. Ranquilhue Neighborhood Council
- 19. La Familia Nilahuina Neighborhood Council
- 20. La Cabaña Fortress Senior Club
- 21. Agua Santa Rincón El Sauce Neighborhood Council
- 22. La Unidad de Peumayén de Nerquihue Group
- 23. Escuela Pumanque General Center of Parents and Guardians
- 24. Vega de Salas Neighborhood Council
- 25. Senior Citizen Committee of Pejerrey (COMADULPEJE)
- 26. Defense and Conservation Group Maule-Mataquito
- 27. Coipué Alto Neighborhood Council
- 28. Tabunco Union and Progress Neighborhood Council
- 29. Los Mayos Advancement Committee
- 30. Los Pinos de Putú Advancement Committee
- 31. Putú's Friends Club
- 32. Association for Sustainable Territorial Development Ránquil-Quillón-Florida
- 33. San Nicolás Communal Farmers' Coordinating Committee
- 34. Coipín Farmers' Committee
- 35. Lonquén Farmers' Committee
- 36. Los Montes Farmers' Committee
- 37. Peña Santa Rosa Farmers' Committee
- 38. Puyaral Farmers' Committee
- 39. La Esperanza de Vidico Farmers' Committee
- 40. La Maravilla Farmers' Committee
- 41. Puyamávida Farmers' Committee
- 42. Association BM Araucarias del Alto Malleco
- 43. Association BM Araucarias del Alto Malleco
- 44. Association BM Araucarias del Alto Malleco
- 45. Pehuen Senior Club
- 46. Llames Neighborhood Council
- 47. Mallin Del Treile Neighborhood Council
- 48. Manchurian Rural Fair

At this level, initially the continuity of the partnerships will depend on the continuity and results achieved in the near future with the agreement with INDAP; and secondly on the strength of the community organizations at the end of the project, and the support provided by the support organizations with which they worked.

Institutional Level - Internal MMA:

- 49. Division of Environmental Education and Citizen Participation
- 50. Division of Natural Resources and Biodiversity
- 51. Program for Environmental and Social Recovery (PRAS).

The agreements established by the project with OCS/OC are considered adequate, relevant and effective, considering the capacities of such organizations for the implementation of IETs.

3.2.3. Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management Period 2015-2017

First, it should be noted that both the monitoring visit in 2016 and the EMT in 2017 highlighted the lack of an M&E strategy and plan that included the use of monitoring tools for the project. This situation has not been satisfactorily resolved to date. In fact, the project did not have an appropriate M&E system in place. This work was carried out by the project coordinator with the support of two other people. This situation certainly explains, in part, the weaknesses noted below. Although PRODOC presents the details of the project's M&E plan, it is not clear in identifying the tools intended to be used. However, this was not the case with the GEF tracking tools, which were to be applied in each of the IETs at the beginning, mid-term, and end of the project. The evaluators found that the use of the "tracking tools" developed by the GEF was relevant. The application of these tools is a requirement for their projects, including multi-focal projects such as the CMS. In this case, two GEF-5 outcomes are addressed, both of which are covered by this tracking tool^{27,28,29}. A similar approach was taken by the EMT, but UNDP reported that its application would not be mandatory for this type of community project.

The UNDP Regional Technical Advisor informed the evaluation team that the institution decided not to use this monitoring tool because its application was not mandatory for this type of community-based project.

It should be noted that, in a project with several levels of work like this one, ranging from the national to the territorial and local level, the situation indicated by the EMT occurs: "The lack of implementation of tracking tools as a mechanism for monitoring results... ..., as well as the lack of other monitoring and evaluation systems that would have contributed to efficient management, did not allow the project unit to visualize the efficiency of the tools in the field in a joint manner, but rather through a case study related to the field visits".

Period 2017-2020

Consistent with the aforementioned period, it would have been necessary to have a solid M&E system that went beyond activity and financial reporting. One that allowed for the measurement

²⁷ It should be noted that the "Tracking tools" are applied at the beginning, middle and end of each project, and are used to measure the impact of the projects at the level of the GEF portfolio.

²⁸ "EVALUATION OF THE MULTIPLE BENEFITS OF GEF'S MULTIFOCAL AREA (MFA) PORTFOLIO, Prepared by the Independent Evaluation Office of the GEF", November 2017, Page 57.

²⁹ "GUIDELINES ON CORE INDICATORS AND SUB-INDICATORS", GEF CEO, approved March 2019, page 3

of progress towards the environmental and social results proposed by the project and its associated methodologies.

The M&E system implemented during the period 2017-2020 consisted of a series of procedures that were designed to track the progress of individual community projects, at the territorial (IET) and global CMS level. This system was called "Three-Level M&E" by the implementation team.

For the overall scale of the project the execution of M&E activities was generally adequate in terms of monitoring the various tasks and products of the project. In addition to CS and IRP reports and minutes, CMS implemented detailed POAs and multi-year plans. These included timelines for obtaining products and activities, as well as establishing a set of indicators to verify compliance³⁰. These POAs are prepared in an Excel spreadsheet with a standard UNDP format, which does not have a narrative text of the strategic lines to address the various products and prioritize lines of work. This limits the possibility of rationalizing the budgets, activities and products contained in the POAs³¹.

With regard to the annual and quarterly reports, the same situation occurs. These are reports on the execution of activities and the achievement of products. In the case of the PIR, these are similar to those mentioned above, but an effort is made to include the environmental benefits of community projects. In addition, the intervened areas are projected without sufficient support. This situation is discussed in Section 3.3 of this report.

<u>With respect to the SC</u>, its meetings are mainly focused on operational and programming issues of the project activities. They do not systematically and deeply address the most strategic aspects that determine the sustainability and replicability of the initiatives promoted. These meetings do not deal with the analysis of how this set of activities would allow to fulfill the project's objective.

Therefore, based on the above, it is considered that the feedback was partially effective.

<u>At the IET level</u>, the "Guide for the Development of Initiatives at a Territorial Scale (EIT)" is the instrument that contains the criteria for the selection of territories to carry out the planning and implementation of community projects. There are four levels to be considered in order to delimit the landscape (natural biophysical system, productive land uses, well living and governance), with their corresponding criteria to identify their different dimensions. These should be prioritized, measured and monitored to obtain the necessary information once the landscape and community projects are selected. In this guide there is a comparison between what currently exists and what is desired to achieve in the landscape in the long term. *However, concrete result indicators of the changes expected with the planning are not provided. This is also observed in the PGTI, which are a description of these dimensions, but which lack a formal results statement and a lack of information pertaining to its means of measurement and monitoring*. Additionally, no guidelines were developed to bring the criteria on the biodiversity used for the selection of EITs to the local

³⁰ For example, see adjusted POA 2020 or POA 2019.

³¹ There is only one exception that occurred in 2016, where an explanatory strategy document was elaborated before the EMT: "Work Plan GEF Sustainable Mediterranean Communities Project, October 2016 - March 2017"

and property levels, generating a methodological discontinuity that impacted the progress to results.

At the level of community projects and property planning, there are no statements of expected results and nor of any indicators needed to measure environmental and social improvements. Therefore, there is a disconnect between these community projects and their desired effects on the landscape. These types of results and indicator statements are not found at the IET level, nor in community projects. Therefore, it is not possible to measure progress of the different dimensions of community projects, nor their contribution to the overall expected landscape result.

<u>The CMS team also developed criteria for monitoring the progress of community projects.</u> However, their M&E is at the processes level for obtaining products and activities (compliance with formal requirements, technical and financial reporting, etc.) ³² These do not include any specific M&E system to verify progress in the desired social and environmental sectors, only the number of hectares intervened.

Conversely, the documentary review and interviews conducted do not show the existence of a formal plan for M&E that includes the organization of periodic field visits, the definition of the landscape variables to be measured and their periodicity, description of responsibilities and milestones. The professionals in charge of M&E were mostly responsible for providing technical assistance to the beneficiaries. They also monitored community project activities, but there was no person responsible for monitoring the variables leading to the project's final results (in terms of the improvement of environmental and social variables in the intervened areas).

The impact of this weakness can be seen in the fact that there is no exit strategy and that there was no monitoring of the extent to which the project was moving towards the desired environmental and social results at the territorial, local and property levels (each of which is critical).

Therefore, it is concluded that the M&E system implemented was adequate to verify progress in the execution of project activities and products, but was insufficient to monitor and verify progress towards the desired changes in the different dimensions at the local and territorial levels. This situation leads to a lack of knowledge in the evolution of these variables according to the final objective of the project (to obtain environmental benefits) and is also manifested in the lack of a project exit strategy.

3.2.4. Project financing

At the time of project approval, funding includes US\$3,311,614 from the GEF and US\$17,119,772 from co-financiers, for a total of US\$20,431,386, as shown in Table 10.

³² See M&E GEF CMS 3 Niveles.ppt

| Source/Amount of Funds | Cash | Payment in Kind | Total | |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|--|
| GEF | 3,31 | - | 3,31 | |
| MMA (*) | 10,00 | 2,12 | 12,12 | |
| Beneficiarios | 1,00 | 3,00 | 4,00 | |
| PNUD/EU | 1,00 | - | 1,00 | |
| Total | 15,31 | 5,12 | 20,43 | |

Table 10: Total CMS funding according to PRODOC (USD)

According to PRODOC, the distribution of the US\$ 3,311,614 in GEF funding is as follows (see Table 11): US\$ 2,479,410 for the achievement of Result 1; US\$ 255,484 for the achievement of Result 2; US\$ 166,751 for Result 3; US\$ 254,275 for monitoring and evaluation; and US\$ 157,694 for project management. As mentioned in Section 3.1, Result 4 does not have an allocated budget despite having a significant weight in the achievement of the CMS objectives.

| Component/Year | Execution Level | Comp. 1 | Comp. 2 | Comp. 3 | Comp. 4 | Comp. 5 | Comp. 6 | Annual Accumulation |
|----------------|--------------------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------------|
| | Prodoc | 673.079 | 67.664 | 46.205 | - | 38.055 | 29.739 | 854.742 |
| 2015 | Real | 134.105 | - | - | 1.043 | 23.752 | 59.961 | 218.861 |
| | % | 20% | 0% | 0% | | 62% | 202% | 26% |
| | Prodoc | 632.288 | 107.716 | 36.688 | - | 38.055 | 29.739 | 844.486 |
| 2016 | Real | 399.190 | 15.721 | 1.848 | - | 30.290 | 23.820 | 470.869 |
| | % | 63% | 15% | 5% | | 80% | 80% | 56% |
| | Prodoc | 532.292 | 80.104 | 41.929 | - | 68.055 | 32.739 | 755.119 |
| 2017 | Real | 373.423 | 42.352 | 6.044 | - | 63.011 | 25.672 | 510.502 |
| | % | 70% | 14% | 14% | | 93% | 78% | 68% |
| | Prodoc | 552.293 | - | 41.929 | - | 35.055 | 32.738 | 662.015 |
| 2018 | Real | 552.935 | 747 | 12.988 | - | 30.319 | 13.628 | 610.617 |
| | % | 100% | 0% | 31% | | 86% | 42% | 92% |
| | Prodoc | 87.458 | - | - | - | 75.055 | 32.739 | 195.252 |
| 2019 | Real | 784.654 | 2.031 | 4.773 | - | 13.507 | 18.563 | 823.528 |
| | % | 897% | | | - | 18% | 57% | 422% |
| | Prodoc | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2020 | Real | 151.741 | 2.765 | 131.685 | - | 434 | 3.929 | 290.554 |
| | % | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | Prodoc | 2.477.410 | 255.484 | 166.751 | - | 254.275 | 157.694 | 3.311.614 |

Table 11: Evolution of CMS expenditures for the period 2015-2020

| Cumulative Totals | Real | 2.396.049 | 63.615 | 157.338 | 1.043 | 161.313 | 145.574 | 2.924.931 |
|--------------------------|------|-----------|--------|---------|-------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------|
| per Component | % | 97% | 25% | 94% | | 63% | 92% | 88% |
| N/A: not applicable | | | | | | Balanc 31/07/20 | e as of 20 (USD)= | 386.683 |

12%

The expenditure execution as of July 31, 2020 was 88.3% of the total budget (see Table 9). However, when analyzed by component, the situation is uneven, since component 1 is over-executed, while components 2 and 3 show a very low execution of expenditure. Nevertheless, since component 1 represents almost ³/₄ of the total budget, its execution throughout the project development illustrates to a great extent the management that has been carried out. The trend in budget execution for this component, as shown in Fig. 4, is low in the first three years and increases considerably in the fourth and fifth years. This execution process manifests two facts. On the one hand, planning and design problems and inefficient management. This is evident even considering the problems of execution produced by changes in context or ambitious goals. Due to this pace of execution, the extension of the project was necessary and was correctly approved. Conversely, the execution of the expenditure of component 1 is strongly marked by the increase of IET that is carried out at the end of 2017 and beginning of 2018.

The execution of expenditure in component 2 shows the opposite behavior to that of component 1, decreasing substantially as of 2018, which is consistent with an almost total absence of territorial work.

The expenditure of component 3, shows a huge irregularity. In this regard, both the design of the project, and in particular its implementation, do not allow to appreciate a fit between the results and products proposed and the activities and expenditure. This situation makes components 1 and 3 indistinguishable, which seem to have been managed as a single budget component.

Finally, it is noteworthy that the expenditure in components 5 and 6 went down during the period of greater intensity of management and territorial coverage of the project. Furthermore, during this period, the need for active work planning the closing and exit strategy of the project was crucial.

Fig. 4: Budget execution by component



With respect to the distribution of expenses for component 1, the preparation of the IETs demanded approximately USD 163,000, while the financing for community projects is in the order of US\$ 1.3 million. Among these, the Alto Malleco Model Forest Association (US\$ 154,000), followed by the Community of Quillón in the Bio-Bio (US\$ 106,000) are the most relevant. Tables 12 and 13 show an approximate detail of these expenditures.

Table 12: Expenditure on preparation of IET

| Development of IET | Amount (US\$) | | | |
|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CENTER | 46,132 | | | |
| DEFENSE AND CONSERVATION GROUP | 46,079 | | | |
| COMMUNAL FARMERS' COORDINATED COMMITTEE | 44,891 | | | |
| SOCIAL AND CULTURAL TOURISM GROUP | 25,666 | | | |
| Total | 162,768 | | | |

Another interesting aspect of the community projects is the type of activities that were financed with the donations. The largest items financed were infrastructure with a third of the expenses,

followed by equipment and tools (14%), technical assistance (14%) and training (10%). Fig. 5 shows the distribution of project investments in detail.



Fig. 5: Distribution of expenditure for community projects

Table 13: Funding provided to community-based organizations

| Nº | Grants | US\$ Amount | % |
|----|--|-------------|-----|
| 1 | ASSOCIATION BM ARAUCARIAS DEL ALTO MALLECO | 153,999 | 12% |
| 2 | ASSOC FOR SUSTAIN TERRIT DEVELOP QUILLÓN | 105,986 | 8% |
| 3 | VILLA ALHUÉ AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITY | 55,854 | 4% |
| 4 | FOLIL PEHUEN SENIOR CLUB | 53,532 | 4% |
| 5 | BM CACHAPOAL ASSOCIATION | 52,597 | 4% |
| 6 | COMADULPEJE SENIOR CITIZEN COMMITTEE | 50,944 | 4% |
| 7 | VEGA DE SALAS NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL | 50,366 | 4% |
| 8 | SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CENTER | 46,132 | 4% |
| 9 | SAN NICOLÁS COMMUNAL FARMERS' COORDINATING | 44,891 | 3% |
| 10 | AGUA SANTA RINCÓN EL SAUCE NEIGHBORHOOD | 38,354 | 3% |
| 11 | LA UNIDAD DE PEUMAYÉN DE NERQUIHUE GROUP | 37,229 | 3% |
| 12 | UNION AND PROGRESS NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL | 36,806 | 3% |
| 13 | LA FAMILIA NILAHUINA NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL | 36,575 | 3% |
| 14 | SENIOR CLUB LA FORTALEZA DE LA | 36,513 | 3% |
| 15 | LOS MAYOS ADVANCEMENT COMMITTEE | 36,266 | 3% |
| 16 | ESCUELA PUMANQUE GENERAL CENTER OF PARENTS | 35,267 | 3% |
| 17 | EL ESFUERZO COMMUNITY ADVANCE COUNCIL | 35,200 | 3% |
| 18 | VALLE ALEGRE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL | 35,062 | 3% |
| 19 | COIPUE ALTO NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL | 34,464 | 3% |
| 20 | RANQUILHUE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL | 33,776 | 3% |
| 21 | PUTU FRIENDS CLUB | 33,375 | 3% |

| N⁰ | Grants | US\$ Amount | % |
|----|--|-------------|------|
| 22 | LOS PINOS DE PUTU ADVANCE COMMITTEE | 30,291 | 2% |
| 23 | ESMERALDA DE LONQUEN FARMERS' COMMITTEE | 26,608 | 2% |
| 24 | AGRUPACION TURISMO SOCIAL Y CULTURAL RUR | 25,666 | 2% |
| 25 | EL PORVENIR DE LOS MONT FARMERS' COMMITTEE | 24,876 | 2% |
| 26 | PEÑA SANTA ROSA FARMERS' COMMITTEE | 24,628 | 2% |
| 27 | PRODUCTIVO CAJON DE LA FARMERS' COMMITTEE | 24,599 | 2% |
| 28 | PUYARAL FARMERS' COMMITTEE | 24,393 | 2% |
| 29 | COIPIN FARMERS' COMMITTEE | 24,031 | 2% |
| 30 | PUYAMAVIDA FARMERS' COMMITTEE | 23,327 | 2% |
| 31 | LA ESPERANZA DE VIDICO FARMERS' COMMITTEE | 23,048 | 2% |
| 32 | MANCHURIA RURAL FAIR | 4,310 | 0% |
| 33 | LLAMES NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL | 4,310 | 0% |
| 34 | MALLIN DEL TREILE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL | 4,310 | 0% |
| | Total | 1,307,586 | 100% |

In terms of the project's financial management, at the time of the evaluation there is information on disbursement (budget execution) by component and by year.

From a management point of view, Fig. 6 shows the great irregularity between planned and executed expenses throughout the development of the project. This is particularly marked with respect to components 2 and 5, which confirms what was stated above.



Fig. 6: Percentage of actual versus planned expenditure

Territorial management biodiversity, local monitoring carbon stocks, improvement of agrosystems services, Monitoring and evaluation

It should be noted that the project has benefited from a favorable exchange rate, especially in recent times. As of February 2012, when the PIF was presented, the exchange rate was USD 1 = CLP 481.49. Throughout the project's execution period, the dollar has been appreciating with respect to the Chilean peso, as shown in Table 14 below. This has been significantly favorable to the project management.

| Year | Average change (CLP/USD) | % change from 2012 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| 2015 | 681.1 | 41% |
| 2016 | 679.8 | 41% |
| 2017 | 650.4 | 35% |
| 2018 | 645.3 | 34% |
| 2019 | 722.9 | 50% |
| 2020 | 810.5 | 68% |
| Average for the period | 680.1 | 41% |

Table 14: Dollar exchange rate during project implementation

Prepared by the author from UNDP ATLAS data

With respect to co-financing, the commitments made in PRODOC are listed in Table 15.

Table 15: Co-financing commitments according to PRODOC

| Cofinanciamianto | Monto período (USD) | | | |
|---|---------------------|-------------|------------|--|
| comanciamiento | Efectivo | En especies | Total | |
| Ministerio Medio Ambiente | 10.000.000 | 2.119.772 | 12.119.772 | |
| Ministerio Medio Ambiente-FPA | 1.000.000 | 3.000.000 | 4.000.000 | |
| Programa PNUD-UE para combatir la desertificación | 1.000.000 | - | 1.000.000 | |
| Total | 12.000.000 | 5.119.772 | 17.119.772 | |

Co-financing,

Period amount (U\$D),

Ministry of environment, Ministry of environment_FPA, UNDP - EU program to combat desertification, Total

Cash, in kind, total

The project implementation team has made estimates about the contributions of the different partners and the MMA. An approximate amount of USD 1.1 million was estimated by the MMA and another USD 993,000 in kind, which are both shown in Table 16. The numbers indicate that the commitments stipulated by PRODOC are far from being achieved. The MMA has contributed only 11% of its commitments in cash, while 16% in kind. No cash contributions have been made by the

beneficiaries, but in-kind contributions amount to USD 131,000, which represents 4% of the commitments made.

| Co-financina (type/source) | UNDP's own funding | | Government | | Beneficiaries | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------|------------|--------|---------------|--------|
| | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual |
| Cash | 1.00 | S/I | 10.00 | 1.11 | 1.00 | - |
| In-kind | - | - | 2.12 | 0.86 | 3.00 | 0.13 |
| Total | 1.00 | - | 12.12 | 1.98 | 4.00 | 0.13 |
| % | | S/I | | 16% | | 3% |

 Table 16: Co-financing reported by CMS (in millions of USD)

Prepared by the author from data provided by the CMS

It is worth mentioning that the CMS has estimated additional co-financing of USD 3.81 million corresponding to contributions from the FNDR Cayumanque Restoration Program, the CONAF REDD+ Project in Alhué, the FNDR INFOR Achibueno Program, and the MMA Restoration Pilot Plan. These figures were not included in Table 14 because these resources were not formalized or their magnitude were not known. Furthermore, it was not indicated whether they were cash or in-kind contributions. If these contributions are confirmed, the cash contribution of the MMA and other government partners could increase from 11% to 60% of the initial commitment. Finally, there is no information on the UNDP counterpart, which should reach USD 1 million.

As a conclusion of this section, this goal has not been achieved at the moment. However, based on the information above, it could be slightly over 60% of the funds initially committed, and according to the information provided by the project team, additional updated figures would be available from INDAP, INFOR and CONAF by the end of 2020.

| Sources of Co-financing | Name of Co-financier | Type of Cofinancing | Investment Mobilized | Amount (\$) |
|----------------------------|--|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| Recipient Country Governme | Ministry of Environment | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 920,492 |
| Recipient Country Governme | Ministry of Environment (Environment Protection Fund) | Grant | Recurrent expenditures | 1,161,491 |
| Recipient Country Governme | Ministry of Environment (Putú-Huenchullamí Pilot Ecological Restoration Plan) | Public Investment | Investment mobilized | 18,475 |
| Recipient Country Governme | Institute of Agricultural Development (INDAP) | Grant | Recurrent expenditures | 716,117 |
| Recipient Country Governme | Forest National Agency (CONAF) | Grant | Recurrent expenditures | 48,880 |
| Recipient Country Governme | Forestry National Agency (CONAF) - UN REDD Pilot Project Alhué | Other | Investment mobilized | 286,164 |
| Recipient Country Governme | Solidarity and Social Investment Fund (FOSIS) | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 172,648 |

Confirmed sources of <u>Co-financing</u> for the project by name and by type

| Recipient Country Governme | Forestry Institute (INFOR) | In-kind Investment mobilized | | 163,080 |
|----------------------------|--|------------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| | - Achibueno FNDR | | | |
| | Program | | | |
| Beneficiaries | Community-based | Grant | Recurrent expenditures | 144,522 |
| | Organizations | | | |
| GEF Agency | United Nations | Grant | Investment mobilized | 76,928 |
| | Development | | | |
| | Programme (PNUD-Chile) | | | |
| | BIOFIN (San Nicolás) | | | |
| | and UN REDD (Alhué) | | | |
| | microcapital | | | |
| Recipient Country Governme | Cayumanque Ecological | Public Investment | Investment mobilized | 3,239,738 |
| | Restoration Program | | | |
| | (FNDR Biobío Region and | | | |
| | Ministry of Environment) | | | |
| Recipient Country Governme | Municipality of San | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 247,887 |
| | Nicolás (Rural | | | |
| | Development | | | |
| | Department - PRODESAL) | | | |
| Total Co-financing | | | | |

3.2.5. Monitoring and Evaluation: input design and execution (*)

The project's M&E Plan is described in PRODOC and is in accordance with UNDP and GEF procedures with responsibility for project execution under the supervision of the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP GEF Regional Office including monitoring at the national, ecoregional, territorial, and local levels. It is also indicated that the monitoring and evaluation of results: i) will be carried out with indicators proposed by the project and its institutional framework; ii) will include a start-up report, reviews of project implementation, analysis of project implementation, quarterly (QPR) and annual (PIR) analysis reports, as well as mid-term and final evaluations. The responsibilities for implementation and compliance with the M&E consider active participation by the Tripartite Committee (TPC), to indicate the type of instruments to be presented to that entity.

The mandatory instruments of the M&E Plan are the Project Initiation Report (PRI), Project Annual Report (PRA), Quarterly Progress Reports, Thematic Reports, Project Final Report and Project Publications; and field visits by UNDP for M&E All of these instruments-actions are described in scope and contribution to project management.

In summary, the PRODOC M&E Plan complies with the indications of the GEF Final Evaluation guide. However, it shows weaknesses in controlling progress to results.

The monitoring and evaluation of the project was coordinated between the DNP, CP, and CS, in close relationship with the UNDP National Office and with the assistance of the ATR-UNDP GEF. One important change from PRODOC was that the central role it gave to the CTP was transferred to the CS during execution.

In addition, it should be noted that M&E activities were executed by the project coordinator with the support of two other people. The M&E component was highlighted at the initial workshop. However, there is no record of it being discussed in detail at that time. This workshop was devoted to a presentation of the framework of the project "Sustainable Mediterranean Communities", to present the Annual Operational Plan 2015 and to develop an exercise concerning the sustainability

of joint management processes and the generation of environmental, social and economic benefits in the territories. However, it did not address the following aspects of PRODOC: the UNDP-GEF reporting methodology, M&E requirements, and the instruments associated with M&E.

The M&E mechanisms were adequate and effective in the administrative and financial monitoring of the project. They complied with key M&E reports in a satisfactory manner. However, a start-up workshop more oriented towards project review and strategic planning would have been more desirable for faster and more effective adaptation management, without having to wait until EMT and SR. Similarly, no relevant M&E management is observed in terms of a project exit or a closure strategy. In this context, the EMT report and the justification for extension (Substantive Review, 2017) are the documents that show the greatest effectiveness and contribution toward the adaptive management of the project and progress towards results.

Another monitoring and evaluation mechanism was the participation of UNDP country office staff and a follow-up visit in 2016. It is also important to point out the guidance of the TRA and the UNDP country office in technical and administrative aspects, transfer of experiences and in monitoring and evaluation. This provided recommendations to safeguard the achievement of products and results, the rescuing of lessons learned and recommendations that favor future initiatives.

3.2.6. Coordination of implementation and execution (*) of UNDP and partner for implementation and operational matters

UNDP actively contributed to the design stage of the project, providing elements to obtain significant results, both in the generation of global benefits, as well as in refining the FPA and collecting the experience of the PPS-CHILE. Similarly, it provided guidance and elements for the development of the project proposal and management for approval by the GEF. In the same vein, the interviews show the work UNDP has done in the past in implementing the PPS-CHILE. This allowed to have a deep reflection for the elaboration of the project and to "open doors" with local stakeholders who knew such experience.

The role of the MMA in the implementation of the project was affected by three situations. The first was to define the unit in charge of the project, which was taken over by EDUPAC. This situation is surprising, given the project profile, and has been expressed in several interviews. In addition, the levels of coordination between this division and the Natural Resources and Biodiversity division were not as close as they should have been. This explains, in part, the difficulties in managing the project, as well as weaknesses in the implementation of those aspects related to biodiversity and carbon. A second situation involves the successive change of the division heads of EduPAC. This situation generated delays for the management unit of the project, since they had to restart their relationship with these leaders at every opportunity. This also led to a momentary halt in the continuity of the project. In the end, the Ministry was not able to gain sufficient support for the project from all of the Regional Secretariats. Although there are cases in which the work of the Regional Secretariats was at a high level, most of the situations were far from it and most of the times the role of these were to satisfy protocol. In a project such as this, which requires great territorial deployment and great institutional articulation, this fact was a major impediment. On another note, the MMA played a major role in advancing the agreement with INDAP, in which the Under-Secretariat played a very important role. Similarly, the Ministry's coordination with the National Committee for Ecological Restoration and the integration of the Program for Environmental and Social Recovery (PRAS) are noteworthy.

3.3. Project results

3.3.1. Overall results (achievement of objectives) (*)

The results presented in this section have already assimilated the goals adjusted by the SR, which can be seen in Table 17 below:

| | Physical goals of the project | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Result | PRODOC Goal | SR Goal | Expected adjustment at the end of the project | Achievement according to CMS | Effective achievement | |
| Project objective | 1.2 M ha | 1.2 M ha | 650,000 ha | 840,000 | | |
| 1 | 700,000 | 700,000+32,000 | 326,000 | 352,700 | | |
| 2 | five 200- hectare demonstrat ion plots | five 200-hectare demonstration plots | no change in the number of plots | a 42-hectare plot | a 42-hectare plot | |
| 29,200 tCO2e0 | 29,200 tCO2eq | 29,200 tCO2eq | under study | 1,404 tCO2eq | 462 tCO2eq* | |
| | sustainable manageme nt additional 140,000 ha of productive land | 140,000 ha of agricultural land are under land management plans | 65,000 ha | 128,700 | | |
| 3 | 10,000 hectares of degraded agricultural land rehabilitate d | 10,000 ha of degraded agricultural land under planning and land management for agro-ecological production | 190 | 678+20 ha | | |

Table 17.: Summary of physical achievements of the project.

* Estimated by the evaluators based on the standards provided in the PRI 2019, for the 42 ha, which is the unit of reference.

The progress of the CMS is very limited with regard to **Result 1. Sustainable land management for biodiversity conservation**. This is due to a combination of i) the design problems mentioned in 3.1; ii) the absence of adaptive management measures relevant to the design problems mentioned in 3.1; and iii) the lack of an M&E system that could have indicated that the project activities were not relevant to biodiversity conservation, nor were they carried out in the relevant territories. Thus, the assumptions of the 352,700 ha of the 2019 PIR as progress towards the goal "... 700,000 hectares of land are under medium and long term (5 to 10 years) land management plans for conservation..." are not sustainable. The activities developed by the project are mainly agricultural. In general, these projects do not consider biodiversity³³, are dispersed in the territory and not connected to native ecosystems. Therefore, such activities are not relevant, nor projected to be for the *conservation of the various species and habitats of the Mediterranean Ecoregion*. Conversely, the types of land and property on which such activities take place are not the predominant types of land and property on those 352 thousand ha. Additionally, the activities that are qualified, or deduced, as being oriented to generate changes on the conservation of biodiversity are in general, of very reduced effect. This happens with afforestation with native species, which according to the images observed in the reports cover very small areas (measurable in m²). Furthermore, they are not adequately inserted in the environment and are not associated with restoration processes of existing native vegetation patches. Another action was to fence off areas, which was implemented in only one location and had a mixed conservation and production purpose. However, the criteria that guided them was production.

With respect to the provisions of *Result 2, on carbon capture and measurement,* this has definitely not been achieved. There is a pilot plot of 42 ha, of the five demonstration plots of 200 ha indicated in the PRODOC. In this unit, 462 tCO2e have been sequestered out of the 29,200 tCO2eq budgeted for the life of the project (5 years).

Progress on <u>Result 3, maintaining and improving the flow of forest and agro-ecosystem services,</u> *is limited.* This is due to the fact that most of the agricultural activities promoted by the project cover very small areas, and in many cases, present low additionality, since they are carried out in orchard areas, which generally do not present problems of land use sustainability. Additionally, the PGTIs, which are proposed as management and projection instruments in the indicator, did not constitute a validated, scalable, or binding management tool for the public services that work in each IET. This implies that farmers within the territory of each IET, who are not participants in the project, will not be linked to, and will not replicate the advances developed within, the framework of the CMS. Additionally, as suggested by PIR 2019³⁴, the properties where this could escalate (subject to the previous paragraph) are very small owners with a maximum of 6-7 ha. Most of the small owners have only one hectare³⁵, which reflects the fact that the area of 128,700 hectares covered by the PGTI belongs to another type of owner. In the case of the hectares of degraded soil, the PIR indicates that the established goal will not be reached.

In the case of Result 4 Community capacity development and knowledge management, Progress has clearly been very significant, and the goals have been largely achieved, which is reflected in the approaches in this report to strengthening and empowering organizations and raising awareness among users. The weaknesses are consistent with the weaknesses in the progress towards the other three results. The progress reported by the CMS is consistent with the interviews held with

³³ In this regard, it is necessary to specify that activities aimed at biodiversity conservation are those that seek to preserve native species and ecosystems, through restoration, protection or elimination of threats. In this sense, agro-biodiverse agriculture is not part of biodiversity conservation, since agro-biodiverse refers to an agriculture that is diverse in species, almost all of which are introduced.

³⁴ 2019 Project Implementation Review (PIR). GEF-PNUD

³⁵ See from PIR 2019: "However, it should be taken into account that the upscaling will be done in small rural properties (average land area of the participants of the community-led projects is 6 to 7 hectares, with the majority covering only 1 hectare or less)".

community organizations and beneficiaries. These reflected a high acceptance of the project among the communities and recognition for the transfer of new knowledge, technical support and strengthening of their management capacities. Notwithstanding the above, the continuity and escalation of this knowledge transfer and empowerment is not guaranteed. It is essential to give priority to the development of an exit strategy for the project. The management elements proposed by PRODOC show that inter-institutional coordination has been very limited. The CS has mainly been a forum for information exchange and project approval. However, it has not played a real strategic and coordinating role. An exception in this case is the work between the Development Division of INDAP and the CMS, which has led to an agreement between INDAP and the MMA. In the territories, this coordination was even more reduced, limited to specific contacts and cooperation, but without any active work or planned action by the institutions involved in the intervened territories. The interviews also did not reveal any active work on the part of the project's management unit staff in articulating the work of the EITs and the bodies that are part of the CS. With the exception of the case already mentioned of O'Higgins and the articulation with the Biofin Program in San Nicolás, the few situations in which work was done with other organizations in an active and coordinated manner were the result of unplanned situations. Although there was support from municipalities for logistical purposes, in most of the ETIs there was uncoordinated work that is not articulated with the other stakeholders. Some coordination was noted with the climate change project implemented by the SEREMI of Agriculture in the O'Higgins Region.

Finally, during the round of interviews it was possible to verify a strengthening in the sensitization of the communities that needs to be reinforced even more. The knowledge acquired was delivered mainly in terms of agricultural actions, water capture and recovery, reforestation and soil improvements. The beneficiaries highly value these activities that solve problems in their daily lives, which they positively associate with the environment in general. However, more depth is needed in key aspects of the project so that beneficiaries can make clear distinctions in biodiversity and climate change issues. The majority of beneficiaries' understanding is to associate community projects with agricultural and reforestation improvements, without relating these improvements to biodiversity protection or climate change. However, there is a slightly higher level of knowledge among the directors of the organizations interviewed and, in general terms, it has been possible to increase environmental awareness among the beneficiaries.

With respect to the landscape approach, it is a concept that has not been integrated among the community organizations involved and even less so among the beneficiaries. This situation is difficult to understand, since the document "*Didactic guide for facilitators: Land planning processes with a landscape perspective*", places special attention to this and proposes methodologies that seem to be effective for users to incorporate such a concept. It seems that there is a big leap between the landscape and the property, where the beneficiaries concentrate on the property. Conversely, institutionally this concept was not identified either. The project focused on raising awareness among CS members and beneficiaries, but there is no evidence of a policy to strengthen municipalities, advisors and other stakeholders in the territory. However, the CMS has had an important achievement in mobilizing communities around a discussion of the problems of their territory and in starting to work together, using concepts referred to as partnership, management and implementation of projects, provided by the CMS.

In summary, progress towards results was limited or very limited in three of the four results. Result 4 is the notable exception, as it corresponds to an area of great progress, in which the desired goals have been largely achieved.

Achievement of the Project's objective

From the above analysis, it is clear that the CMS is unable to generate or predict that the project's objective will be met: "To develop, demonstrate and integrate the achievement of significant environmental benefits by community organizations in the management of seriously threatened territories in the Chilean Mediterranean Ecoregion".

The work of the project in its second stage manages to identify, solidly, seriously threatened territories in the Mediterranean Ecoregion. Conversely, continuing and strengthening the progress made in its first stage, the project manages to empower community organizations based in the Ecoregion. However, it fails to develop, demonstrate and integrate the achievement of important environmental benefits (DDIBA). This last situation, which is precisely the one that should arouse the greatest concern, is based on two elements. On the one hand, considering what was proposed by the EMT, the project identifies the seriously threatened territories, thus taking a first step of adaptive management to face this barrier. However, it did not manage to project this step to the local or property level. Thus, it did not have methodologies and activities that would contribute to identify relevant and critical situations for biodiversity conservation in the ecoregion. Apparently, there was also weakness in systematically identifying areas of degraded agricultural soils. This meant that most of the activities carried out were not relevant, nor projected for the conservation of the various species and habitats of the Mediterranean Ecoregion. This limited the development and relevance of activities related to soil degradation. In addition, the project could not advance in terms of carbon capture. The second explanatory element was the lack of progress in DDIBA as indicated in the design of the project. The type, amount and location of land owned by project users made it impossible to make significant progress on DDIBA. As indicated, the users identified by PRODOC own only 25% of the Ecoregion's surface area. In addition, most of the lands they own are under agricultural use, so the possibilities of developing activities relevant to the conservation of biodiversity in the ecoregion, or carbon sequestration, were extremely limited. This structural situation, which also affects the possibilities of progressing towards outcome 3, was probably intensified by the selection of project beneficiaries. In some cases, it incorporated urban or periurban sectors, owners of very small land areas and even rural populations, who do not qualify as small farmers. However, even under very suitable user selection, and with respectable work in developing and implementing activities relevant to the conservation of the ecoregion's biodiversity and carbon sequestration, the project would not have been able to meet the targets of outcomes 1, 2 and 3. Although likely, the project would have been successful in developing and demonstrating practices in the above topics.

Therefore, the rating of the project for the achievement of environmental benefits and territorial coverage is considered as "Moderately Unsatisfactory" due to the limited achievements at that level and to their low improvement of biodiversity and ecosystem services as well as, low carbon sequestration.

3.3.2. Relevance (*)

The project is in line with the following Sustainable Development Goals³⁶

13: Climate action, through its target 13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate and natural disaster related risks in all countries;

15: Life of terrestrial ecosystems through its targets 15.2 By 2020, promote the sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests, and increase afforestation and reforestation globally; and 15.3 By 2030, combat desertification, rehabilitate degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought, and floods, and aim for a world with neutral land degradation through its indicators 15.2 By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally, through indicators 15.1.1 Forest area as a proportion of total area and 15.2.1 Progress in sustainable forest management and 15.3.1 Proportion of degraded land in relation to total area.

Likewise, the project is in line with the objectives of the GEF-5 focal areas for Biodiversity (BD-2), Climate Change Mitigation (MCC-5) and Soil Degradation (LD-1 and LD-3)³⁷. At the same time, it is in line with the goals of the UNDP³⁸ country office's 2015-2018 Country Program corresponding to the results: "National and subnational institutions have the capacity to define and implement policies, plans and strategies to conserve biodiversity, combat the effects of climate change and desertification"; "Local communities have the capacity and means to develop and implement sustainable productive activities to enhance biodiversity conservation, combat the effects of climate change and desertification"; and "Women and youth have knowledge and skills for leadership and social and political participation".

Regarding the MANUD³⁹, the project is in line with Direct Effect 7: "The State Strengthens its Capacities for Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation considering especially vulnerable groups"; and Direct Effect 8: Public Policies for Sustainable Management of natural and energy resources strengthened with the participation of civil society and affected groups".

Finally, the CMS is within the public policies resulting from the country's commitments to the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention to Combat Desertification and the Convention on Climate Change, with their instruments and amendments. The National Biodiversity Strategy and the Plan for Adaptation to Climate Change in Biodiversity (2014) deserve special attention. Conversely, the issues addressed by the project have been present in the governments' programs for the periods 2014 to 2022, highlighting the creation of the National Climate Change Plan (including mitigation measures, expansion of citizen participation in territorial and local planning, limitation of productive forest plantations on agricultural land and indigenous communities)⁴⁰. Also

³⁶ https://sdgs.un.org/

³⁷ "GEF-5 Focal Area Strategies"; 2010, pages 11, 32, 67, 68

³⁸ Country programme document for Chile (2015-2018); Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Population Fund and the United Nations Office for Project Services; 21 December 2014.

³⁹ FRAMEWORK OF ASSISTANCE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM IN CHILE 2015 - 2018; Santiago, September 2014.

⁴⁰ Chile de Todos, Michelle Bachelet's 2014-2018 Government Program.
noteworthy in this regard are the restoration and recovery of soils in the O'Higgins, Maule and Bio-Bio regions, the implementation of the Climate Change Law and the integration of climate change adaptation into the national investment system, among other measures⁴¹.

Therefore, the project is considered to be "Relevant" for all its partners.

3.3.3. Effectiveness and efficiency (*)

Effectiveness

Component 1: "Sustainable territorial management for biodiversity conservation".

As mentioned in the project progress analysis, nine IETs (eight in PRODOC) and 38 community projects were implemented. In addition, two technical reports were prepared in areas relevant to the project: "Guide for the Development of Initiatives at a Territorial Scale" (IET); and "Didactic Guide for Facilitators: Land Planning Processes with a Landscape Perspective". Both instruments are a great contribution to fill a crucial methodological gap for the development of the project.

CMS worked in seven regions of the country and involved 678 people from 38 community organizations. The projects implemented cover aspects of water collection and accumulation in dry areas, the implementation of agro-ecological production practices, soil recovery, protection of water sources, nurseries, community gardens and reforestation of native species. The IETs included participatory planning at the territorial and property level.

Although the CMS estimates the area potentially impacted by IETs at approximately 352,700 ha, the possibilities of escalation to such areas are very limited by the type of owners and land. With regard to the additional 32,000 ha through local and private schemes other than protected areas, there does not seem to be any progress, except for the fencing of a very small surface area in the Lonquimay zone.

Progress in delivering elements for the development of a new FPA 2.0 is limited. The development of the CMS indicates that the magnitude of the expectations for transfer of funds was greater than actually achieved and a longer time frame would be required to achieve this practice. Currently, the only experience of coordination of the FPA with other institutions is under the Agreement between the MMA and CONADI in force since 2011, where the FPA raised a special line of competitions exclusively for indigenous communities. However, the interviews conducted indicate that there is not much chance that the FPA can significantly change its operation and its current approach. In addition, there is a significant dispersion of funding in many small initiatives with very local impacts and with modus operandi of little involvement and little technical and administrative support to communities in project design and implementation. Similarly, since the potential impacts of the CMS are spatially broader, they cannot be considered relevant at the landscape scale.

Conversely, an agreement with INDAP is in process that could improve the complementarity of the initiatives of the MMA and INDAP. INDAP programs are expected to introduce the aspects of biodiversity protection and landscape concepts.

⁴¹ Government Program 2018-2022: Construyamos Tiempos Mejores para Chile, Sebastián Piñera Echeñique, p. 183

Therefore, the achievement of this component is considered as "*Moderately Unsatisfactory*" due to its local scope, except for in the San Nicolás Community, where the CMS intervention was complementary to what the municipality has been working on for almost 14 years in the strengthening and creation of community organizations in its territory.

<u>Component 2:</u> "Demonstration/promotion of conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through land use, land use change, forestry, and local carbon monitoring systems". Surface coverage was not achieved (unrealistic in PRODOC). At the time of the final evaluation, carbon monitoring had not been carried out, although a methodology had been developed by the Universidad Mayor for Lonquimay Norte. For Alhué, the REDD+ - CONAF project methodology was used, but apparently there was not much community involvement. The activities of the CMS have been strongly impacted by the social demonstrations and COVID-19. However, there is also an important component in the lack of a work plan and an adequate strategy for its implementation which also explains the slow development of this component and the lack of interest from stakeholders.

For all of the above reasons, the achievement for this component 2 is considered "Unsatisfactory".

Component 3: "Maintaining and improving the flow of forest and agro-ecosystem services to sustain the livelihoods of local communities". The projects implemented have been effective in alleviating some shortcomings related to the well-being of users, mainly with regard to the availability of water for irrigation and in the area of small-scale horticulture and fruit growing. However, this component and its implementation have a limited effectiveness, since they respond to only a part of the agricultural situations that exist in the IETs. The project's effectiveness in rehabilitating degraded soils appears to be low, since its actions have been less than initially expected.

Finally, it should be noted that in Pumanque, projects for the recovery and recycling of gray water were achieved, which were highly valued by the community.

Therefore, the achievement for this component can be considered as *"Moderately Unsatisfactory"*

Component 4: "Community capacity building and knowledge management". This has been the most successful component in terms of introducing the concept of community work, agro-ecological techniques, and promoting and strengthening local organizations through the incorporation of small project development and management knowledge. Progress was also made in raising the awareness about environmental issues to these organizations and beneficiaries. To achieve this result, the CMS made numerous field visits, organized a series of workshops to raise awareness, and organized and trained community organizations, reaching a total of 678 beneficiaries and 77 organizations.

The background obtained indicates that the project improved the project's project management capacities in the communities. However, not enough to become independent of external support, so many communities are waiting for project proposals from various government or international agencies. Therefore, the assumption that they would be able to develop their own proposals was overestimated.

The systematization of territorial experiences, as well as the networking practices of community organizations for peer-to-peer exchange are still pending. Finally, in the absence of an exit and

continuity approach by the CMS, it is unlikely that scaling up and dissemination will take place spontaneously in the immediate future.

For the reasons described above, the achievement of this component is considered <u>"Satisfactory".</u>

Efficiency

The implementation of the CMS has two clearly defined stages: 2015-2017 and 2017-2020. The first corresponds to the installation of the CMS in the MMA, in the associated public services and in the territories that had been previously selected during the making of the project. The implementation of activities was slow at this stage, mainly due to the lack of understanding of the project by the implementing team. In addition, there was a lack of a strategy developed to address the various dimensions of the MMA - which is itself a complex project with design deficiencies - and disagreements between UNDP and the project's coordination. The above factors resulted in three IETs with only seven projects in different stages of implementation after almost 30 months of implementation. During this stage there was a follow-up visit by UNDP, where reference was made to the lack of planning and strategy that the project had followed. Looking back, and as a result of the interviews and revised documentation, the evaluators concluded that the project management did not have an adequate approach to implement the project and that the recommendations of the follow-up visit were not followed. The MTR makes virtually the same recommendations.

The second phase 2017-2020 starts with a delayed project and an urgent need to implement local projects, develop methodologies for the selection of territories and improve the planning of project activities. However, it is observed that key elements to improve effectiveness and efficiency, such as the elaboration of implementation and exit strategies of the project are still absent.

This need to implement the project quickly had consequences on the quality of the products and their scope. Interviewees are clear in identifying the two stages, one excessively slow, but delivering more elements on landscape, biodiversity, discussion and community strengthening, but with a very small team that is weak in the skills needed to plan and implement. The second stage is appreciated by the interviewees as consisting of a compact team with greater implementation capacities, but where part of the participatory component and conceptual depth of the issues addressed was lost.

The net result of both phases, in terms of efficiency, is that GEF project resources have not yet been disbursed. There is still a balance of approximately US\$ 400,000 four months after the project's operational closing. However, key activities are still pending, such as the systematization of territorial experiences, some training workshops for communities, carbon monitoring, and the development of a project exit strategy, which should definitely be discussed and validated by key stakeholders. Finally, according to the project team, as of August 2020, 23 projects (61% of the total) were pending closure and four were under implementation (11%).⁴².

Considering the above reasons, and considering that part of the disbursement situation was affected by the social demonstrations and by the pandemic, <u>the efficiency of the project is considered</u> <u>"moderately satisfactory"</u>.

⁴² SUMMARY TABLE OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS WITH CMS GEF PROJECT SUBSIDIES (as of 13.08.2020)

3.3.4. National involvement

CMS is located in the MMA's Division of Citizen Participation and Environmental Education. The implementation team has installed some instances of coordination and cooperation with the Division of NR and Biodiversity. In this regard, the draft agreement between the MMA and INDAP has installed a commission to discuss the issues and activities that could be included in this institutional agreement.

With regard to the FPA - which is in the same division as the CMS - it has launched a couple of special competitions and approved a dozen small projects to respond to the concerns of the CMS project. However, it has not been possible to change the approach towards the communities, nor the way this fund operates. Therefore, more influence is needed at high levels of the MMA to be able to institutionalize a different way of conceiving this fund.

The articulation at national level has been centered in the CS, an instance in which about eight public services participate. However, this committee did not constitute a real coordination among the participating entities, but rather was an information and approval space for the IET and their projects. Conversely, the evaluators found little evidence of a systematic coordination effort with other public sector stakeholders. This interaction is limited only to specific co-operations and defined mainly by the interest shown by the officials participating in the territories intervened by the project. However, it was detected that INDAP sent an instruction to its regional directorates to collaborate with the CMS. Nevertheless, no resources or clear specifications were assigned for this purpose, so cooperation was contingent on the time available and the interest of the official involved. An important point that should be highlighted is that the officials of the services interviewed, who are part of the CS, highly value the concept of community work and territorial planning to design support initiatives. However, a more systematic effort will still be needed to train officials and high-level management in order to achieve a significant change in the way institutions operate, including inter-institutional cooperation.

The community organizations were the ones that most took ownership of the CMS activities, as it showed them that projects could be carried out with a collective sense that would benefit all the members of the community. Importantly, these communities now feel more involved and better equipped technically to manage future projects. Although most of them still have a high dependence on external initiatives such as those offered by INDAP and Prodesal. another important achievement is that community organizations have internalized concepts of the environment, sustainable agricultural practices, and territorial planning, but concepts such as landscape, biodiversity, and climate change still need significant work.

Most municipalities were involved in the activities, and there was agreement that the more involvement, the more successful and sustainable the IET experience would be. The municipalities participated mainly in the meetings with the organizations and provided logistical support to attend meetings (transportation, provision of meeting rooms and schools for community projects).

3.3.5. Integration

The CMS achieved a good integration with the Municipality of San Nicolás (Ñuble). The efforts made by that municipality were complemented to achieve a sustainable agricultural activity in its territory. The project carried out an initiative to capture and store rainwater. There was also a good integration with the APL, where the CMS provided the guide of good agricultural practices that would serve as a basis for the standard of negotiation of the APL between the municipality and the ASCC.

Conversely, the agreement between the MMA and INDAP reveals a willingness to move forward together in the development of agricultural communities and sustainable development in rural areas. The agreement stipulates mechanisms for collaboration, but does not involve the comanagement of financial resources. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that a working group has been set up to promote coordination between public institutions and their programs.

The CMS also carried out some cooperation activities with the climate change project of the SEREMI of Agriculture of the O'Higgins region, which provided soil-moving machinery for the implementation of terraces at the IET in Pumanque-Lolol.

3.3.6. Sustainability (*)

The sustainability of the project results will be looked at as a whole, without analyzing them by component, due to the close interdependence they have with each other.

Financial: The sustainability of project results presents a high financial risk, since their maintenance depends on the enormous flow of resources that the GEF has channeled through the EIF, which will not be sustained after the project's completion. A large part of the CMS activities is not part of the MMA's scope of action, and therefore do not fit into its budget. There would be no replacement financial sources. The CMS has high expectations of the MMA-INDAP agreement. So far, a working group between both institutions has been set up to agree on the activities that could be carried out under the agreement. However, the implementation of the agreement will depend on the willingness of both entities to make the agreement operational. The agreement with INDAP is of a collaborative nature and does not consider the mobilization of financial resources.

There are some situations, such as those of San Nicolás and Alhué, where there will be some financial continuity, but this is not ordered according to the results of the project, but with respect to the orientations of the municipality and CONAF. It is likely that, with the support of Prodesal and PDTI, some of the activities and orientations promoted by the CMS will be maintained in certain locations. Similarly, it is likely that some CMS activities based on the collective action of users, such as nurseries and community gardens, will be sustained over time. The same may be true for certain individual actions such as gardens and water harvesting and efficiency activities. Thus, the sustainability of project results in this outcome area is somewhat unlikely (a considerable risk that key results will not continue after project closure, although some results and activities should continue).

Socio-economic: The recent social and political changes in the country favor addressing the issues promoted by the CMS. However, these same changes have generated social demands that will restrict the possibility of resources being available for the lines promoted by the project. This situation is exacerbated by the social and economic impact of the pandemic. Similarly, the risks of social disruption remain high and it is highly likely that the country could be severely slowed down

as a result. These factors contribute to socio-political risks that make the sustainability of project results in this area unlikely.

Conversely, the project has found a rural / social scenario that is highly sensitive to the associative, territorial, conservation, and local empowerment issues that the CMS promotes. This, together with a growing empowerment, participation and female leadership, contributes to diminish the socio-political risk, which leads to the sustainability of the project's results in this area.

Finally, it is not likely that the project, its objectives and results have been appropriated by the participating institutions, so the sustainability of the results are improbable.

Institutional and governmental: The project aims at a new governance that articulates the existing institutional framework. In this sense, the institutional and governmental sustainability of its results depends on the progress made in generating and consolidating such governance. Although the APL between the municipality of San Nicolás and the ASCC is a relevant case of strengthening governance and institutionality, in general the model promoted has not been established (see figure 3). Therefore, the sustainability of the results from this prospect is unlikely.

Environmental: The project aims, among other things, to improve the resilience of the intervened territories. The main factor that can affect such resilience is climate change, its major expressions being water scarcity and forest fires. The project paid special attention to the issue of water, particularly in alternatives for irrigating vegetable gardens and fruit trees around the houses. Additionally, reforestation activities were carried out which can have an impact on regulating and improving water flows, as well as on erosion processes. All of this reduces the probability that ongoing climate change processes will affect the sustainability of the project's progress. However, accelerations in the climate change process that lead to higher temperatures and a faster decrease in precipitation could lead to situations in which the sustainability of the results is somewhat probable.

3.3.7. Impact

As indicated in previous sections, the project has made very limited progress towards DDIBA in seriously threatened territories in the Mediterranean ecoregion of Chile, so its development will have very little impact on these issues. Thus, for the reasons mentioned above, the impact on improving the conservation status of various species and habitats of forests in the Mediterranean Ecoregion, which is what the project seeks in biodiversity, is estimated to be very low. This situation is not related to the short time elapsed, but to design problems, the type of actions developed by the project, and the scarce territorial projection of them. Similarly, the impact on carbon sequestration is also very limited. Finally, actions on soil degradation and recovery have been a little more effective in those locations where they were carried out. However, these actions have always had limited impact. The project activities did contribute, from a food and welfare improvement point of view, to the populations involved. The greatest impact of the CMS was the strengthening of the capacities of local organizations and also of the technical agents that advise them. There was also an improvement in the management capacities of these organizations to devise, plan and implement small community projects. However, there is still an important gap regarding selfmanagement, since some of them still expect to channel initiatives from external organizations to the detriment of their own initiatives.

Conversely, there is a broad consensus among these organizations that the project brought back the notion of community and teamwork to achieve improvements that benefit all community members who have been disconnected for decades and running individual projects for their own benefit. The implementation and maintenance of gardens and nurseries managed jointly by the organizations will be a great challenge and an opportunity for these communities to keep in touch and generate other activities derived from the CMS.

With regard to the change in the way of working and action of the public services present in the territories, effects were noted at the level of the officials directly involved, but there is no evidence that they have managed to institutionally influence the public agencies. For now, the Prodesal and PDTIs would be the most likely to make progress in this regard, since there is an institutional policy of implementing community projects.

In summary, the impact probability of the project on the sustainable management of territories for biodiversity conservation; the conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks; and the maintenance and improvement of forest and agro-ecosystem service flows is estimated as a minimum. However, the impact of the CMS on community capacity building can be qualified as considerable.

4. Cross-cutting Aspects

4.1. Relationship with the FPA and PPS-CHILE

For the purposes of this section and to avoid confusion, the term "PPS-Chile" identifies the "Small Grants Program" executed by the UNDP office in Chile, while "SGP" is the global program implemented by UNDP worldwide.

The analysis presented below seeks to provide background information that allows determining the achievements and weaknesses of the instruments used in the project to support rural populations and territories in the pursuit to achieve global environmental benefits, while generating local socioeconomic and environmental benefits, considering the integration of the gender and indigenous peoples perspective. Correspondingly, it is desired to draw conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned regarding the instruments and practices used to support the territorial communities, which can serve both for the regular operation of the PPS, and for the modalities that are available to be used by the graduate countries.

The CMS project coincides with key elements of COMDEKS regarding participatory community planning of the territory at the landscape scale, establishment of territorial governance mechanisms, communities of practice, adaptive management, extraction of lessons learned and scalability.⁴³ However, there are some important differences in both models: while COMDEKS is community-focused and funded by the SGP (which is funded by the GEF) and implemented by UNDP globally, the CMS project also includes the existing private sector in the territory and is financed through project funds. Another important difference between COMDEKS and CMS projects is that the first one uses a set of 20 resilience indicators (qualitative and quantitative) that include social and environmental aspects. It should be noted they are measured at the beginning and end of the project and whose values are discussed and determined by the communities⁴⁴. It should be noted that the CMS did not consider using the COMDEKS indicators, since these were developed in parallel with the execution of the CMS and there was no obligation to apply them. Therefore, a comparative analysis is presented between the methodologies and results achieved by the PPS-Chile, FPA and the CMS project, with regard to:

4.1.1 Zoning and resource targeting..

- a. PPS -Chile. This is one of the issues that the PPS-Chile identified as relevant if modified, however, it did not translate it operationally. The PPS-Chile's reflection on this issue was related, mainly, to the fact that the magnitude of resources available was very limited, which made it impossible to work throughout the country, making it necessary to focus on territorial actions to achieve greater impacts;
- **b. FPA.** The FPA is not making substantive progress in this area, although it has made efforts to convene competitions focused on the issues to be addressed, this being the main course of advance, rather than the territorial approach advocated by the PPS;

⁴³ <u>https://comdeksproject.com/</u>

⁴⁴ For more information see Chapter 1 of "Assessing Landscape Resilience: Best Practices and Lessons Learned from COMDEKS Program"; United Nations Development Program, Bureau for Policy and Program Support, 2018.

c. **CMS:** The CMS includes, as one of its central design criteria, the territorial focus of projects. The project document considers that "A proactive effort to restore biodiversity and ecosystem functions at scale in degraded territories is critical to achieving... (the goals of)... conserving biodiversity and optimizing ecosystem services for sustainability, productivity and resilience to climate change through productive territory"^[1]. This is reflected in the fact that it considers that "... The long-term solution for the degradation of the ecosystem and the loss of global environmental values in the Mediterranean Ecoregion lies in the organized communities acting in a concerted manner in the identification and implementation of appropriate technical innovations...... for the projects they control, in individual territories where social, economic and biophysical synergies can be generated, both locally and *globally*^{"[2]}. In other words, it suggests that in order to achieve local and global environmental benefits, it is necessary to consider the aggregate territorial perspective, which allows for identifying the relevant spaces to generate benefits, according to the type of natural asset to be protected / recovered. Clearly, this approach is a response to the weaknesses shown by the PPS-Chile and the FPA, as well as by the regular rural development intervention implemented up to that moment, to generate conservation and protection benefits. The zoning and targeting of the use of resources increases the effectiveness and efficiency in the generation of environmental benefits, both at the local (territorial) and national levels.

The centrality of the project perspective is expressed in the effort to develop a methodology to select the intervention areas with a territorial approach. Although, after the EMT, a solid methodology was developed for the identification / selection of territories to be the basis of an IET, the project seems not to have generated a consolidated territorial intervention methodological model. Indeed, although in each of the IETs there was work with talking maps and similar methodologies for the collection of territorial information, it is unclear if this has led to: i) the identification of the relevant territorial scales for each of the environmental components that are to be maintained or recovered. The only exception observed in this regard corresponds to a case of a locality in which the pertinent work scale is determined in relation to recovering soils and capturing water. However, such method was not replicated in other areas; ii) an aggregate territorial management, where it was found that in almost all of the cases analyzed, the management was carried out at the property level; and iii) the understanding and appropriation of the territory by the beneficiaries, as indicated in Section 3 of this report.

4.1.2 Governance of the initiative at the national level and mechanisms and criteria for the selection of community projects and initiatives, considering a gender perspective.

a. **PPS-Chile.** The governance of the PPS-Chile consisted of a National Advisory Council composed of people who work *ad honorem* and who correspond to representatives of NGOs, Congress, the Association of Municipalities, Universities, 3 officials from the Ministry of the Environment, including the focal point GEF, and UNDP. This instance was the one that selected the projects on the basis of two reports for each representative, where all the projects presented participated in the selection process.

The projects were supported and revisited during their development by UNDP staff, and project managers participated in at least one inception and one final workshop. One of the most highlighted characteristics of the PPS-Chile is its approach that communities are the protagonists of their projects and that, in addition, it incorporates the gender perspective;

- b. FPA. In this case, governance is that of the Ministerial structure. The selection is done in two stages; the first, pre-selection, is carried out through the Regional Preselection Committees, made up of two members of the Regional Advisory Council and those in charge of the areas of Environmental Education and Citizen Participation, and Protection of Natural Resources, with another optional body decision of the Regional Board of Directors^[3]. The shortlisted projects go to the Executive Board of Directors, who makes the final decision. Conversely, the CMS does consider the gender approach which is a criterion in the project selection process; and
- **c. CMS.** Governance at the national level is found in the Partners Committee (CS), which is chaired by the Ministry of the Environment and has the participation of public bodies and UNDP. The selection mechanism for the IETs rested in the project's executing unit, in conjunction with its national leadership and the UNDP, while the selection of projects to be financed was carried out by the CS.

4.1.3 Governance, territorial organization and management model and the role of communities, considering gender perspective.

- a. **PPS-Chile.** In this case, it is not possible to analyze the governance and management and organization model at the territorial level, since it was a mechanism that lacked territorial targeting, comprising the entire national territory, for which there was no way (nor did it make sense) to establish governance mechanisms at the level of a specific territory, since the norm was the existence of only one organization per territory. Conversely, the role of the communities was that of decision-makers, both in determining the issue to be addressed in the project they presented, as well as in its execution and administration of resources, once it was awarded.
- **b. FPA.** This case is analogous to the previous one, with the exception that decisionmaking regarding the subject of the project to be presented is limited to the lines that the MMA establishes for each contest;
- c. CMS. The Prodoc proposes a four-level governance model, as can be seen in Fig. № 7. Analyzing from the bottom up, the first is that of the existing OCs in the IET. These, together with government entities and other representatives, make up a "Platform for Territorial Management of Multiple Actors" (PGTMA) which constitutes a space for analysis, reflection and agreements on proposals and initiatives. On this basis, the OCs prepare projects that are presented to the PGTMA, to be reviewed, discussed and grouped in portfolios for presentation to a "Territorial Advisory Council of the Mediterranean Ecoregion" (CATEM), for approval and technical authorization. This instance presents the portfolios with the projects to the CS for final approval of their financing. However, as shown in Fig. No. 7, very little of such a governance model was implemented, being reduced to a simple two-level model: Central State (CS-OCs). In the operation of the project and its IETs, it is not clear if the PGTMAs have actually been established. There are some cases in which the project was assigned to a territorial

organization that may have certain characteristics in common with what the Prodoc defines as PGTMA. However, none of the aforementioned cases can be considered a PGTMA and it is impossible to imply that the CMS has succeeded in establishing a model of PGTMA. In this framework, the CMS defined and worked with IET and in the absence of a PGTMA, the units that would act as the PGTMA secretariat were formed into what we will call the IET Secretariat (SIET) (see Fig. № 7). The interviews carried out indicate that, only on a few rare occasions and in a very irregular and sporadic manner, mechanisms of territorial organization were established that grouped the OCs of each IET. The CMS includes the decision-making and resource management model by the OCs that the PPS proposed, strengthening it through a substantially greater injection of resources, for a longer term and with technical support at the level of each OCs, in addition of technical support from SIET.



Figure 7. Governance model, according to Prodoc, implemented during the execution of the CMS

4.1.4 Basis for scalability (of impact on a territorial and model scale) and influence on other initiatives and policies.

d. PPS-Chile. The organizational impact and the empowerment of the communities generated by this program is highly recognized. However, there is no history that indicates that the initiatives supported by the PPS-Chile have escalated, or generated replications in significant magnitude. It is evident that this program had a great influence on other initiatives such as the FPA itself, which largely followed the model of the PPS-Chile. Likewise, according to the information obtained, other UNDP headquarters that applied the SGP program took elements from the PPS-Chile.

- e. FPA. The evaluations of the FPA carried out indicate that it generated little or no continuity, and if they were attempted, they failed ^[4], from which it is concluded that there is no impact on scalability in the projects approved by the FPA;
- f. CMS. The impact that the CMS could have on the scalability of the initiatives is not yet known. Based on the indications of the previously cited studies, it is inferred that the continuity of the initiatives should be a condition to achieve scalability. Therefore, it is likely that the fact that CMS projects consider longer periods of operation may lead to increase the possibilities of continuity and, in this way, eventually, the scalability of the initiatives. Additionally, empowerment and training processes, carried out by the project, can facilitate continuity and, finally, scalability. However, if such an escalation occurs, it would be limited in the case of the initiatives that began in 2018, as they were developed in a shorter period and being affected by the social outbreak and the pandemic. Conversely, it is also too early to identify influence of the project on other policies and initiatives.

4.1.5 Impacts on resilience.

- **g. PPS-Chile.** There is no background information on the impact of this initiative on resilience. It seems clearly out of the question that the projects promoted by the PPS may have generated an impact on the physical resilience of the areas in which they were located. This is as a result of the limited territorial scope and the quantities / duration of the projects. A different situation may have arisen regarding the resilience of the participating OCs, given the assessment that such OCs had for the empowerment process experienced and the changes observed in it, being very similar to what was found in the CMS;
- **h. FPA.** Based on the information previously provided, from the evaluations carried out in 2006 and 2010, low or no impact on organizational resilience can be indicated. Regarding physical resilience, it is expected that the FPA will follow what is indicated for the PPS, in accordance with what is proposed in point 3.3.1.
- **CMS.** Despite what was proposed in the Prodoc, the action of the CMS has had little i. territorial scope, and that which is also not observed has been guided by criteria of spatial action relevant to the scales of the conservation and restoration processes that it sought to address. Conversely, management of the project, according to what can be deduced from the interviews, was basically carried out from farm to farm and in a sectorized way for each line of action within it. Additionally, said management according to what is deduced from the interviews and documentation of the individual projects - had as its central axis production. As a result, it is estimated that the project has had a reduced impact on the resilience of the territories with respect to the situations and threats generated by climate change, the loss of biodiversity and the loss of soil. However, it is highly probable that in most cases the impact on family resilience to food, water supply and conditions in the immediate environment of the home will be significantly increased. In the same way, it is probable that, in part of the intervened territories, in which there was no great development of organizational capacities or collective action, social and organizational resilience will increase.

4.1.6 Conclusions and additional scopes

The experiences reviewed allow us to propose the following:

- i. It is not possible to determine the relevance and impact of zoning and resource targeting, since, although it was implemented by the CMS, its impacts are contingent:
 - a. on the socioeconomic and management aspects and to other aspects of the instrumental management model, such as the governance model, management model, territorial organization and the role of the communities, which in the case of the CMS are not implemented as programmed, or with severe weaknesses in its implementation; and
 - b. biophysically, to the spatial management model of the interventions, which, as indicated, would present methodological weaknesses, to which it is added to the reduced spatial scope of the interventions, as a result of resource and temporal limitations;
- ii. The zoning and targeting of resources, in order to effectively generate benefits for the conservation and restoration of territorial heritage and improve biophysical resilience, additionally requires the identification of the relevant territorial scales for each of the natural heritage assets that are sought to be maintained or recover, in such a way as to determine the components and critical flows of such assets and order territorial intervention based on them;
- iii. The local governance model implemented both in the PPS and strengthened in the CMS, means great advances in organizational development, empowerment and development of innovations relevant to the local reality. However, it is necessary to deepen this model, by effectively advancing at a territorial level, as was proposed in the CMS, which was not fully implemented;
- iv. continuity of initiatives should be a condition for achieving scalability. So far, the national experience shows that the great challenge for the OCs that have obtained funds from the FPA is to continue developing new initiatives, a situation that does not occur. In this sense, the CMS opens a significant opportunity to know if the increase in the amounts of the projects, as well as the longer periods of operation of these, together with the greater resources placed in organizational training and empowerment, can lead to an increase in the possibilities of continuity;
- In a preliminary way, it is possible to point out that, in order to generate processes in which v. rural communities are central stakeholders in the recovery and sustainability of their territories, generating local and global environmental benefits, a different articulation is necessary to that which has been proposed in each one of the initiatives analyzed. The strategy of such initiatives has aimed to: i) modify or improve environmental instruments of limited scope, seeking, from such instruments, to modify or articulate the major instruments of rural intervention; and ii) establish heritage conservation and restoration programs with stakeholders who, being sensitive to such actions, have short-term subsistence and income generation as their first line of interest. In doing this, insufficient attention has been paid to the territorial, social, cultural, and economic magnitude of such purpose, nor to the existence of dominant stakeholders in rural action. In this framework, it seems necessary that any instrumental development that aims to address the sustainability of the natural processes of such territories, within a framework of maintaining or improving the socio-economic wellbeing of the rural population, increasing their resilience and under criteria of empowerment, organizational strengthening and gender approach, while generating territorial and global

environmental benefits, requires the development of initiatives and mechanisms to internalize such aspects in the instruments and management of the sectoral ministries linked to productive development.

4.2. Gender Issues

The project carried out a series of activities in which most of the participants were women of all ages.

The CMS carried out a very important activity that consisted of a gender-specific survey, where valuable information was collected on the living conditions of peasant and Mapuche women. The data collected provides information on family income, types of work performed, problems of domestic violence and cultural changes in the Mapuche people as a result of the entry of evangelical organizations within their territories. However, all this information did not materialize into a strategy to address specific aspects and demands of women of different ages. Within this framework, the gender approach was reduced to the participation of women in workshops and projects, but no effort was made to collect specific information on each community project.

4.3. Approach to Native Peoples

The CMS had good results in some indigenous organizations in the Araucanía Region, where translators from Spanish to Mapudungun were provided for those participants who did not understand Spanish well, so the dialogue was culturally relevant and facilitated understanding amongst the staff of the CMS and its partners within the communities. There was also a very respectable success in hiring technical support from small local consultants formed by Mapuche professionals, which strengthened these companies and the communities with which they interacted, allowing for a dialogue and a successful and fluid implementation of projects, especially in stony.

5. Conclusions, recommendations, and lessons

5.1. Conclusions

Design

The project was designed to advance, in parallel, on three highly challenging fronts: i) to modify the serious trends and patterns of ecosystem degradation observed in the Mediterranean Ecoregion of Chile, by making a proactive effort to restore biodiversity and ecosystem functions at scale in degraded territories; (ii) strengthen organized communities so that they can act in a concerted manner to identify and implement appropriate technical innovations for the generation of environmental and global benefits using investment resources, through projects, in specific territories generating social, economic and biophysical synergies; and (iii) develop a new model of sustainable rural development, based on the coordination of the institutional framework, which provides a basis for faster transfer and better practices. It is clear that addressing the three fronts mentioned above meant developing a complex project, with several assumptions that were not met and with very ambitious proposals for mechanisms and demanding goals. All of these design factors were very relevant in regards to the weak results achieved.

Although the execution weaknesses cannot be ignored, the project design explains an important part of the limitations in the project's progress towards its results. On the one hand, the project focuses on the small farmer sectors, which have land that, in general, presents high levels of transformation. For the same reason, they are mostly devoid of ecosystem assets and of habitats in the ecoregion to be protected, or restored. This generated difficulty in designing activities pertinent to the project's objective and, therefore, the project was unable to develop experiences scalable to the ecoregion. This situation was intensified by the fact that small landowners own only 25% of the ecoregional surface, which obviously meant a new limitation to scalability. On the other hand, although less relevant, given the barriers to progress towards results 1, 2, and to a lesser extent 3, which generated the aforementioned design problem, the project established very ambitious indicators and goals that were impossible to meet, which caused great problems for the executing teams, because they were pressured to achieve unattainable goals in the short term, forcing them to place substantive efforts in these activities, which prevented them from reaching a set of strategic tasks, critical for the continuity and, eventually, the replicability of the results.

The aforementioned applies to the three components that propose physical intervention activities in the territory. In the case of component 4, strengthening of organizations, the project design did not generate limitations such as those indicated, which allowed for significant advances.

However, from the design point of view, it is noteworthy that this result did not have an associated budget, which would have avoided problems of how to deal with its execution and would have given greater transparency to the management of the project.

Execution

Although the design problems explain part of the weaknesses in the progress of the project with respect to its first three results, it cannot be ignored that the execution weaknesses deepened such problems.

Except for the criteria applied to select the IET, where the guidelines set forth by the EMT were followed ⁴⁵, the project execution failed to develop criteria for the identification of assets, and for action, pertinent to the scales of the conservation and restoration processes that were hoped to be addressed (territory, locality and property). This weakness meant that the actions carried out will not account for such assets and therefore will not generate, by aggregation, benefits for the biodiversity conservation of the macro-region, nor a global order. If methodologies and guidelines had been developed to conserve the assets mentioned, the project, for the design reasons already mentioned, would not have generated significant progress towards the goals. However, it would have developed a valuable experiential and methodological asset that could have been used to integrate the conservation of threatened biodiversity of the ecoregion in the productive activities carried out by small farmers.

Conversely, there was anxiety to execute activities as quickly as possible during the first stage, which led to serious issues in understanding the project in terms of its objectives and organization. The lack of an implementation strategy, methodologies and clear work plans involved serious delays and differences between the stakeholders.

The execution regarding result 4 presented great successes and a lot of continuity throughout the development of the project, a situation that, combined with what has been indicated regarding the design, resulted in a very significant advance in the development of methodologies to strengthen and empower the rural population in the management of self-managed development projects. This will undoubtedly be of great use for other projects and for national initiatives generated to support the rural population. However, it is necessary to indicate that the shortcomings observed in advancing towards results 1, 2 and 3 limit the possibility that such methodologies would incorporate, in a relevant way, biodiversity conservation criteria or avoided carbon capture / emission.

The final evaluation found a significant number of people who were not born in the territories, who came mainly from the cities, settled in the territories and delivered a different and innovative vision regarding local development and environmental concepts in the communities intervened by the CMS, occupying in most cases leadership positions in their communities.

M&E system

The lack of an effective M&E system also impacted project results, having important shortcomings in terms of planning activities and use of tools to measure project progress.

 $^{^{45}}$ Mid-Term Evaluation (EMT) of the GEF Project - UNDP Project N $^\circ$ 88249, page 31

This problem was more acute during the first stage of execution, so this component was limited to monitoring community initiatives. GEF tools, such as tracking tools, were not used and the evidence for determining the baseline for community projects is not present.

Achievement of Results

It should be mentioned that the implementation of the project advanced significantly after the EMT. However, the social and political conditions as of October 2019 as well as the subsequent COVID-19 pandemic seriously affected the completion of field activities such as training workshops and the closure of some community projects. Likewise, these events slowed down activities that were already delayed, such as those related to carbon monitoring. However, it is considered that these two major disturbances, although they certainly affected the progress of the project, in essence, did not alter the very limited progress in the level achieved regarding results 1, 2 and 3, or the progress in result 4. Conversely, these problems should not have significantly affected the development of the project's exit strategy and the systematization of its lessons learned. In more specific areas of the project, and reaffirming what was indicated regarding result 4, the CMS succeeded in reintroducing the concept of community work among local organizations, demonstrating that important improvements can be obtained for the group. It also strengthened the technical and managerial aspects of local organizations and advisory entities, as well as an improvement in the self-esteem of its members, demonstrating that they can plan and manage their community projects.

In terms of the physical impact of the project, the limited progress of the project led the users of the project to perceive the initiatives in which they participated in as improving production and quality of life, where there is an environmental component or "care for nature".

Inter-institutional coordination and the adoption of new approaches to FPA were limited in scope, being subordinated to the interest of the official involved. Regarding the FPA, the approach remains the same as before the project, with modest progress being made with the launch of special contests. However, the project provides important experiences in terms of criteria for territorial targeting, participatory definition of projects, empowerment and self-management of financial resources and technical support.

Differences and Similarities between CMS, FPA and PPS

The FPA and the PPS have similarities in that they both require beneficiaries to compete for financing and that both have very local impacts. However, the FPA works as a fund that defines the environmental issues to be addressed in each tender, where public officials select the projects that are finally awarded. Conversely, the PPS has a more participatory organization made up of a directory that includes public services and OSC.

The CMS differs from the other two in that it is a mechanism with a territorial and landscape planning vision, with flexible implementation and lighter administrative procedures. The CMS is more similar to the COMDEKS approach. However, it does not use all of the latter's methodologies, especially the one referring to the use of "Resilience Indicators", which are defined in a participatory way with the communities.

Gender and indigenous peoples

The project was concerned, in 2016, with generating a study on the situation of indigenous and peasant women of different ages in the intervened territories, but this valuable information did not translate into an approach strategy for the issue, nor, either, in concrete plans or activities, leaving the gender focus simply relegated to the number of women participating in the CMS.

Although there was no formal strategy, on the indigenous issue perhaps the approach was more culturally relevant, where the CMS, in a highly notable case, correctly provided cultural translators and strengthened small consulting companies of indigenous origin that in turn transferred knowledge to community organizations in very successful projects (such as the case of Predregoso, where the sustainability of the actions seems to have good probabilities).

Sustainability

Based on the information provided, the sustainability analysis of the experiences should focus mainly on: i) methodologies for territory selection that present high value ecosystem assets and that face serious conservation threats; ii) methodologies for the empowerment and strengthening of rural communities in relation to the organization and self-management of projects; and iii) methodologies for the development and management of rural support strategies based on organizations, where the State or the public agent plays a supporting role (and not administrator of resources and organizer of activities). The sustainability of such methodologies depends, to a large extent, on the existence of an exit policy or strategy and the systematization of lessons learned, which, for the moment, has not been observed, which also affects the scalability of the experience.

The scalability of the actions carried out by the CMS were very limited, because the project focused on the creation of community networks and State services, but did not explore the creation of networks beyond the type of owners benefited, having no relationship with other types of owners that could enhance these achievements or increase and promote the value chain enabled by the CMS.

This is reinforced by the fact that many community organizations participating in the CMS are willing to continue with activities similar to those developed, but there is still a perception of project abandonment and, in addition - although they are more empowered - they still need additional support to develop new initiatives. This situation is unlikely to occur in the short and medium term, as there is no continuation approach to what has been done, and in the absence of an articulated strategy with the project's partner services, which will prevent them from being able to fill the methodological and financial gap left by the CMS.

5.2. Recommendations

General

It is always essential that the Inception Workshop addresses, in depth, the review of the project, both in relation to its Results Framework, as well as in relation to the assumptions and risks, in order to make the appropriate adjustments early; In projects that have a strong operational nature and a broad area of intervention, great attention must be given to obtaining sufficient technical teams and the capacities to, on the one hand, carry out operational tasks, and on the other, develop and implement the initiatives that aim at the replicability and scalability of the intervention models developed. In this aspect, it is advisable to create networks with owners who are different from the beneficiaries, who have influence in the territories and who can strengthen the value chains and the environmental benefits to be achieved with the proposed initiatives.

The recent experience of substantive alterations in the operating modality of a country should lead to paying greater attention to the risks that are probabilistically small, but with high impact, establishing responses and project execution modalities that mitigate the impact of such changes and maximize the adaptive management to such scenarios.

In projects that require intervention, in parallel with various dimensions of reality to achieve their objective, it is necessary that the change theory that supports achieving this objective is very detailed, in order to facilitate the management of the teams in charge of the implementation, avoid misinterpretations and safeguard consistent products and results. Likewise, such projects must be designed with the participation of the relevant stakeholders in such a way as to collect their experience and vision. Conversely, its execution must be directed and executed by teams that have similar experience and vision. In the case of projects that have several concatenated levels of management, and in which the obtaining of global environmental benefits is generated by staggered aggregation of the benefits that are generated at each of these levels, it is necessary to use tracking tools, or, failing that, have a solid M&E system that pays special attention to progress towards results, both in terms of obtaining products and measuring the desired environmental and social benefits.

The design of the projects must pay close attention to the extent to which the territorial assets of the central subjects on which a project bases its actions are pertinent and sufficient so that the interventions can generate a staggered aggregation of benefits that sustains progress towards the objective and towards obtaining global environmental benefits. Project experience shows that in this case such assets were, in general, irrelevant and spatially insufficient to develop, demonstrate and integrate the achievement of global environmental benefits sought.

Specific

The Project Management and Coordination must design and implement, promptly, an exit strategy, with the purpose of safeguarding the sustainability of the progress made in result 4 and the associated methodologies developed, including those for the selection of the IET. For this, it is critical that project partners participate in the design of such a strategy, with special attention given to the Ministry of Agriculture and the municipalities involved.

The systematization of the project experience that the CMS executing team plans to execute should reflect both the achievements and failures of its execution, identifying the design factors, as well as the contextual and management factors that explain the results achieved and the learned lessons. Additionally, one should try to collect information from community projects, in terms of determining the progress of the environmental and social variables that were supposed to improve, in order to obtain a more objective view of the changes produced.

The differential and aggregate impact on the issues of self-esteem, community work and organizational development should be studied, which generated four distinctive elements of this

project in terms of criteria and methodologies on rural development: longer duration of the projects; higher financial amounts, user participation in defining the issues to be addressed in the projects; and sustained and close in proximity technical support throughout the development of the project.

The Ministry of the Environment must promote articulation with the Ministries, services and municipalities involved in the different IETs to establish mechanisms that allow responding to the interest that has been raised in different communities in order to continue advancing and supporting them in the coming years in a process that takes the "graduation" of these, allowing the communities to continue their more autonomous route.

Lessons Learned

The goals and assumptions that point to the modification of laws, as well as those that seek to reorganize heavy management areas of the State, located in Ministries other than those of the implementing agent, must be considered with caution, since they require a political effort that far exceeds the capabilities of the teams in charge of project implementation.

A great lesson from the project is that there is an incipient but strong interest amongst the rural population for nature conservation. This interest is present even in the older population, normally considered more disinterested in these issues.

Coordination tasks of public stakeholders require great power from the coordinating agent. Therefore, it is required that, as a minimum, they be in a hierarchically high and central position in the government structure. However, such a situation does not ensure that the coordinating management will be successful.

Relevant reverse migration processes (city - country) are observed that should be seriously considered in the design and execution of projects in order to incorporate such visions and their role, at times, as a catalyst or in the strengthening of changes and innovation.

Along the same lines, relevant changes are observed in the role of women in rural organizations, who display high levels of participation and frequently occupy leadership roles. The evaluation of the application level of the gender approach carried out by the projects is favored by this fact. However, it is necessary to carry out studies about such changes, so that the projects reflect them in a better way and provide elements that allow for the development of initiatives more relevant to this new reality of women including their visions and interests.

The lack of an effective M&E system impacts project results by generating significant weaknesses in measuring the progress of the project as a whole, in strategic planning of activities and, in particular, in articulation activities, as well as in those of closing.

It is necessary to pay more attention in determining the factors that affect the continuity processes of the organizations and the achievements. This step is often forgotten and the projects focus on replication and scalability, when both are situations that inevitably require the permanence and continuity of the organizations and their achievements once the project is finished. Finally, for the processes of scalability and sustainability of the achievements obtained, in cases such as this project, the inclusion of rural communities is insufficient. Other types of landowners and actors who have the capacity to sustain the value chains (in the cases of productive and social improvements), and who can also replicate the community's environmental and productive experience on a larger scale, must also participate.

6. Appendices

Appendix 1: TOR

Appendix 2: Matrix of results

Appendix 3: Evaluation questions

Appendix 4: List of reviewed documents

Appendix 5: List of interviewees

Appendix 6: Interview agenda

| N⁰ | Document | Nº | Document |
|----|--|-----|--|
| 1 | Carta cofinanciamiento MMA.pdf | 183 | Inf Financiero Final.xlsx |
| 2 | Informe Preliminar Mapeos.pdf | 184 | INFORME 2 GEF Mayo-Junio.pdf |
| 3 | 2017-PIR-PIMS4577-GEFID4939.docx | 185 | INFORME Avance 2 GEF Mayo-Junio.pdf |
| 4 | 2019-GEF-PIR-PIMS4577-GEFID4939 v23082019.docx | 186 | Informe Caracterización Socio-Económica.pdf |
| 5 | 4939-2012-04-24-091959-GEFReviewSheetGEF5.pdf | 187 | Informe Cofinanciamiento FPA a GEF V2.pdf |
| 6 | 4939-2012-05-06-223032-STAPReviewAgency.pdf | 188 | INFORME DE PLANIFICACIÓN PREDIAL CON ENFOQUE DE PAISAJE.pdf |
| 7 | 88249 - PDLA Anexos.pdf | 189 | Informe Final Acción en Comunidad.pdf |
| 8 | 88249 - PRODOC - PDLA.pdf | 190 | Informe Final CMS Pejerrey Carrizal .docx |
| 9 | Acta CDS GEF CMS 04042017 Final.pdf | 191 | Informe Final Evaluación Impacto de Iniciativas Ambientales.doc |
| 10 | Acta Comité Directivo de Socios_12112015.pdf | 192 | Informe Final FPA 2006.pdf |
| 11 | Acta Reunión CDS GEF CMS 21112016.pdf | 193 | Informe Geodata base ADTS.pdf |
| 12 | Acta_CDS_05052020_signed.pdf | 194 | Informe Tecnico Final Vega de Salas.docx |
| 13 | Acta_CDS_06122018.pdf | 195 | INFORME TERRITORIAL VEGA DE SALAS EL CULMEN LINARES.pdf |
| 14 | Acta_CDS_07032018.pdf | 196 | Informe Visita de Seguimiento Proyecto Comunidades Mediterraneas Sostenibles FINAL Abril 2016.pdf |
| 15 | Acta_CDS_21032019.pdf | 197 | Informe_Final_Análisis_Género.pdf |
| 16 | Acta_CDS_22062017_v01.pdf | 198 | Infraestructura e Inversion predial VS3_Rev Natalia.pdf |
| 17 | Acta_CDS_26072018.pdf | 199 | Inversiones prediales Pejerrey-Carrizal FINAL.xlsx |
| 18 | Acta_CDS_27072017_v01.pdf | 200 | Inversiones Prediales_al 31-08-19.xlsx |
| 19 | Acta_CDS_28012020.pdf | 201 | LEY-19300_09-MAR-1994_version_ene2020.pdf |
| 20 | Acta_CDS_30012018 v02.pdf | 202 | Ley-21202_23-ENE-2020.pdf |
| 21 | Acta_Taller_Biobío_05032018.pdf | 203 | Listado COMITES VIGENTES.pdf |
| 22 | Actas Pejerrey - Carrizal - 2° Informe.pdf | 204 | LISTADO PARTICIPANTES ADTS VIGENTES.pdf |
| 23 | Actualización PGT 2019.pdf | 205 | M&E GEF CMS 3 Niveles.pptx |
| 24 | Acuerdo_Subsidio_Puchuncaví_28032018_signed.pdf | 206 | M&E_Interno_2018_030818_Achibueno16.11.2018_Pejerrey.xlsx |
| 25 | Aenxo_A_Guía_IET.pdf | 207 | MANUAL SIRAP_DISEÑO DE PLANES INTEGRALES PREDIALES_p14.pdf |
| 26 | ALIANZAS VIGENTES.pdf | 208 | MANUD-2014-2017.pdf |
| 27 | ANALISIS_PDTI_2019.pdf | 209 | Memoria_Taller_Inicio_GEF_CMS.pdf |
| 28 | Análisis_Resultados_Biobío_06042018.xlsx | 210 | Metodo de intervención para replicas.pdf |
| 29 | Análisis_Resultados_Maule_06042018.xlsx | 211 | MICROCAPITAL COIPIN.pdf |
| 30 | Análisis_Resultados_OHiggins_06042018.xlsx | 212 | MICROCAPITAL PEÑA SANTA ROSA.pdf |
| 31 | Anexo 1. Diseño predial y prácticas agroecológicas.pdf | 213 | minuta pac 88249_presentación_CMS_jun2014.pdf |

| N⁰ | Document | N⁰ | Document |
|----|---|-----|--|
| 32 | Anexo 12_ propuesta microinversiones.xlsx | 214 | Minuta Reunión FPA - INDAP.pdf |
| 33 | Anexo 14 FODA ADTS.pdf | 215 | MMA-INDAP_09072019.pdf |
| 34 | Anexo 15 listado de alianzas.pdf | 216 | MRR_EMT_GEF_CMS_v16052017 Final.pdf |
| 35 | Anexo 18_Informe de avance información cartográfica ADTS.pdf | 217 | Ñuble-Biobío-Araucanía.docx |
| 36 | Anexo 19_Propuesta visita técnica.pdf | 218 | Operational_Guidelines_OP6.pdf |
| 37 | Anexo 3_ Autoevaluaciones de diseño predial.xlsx | 219 | Partell_POA_2020.pdf |
| 38 | Anexo 5_ Documento base para la construcción de un plan de gestión de riesgos.docx | 220 | PARTICIPANTES GEF ADTS VIGENTES.pdf |
| 39 | Anexo 5_ resumen microinversiones adts.xlsx | 221 | Participantes Proyecto Comunitario_Peña Sta Rosa.pdf |
| 40 | Anexo 6. Presentación Avance Sta Julia GEF.pptx | 222 | Participantes_OC_GEFCMS_09032020.xlsx |
| 41 | Anexo 7_ Informe donación arboles ADTS 2019.pdf | 223 | Participantes_OC_GEFCMS_14082018.xlsx |
| 42 | Anexo 8_ Informe Sostenibilidad ADTS-Trascender.pdf | 224 | Personal GEF CMS 2015-2020.xlsx |
| 43 | Anexo 9_ Informe de creación de comisiones para proyectos.pdf | 225 | PGT Curacautín y Lonquimay 2016.pdf |
| 44 | Anexo nº 5 - Presentación Geodata base - Jorge Barreda.pptx | 226 | PGT Doñihue Coltauco y Las Cabras.pdf |
| 45 | Anexo nº10 - ajuste de presupuestos a Junio de 2019.xlsx | 227 | PGT_Comunidades_03032017.pdf |
| 46 | Anexo nº11 Planes Operativos ADTS.xlsx | 228 | PGTI_ADEMA_Junio2019.pdf |
| 47 | Anexo nº2 - Encuentros comunales _ Priorizacion de areas de restauracion.pdf | 229 | PGTI_CEDESUS_Septiembre2019.pdf |
| 48 | ANEXO Nº2 - Propuestas de microinversiones en faros.xlsx | 230 | PGTI_San_Nicolás_01072019.pdf |
| 49 | Anexo nº3 Taller de priorización y portafolio.pdf | 231 | PIF_4939.pdf |
| 50 | Anexo nº4 - Presentacion inventivas locales Daniela Concha.pdf | 232 | PIR 2018.pdf |
| 51 | ANEXO Nº4 Propuestas microinversiones 14 ADTS.xlsx | 233 | PIR-2016-GEFID-PIMS4577.docx |
| 52 | ANEXO Nº5 - Ficha de Solicitud Proyecto Trascender - ADTS.pdf | 234 | PLADECO 2014-2020 ALHUE PAISAJE DE CONSERVACION.pdf |
| 53 | Anexo nº9 - acta de entrega donación de nativos.jpg | 235 | Plan de Trabajo Ajustado Rinconada Idahue.pdf |
| 54 | ANEXO_2_Altos de Ninhue.pdf | 236 | Plan Gestión de Riesgo 2019.pdf |
| 55 | ANEXO_3_Fichas de terreno.pdf | 237 | Plan Predial Camilo Morales.docx |
| 56 | Anexo_B2_Cuadernillo_Plan_Predial.pdf | 238 | Plan Predial Antonio Meza.docx |
| 57 | Anexo_IV_A_Proyecto_Red_Agroecológica v24112017.pdf | 239 | Plan Predial Beatriz Cabrera.docx |
| 58 | Anexo_IV_B_Proyecto_Reforestación_Nativa v24112017.pdf | 240 | Plan Predial Benedicta San Martín.docx |
| 59 | Anexo_IV_PdTCEDESUS.pdf | 241 | Plan Predial Benita Cabrera.docx |
| 60 | Anexo_IV_PdT_ADEMA.pdf | 242 | PLAN PREDIAL CON ENFOQUE PAISAJE 2018.pdf |

| N⁰ | Document | N₽ | Document | | | |
|----|--|-----|---|--|--|--|
| 61 | Anexo_IV_PdT_CCCSN.pdf | 243 | Plan Predial Ester Salgado.docx | | | |
| 62 | Anexo_IV_Proyecto_Humedal_12062019.pdf | 244 | Plan Predial Feliciano Venegas.docx | | | |
| 63 | Anexo_IV_Proyecto_Pejerrey_v09052017.pdf | 245 | Plan Predial Fernando Durán.docx | | | |
| 64 | Anexo_IV_Proyecto_PQ_23032018.pdf | 246 | Plan Predial Karen Aguilera.docx | | | |
| 65 | Anexo_IV_Proyecto_ValleAlegre_03012019.pdf | 247 | Plan Predial Lidia Ormeño.docx | | | |
| 66 | Anexo_IV_Proyecto_VegadeSalas_v09052017.pdf | 248 | Plan Predial Luisa Silva.docx | | | |
| 67 | Anexo1_CDS_06122018.pdf | 249 | Plan Predial Marta Sepúlveda.docx | | | |
| 68 | Anexo1_CDS_GEFCMS_05052020.pdf | 250 | Plan Predial Nancy Muñoz.docx | | | |
| 69 | Anexo1_Informe_2017_CDS_30012018.pdf | 251 | Plan Predial Oldinia San Martin.docx | | | |
| 70 | Anexo1_Resultados_IET_CDS_07032018.pdf | 252 | Plan Predial Olga Ulloa.docx | | | |
| 71 | Anexo2_AsistenciaCDS_06122018.pdf | 253 | Plan Predial OScar Leiva.docx | | | |
| 72 | Anexo2_Avances_IET_CDS_30012018.pdf | 254 | Plan Predial Ricardo Medina.docx | | | |
| 73 | Anexo2_CDS_GEFCMS_05052020.pdf | 255 | Plan Predial Rosa Rubio.docx | | | |
| 74 | Anexo2_Informe2018_PDT2019_21032019.pdf | 256 | Plan Predial Sara Merino.docx | | | |
| 75 | Anexo3_AnálisisGénero_21032019.pdf | 257 | Plan Predial Silvia Rubio.docx | | | |
| 76 | Anexo3_POA_2018_Sinergias_CDS_30012018.pdf | 258 | Plan Producción Agroecológica2.pdf | | | |
| 77 | Anexo3_POA2020_Ajustado_v04.xls | 259 | Plan_Plurianual_2017_2020.pdf | | | |
| 78 | Anexo4_Presupuesto2019.pdf | 260 | Planes Operativos ADTS.pdf | | | |
| 79 | Anexo-9-Pauta-Evaluacion-Educacion-Ambiental-1.pdf | 261 | POA_2015.xls | | | |
| 80 | AnexoB1_Guía_Plan_Predial.pdf | 262 | POA_2016_Final.xls | | | |
| 81 | Anexo-IA-FICHA-LITUECHE.pdf | 263 | PP_2017-2020_29062017.xls | | | |
| 82 | Anexo-IB-FICHA-LOLOL.pdf | 264 | PPT Comite Directivo 13.07.2015.pdf | | | |
| 83 | Anexo-IC-FICHA-MARCHIGUE.pdf | 265 | ppt lanzamiento.pdf | | | |
| 84 | Anexo-ID-FICHA-NAVIDAD.pdf | 266 | PPT TALLER 1.pptx | | | |
| 85 | Anexo-IE-FICHA-PUMANQUE.pdf | 267 | PPT_Reunion CDS_Noviembre 2015.pdf | | | |
| 86 | Anexo-II-FICHA-MAULE.pdf | 268 | Ppto_2017_Ajustado_Final.xlsx | | | |
| 87 | AnexoIV_EscuelaPumanque_16042019.pdf | 269 | Presentación CDS_31 de mayo_final.pdf | | | |
| 88 | AnexoIV_LaCabaña.pdf | 270 | ProDocChile_Mediterraneanfinal_version_for_resubmission.pdf | | | |
| 89 | AnexoIV_LaMaravilla.pdf | 271 | Productos GEF CMS.pptx | | | |
| 90 | AnexoIV_Lonquén.pdf | 272 | Productos GEF CMS.pptx | | | |
| 91 | AnexoIV_LosMontes.pdf | 273 | Programa País PNUD_2015_2018.pdf | | | |
| 92 | AnexoIV_Nerquihue.pdf | 274 | Programa País.pdf | | | |
| 93 | AnexoIV_Nilahue.pdf | 275 | programa_bachelet_2_2014-2018.pdf | | | |

| N⁰ | Document | N⁰ | Document | | | |
|-----|--|-----|--|--|--|--|
| 94 | AnexoIV_PeñaStaRosa.pdf | 276 | programa-SP-2018-2020.pdf | | | |
| 95 | AnexolV_Proyecto_Coipín.pdf | 277 | PROPUESTA APLICACIÓN GUIA DISEÑO PREDIAL.pdf | | | |
| 96 | AnexolV_Proyecto_CopiuéAlto_04122018.pdf | 278 | Propuesta de Taller Agroecológico de manejo de Vid cristobal.pdf | | | |
| 97 | AnexolV_Proyecto_LosMayos_04122018.pdf | 279 | Propuesta marco funcionamiento CDS.pdf | | | |
| 98 | AnexolV_Proyecto_Putú_04122018.pdf | 280 | Proyección POA 2020 Mensual v02.xls | | | |
| 99 | AnexolV_Proyecto_Tabunco_04122018.pdf | 281 | Proyecto 784 Alhué.pdf | | | |
| 100 | AnexoIV_Puyamávida.pdf | 282 | Proyecto Alhue Piloto de la ENCCRV_10-11-16.pdf | | | |
| 101 | AnexolV_Puyaral.pdf | 283 | Proyecto Alhue_Region Metropolitana.pdf | | | |
| 102 | AnexolV_Ranquilhue.pdf | 284 | Proyecto Cachapoal_Region OHiggins.pdf | | | |
| 103 | AnexoIV_RincónElSauce.pdf | 285 | Proyecto Idahue_BMC 06-04-2016.pdf | | | |
| 104 | AnexoIV_Vidico.pdf | 286 | Proyecto Mallín del Treile_Region Araucania.pdf | | | |
| 105 | AS ABMAM.pdf | 287 | Proyecto Manchuria_Region Araucania.pdf | | | |
| 106 | AS Adema.pdf | 288 | Proyecto Ranquil_Region Araucania.pdf | | | |
| 107 | AS ADTS.pdf | 289 | Proyecto Rincón El Sauce.pdf | | | |
| 108 | AS Alhué.pdf | 290 | Proyecto Villa Alhue.pdf | | | |
| 109 | AS Cachapoal.pdf | 291 | Proyecto_Lajuelas_Biofin_Mayo2019.pdf | | | |
| 110 | AS Carrizal.pdf | 292 | Proyecto_Lajuelas_Biofin_Mayo2019.pdf | | | |
| 111 | AS CCCSN.pdf | 293 | Proyecto_PQ1_v_28-02-2018.docx | | | |
| 112 | AS Cedesus.pdf | 294 | QPR_ABR_JUN_2015.pdf | | | |
| 113 | AS Coipue Alto.pdf | 295 | QPR_ABR_JUN_2016.pdf | | | |
| 114 | AS El Sauce.pdf | 296 | QPR_ENE_MAR_2015.pdf | | | |
| 115 | AS La Cabaña.pdf | 297 | QPR_ENE_MAR_2016.pdf | | | |
| 116 | AS Los MAyos.pdf | 298 | QPR_I_2017.pdf | | | |
| 117 | AS Nerquihue.pdf | 299 | QPR_I_2018-signed.pdf | | | |
| 118 | AS Nerquihue.pdf | 300 | QPR_I_2019-signed.pdf | | | |
| 119 | AS Nilahue.pdf | 301 | QPR_I_2020-signed.pdf | | | |
| 120 | AS Pedregoso.pdf | 302 | QPR_II_2017.pdf | | | |
| 121 | AS Pejerrey.pdf | 303 | QPR_II_2018-signed.pdf | | | |
| 122 | AS Pinos de Putú.pdf | 304 | QPR_II_2019_signed.pdf | | | |
| 123 | AS Ranquilhue.pdf | 305 | QPR_II_2020-signed.pdf | | | |
| 124 | AS Santa Julia.pdf | 306 | QPR_III_2017.pdf | | | |
| 125 | AS Tabunco.pdf | 307 | QPR_III_2018-signed.pdf | | | |
| 126 | AS Valle Alegre.pdf | 308 | QPR_III_2019-signed.pdf | | | |

| N⁰ | Document | Nº | Document | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|--|--|--|
| 127 | AS Vega de Salas.pdf | 309 | QPR_IV_2017-signed.pdf | | | |
| 128 | AS Vega de Salas.pdf | 310 | QPR_IV_2018-signed.pdf | | | |
| 129 | AWP 88249-2018.pdf | 311 | QPR_IV_2019-signed.pdf | | | |
| 130 | AWP_2019_88249_v16012019.xls | 312 | QPR_JUL_SEPT_2015.pdf | | | |
| 131 | AWP_2020_88249_v26122019-signed.pdf | 313 | QPR_JUL_SEPT_2016.pdf | | | |
| 132 | balance gestión integral_MMA_2019_dipres.pdf | 314 | QPR_OCT_DIC_2015.pdf | | | |
| 133 | Bases-SDP0072020 SDT-USACH.pdf | 315 | QPR_OCT_DIC_2016.pdf | | | |
| 134 | Bases-SDP0462016 PGTI RQF.pdf | 316 | Reporte Acuerdos Subsidios 19082020.xlsx | | | |
| 135 | Bases-SDP1952015 PGTI LC-DCLC.pdf | 317 | Reporte Acuerdos Subsidios 19082020_trabajado Jorge.xlsx | | | |
| 136 | Borrador_Informe_Cierre_IET-BMC.docx | 318 | Reporte Final EMT CMS.pdf | | | |
| 137 | Borrador_Plan_Plurianual_Junio_2016.xls | 319 | resilience-indicators-publication-web.pdf | | | |
| 138 | Capacitacion y talleres VS3_REV Natalia.pdf | 320 | Restauración del bosque nativo - ADTS - 1er informe tecnico trimestral (primera versión).pdf | | | |
| 139 | Carta Cof PNUD UE.pdf | 321 | Resumen capacitacion GEF Nucleo Nativo.pdf | | | |
| 140 | Carta cofinanciamiento CORFO final.pdf | 322 | Resumen microinversiones final.xlsx | | | |
| 141 | Carta cofinanciamiento CONAF.pdf | 323 | Resumen Proyectos.pdf | | | |
| 142 | Carta cofinanciamiento CPL.pdf | 324 | Resumen_IET_Proyectos_30062020.xlsx | | | |
| 143 | Carta cofinanciamiento FIA.pdf | 325 | Resumen_Prácticas_Agroecológicas.xlsx | | | |
| 144 | Carta cofinanciamiento FOSIS.pdf | 326 | REVISIÓN INFORME Faros.docx | | | |
| 145 | Carta cofinanciamiento INDAP.pdf | 327 | RS1_Proyecto_88249_13032019_Visado.pdf | | | |
| 146 | Carta cofinFPA a GEF final.pdf | 328 | SC-01-2020-TDR Enc Reg Araucania.pdf | | | |
| 147 | Cartografia_participativa_bosuqe_florida.pdf | 329 | SC-03-2017-TDR M&E Socioambiental.pdf | | | |
| 148 | CDR 2019 Firmado 88249.pdf | 330 | SC-28-2017 TDR Enc Reg Biobio.pdf | | | |
| 149 | CDR 2015.PDF | 331 | SC-29-2015-TDR Tecnico-Productivo.pdf | | | |
| 150 | CDR 2016 firmado.pdf | 332 | SC-29-2017 TDR Enc Reg Maule.pdf | | | |
| 151 | CDR 2017 firmado.pdf | 333 | SC-30-2015-TDR Ambito Social.pdf | | | |
| 152 | CDR 2018 firmado.pdf | 334 | SC-30-2017 TDR Enc Reg OHiggins.pdf | | | |
| 153 | CEO_Endorsement_Ltr.pdf | 335 | SC-31-2017-TDR Adm y Fin.pdf | | | |
| 154 | CNRE_GEF_CMS_06072017.pdf | 336 | SC-32-2017-TDR M&E Tecnico-Productivo.pdf | | | |
| 155 | comdeks-brochure-spreads.pdf | 337 | SC-63-2016 TDR Coordinador.pdf | | | |
| 156 | comdeks-fourth-annual-report.pdf | 338 | SC-74-2014-TDR Coordinador.pdf | | | |
| 157 | comdeks-ii-case-study-publication-web-version-final.pdf | 339 | SC-75-2014-TDR Enc Adm y Fin.pdf | | | |
| 158 | comite campesino coipin.pdf | 340 | SC-78-2019-TDR Adm y Fin.pdf | | | |

| N⁰ | Document | N⁰ | Document |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| 159 | Comité Peña Santa Rosa.pdf | 341 | sistematizacion foro.pdf |
| 160 | Comité_Socios_GEF_CMS_04042017.pdf | 342 | SISTEMATIZACIÓN TALLER EXT.pdf |
| 161 | COMITES VIGENTES.pdf | 343 | Solicitud Manifestación de Interés APL.pdf |
| 162 | compra arboles pilotos restauración.xlsx | 344 | STAP_Certification_2010_1.pdf |
| 163 | Consultorías Principales 2015-2020.xlsx | 345 | Taller Agroecológico de manejo de Vid.pdf |
| 164 | CONVENIO COLABORACIÓN MMA - INDAP.pdf | 346 | TdR_CCabeza_signed.pdf |
| 165 | CP_chile_2015-2018.pdf | 347 | TdR_D-Alvarez-signed.pdf |
| 166 | Cuadernillo PLAN PREDIAL GEF_CMS DIC 2018.pdf | 348 | TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf |
| 167 | Documento_Marco_Restauracion_Ecologica.pdf | 349 | Territorios_Organizaciones-GEFCMS.xlsx |
| 168 | ENCUESTA PRECORDILLERA 2016.xlsx | 350 | undp_cl_operaciones_marco_legal_CPAP_2015_2018.pdf |
| 169 | encuesta_adts.pdf | 351 | Valparaíso-RMS-OHiggins.docx |
| 170 | Estudio Diagnóstico pro APL San Nicolás.pdf | 352 | Valparaíso-RMS-OHiggins.docx |
| 171 | GEF_BD_Tracking_Tool_Guidelines_GEF-5.docx | 353 | verificadores 6to_faros.pdf |
| 172 | GEF_BD_Tracking_Tool-revFeb2012_0.xlsx | 354 | Vertical-Fund-COVID-Survey-April-2020-PIMS4577.docx |
| 173 | GEF-5 PROGRAMMING DOCUMENT.pdf | | |
| 174 | GEF-5_FOCAL_AREA_STRATEGIES_2012_sp.pdf | | |
| 175 | Gira Hidango.docx | | |
| 176 | Guía Plan Predial GEF_CMS DIC 2018.pdf | | |
| 177 | Guía_Evaluación_Capacidades_OCE_COÍPIN.docx | | |
| 178 | Guía_Evaluación_Capacidades_OCE_PEÑA.docx | | |
| 179 | Guía_IET_25062018.pdf | | |
| 180 | Hitos GEF CMS.pptx | | |
| 181 | implementing-comdeks-nick-remple.pdf | | |
| 182 | Inf Financiero Final.xls | | |

Appendix 7: Selection Criteria for Interviewed Actors.

Appendix 8: Analysis of Project Change Theory Results

| | Result 1 | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Impact | | Result | Comments/Assumptions | Products | Analysis | |
| tems in san s | | 1.1 Conservation of Mediterranean forest areas through Community actions, with a | Assumptions: 1. the small landowners (PP), central users of the project have Mediterranean forest (BM) in medium or good state of conservation; 2. the area of BM in the hands of DP is defined. | 1. Eighteen community-led integrated management plans for key Mediterranean landscapes. | The relationship between means and results is solid in this result, within the framework of what was also proposed in result 4. | |
| e Chil | N | | | 2. Twenty or more community forest management associations formed | However, the basic assumptions seem not to be fulfilled according to the following figures and data: i) agriculture occupies 70-75% of the surface of the Mediterranean ecoregion (EM) the figure (provided by PRODOC) seems wrong, | |
| oss of forest e systems in th vironmental s | i) reduced rate of loss of forest e anabled forest ecosystems in th logro-ecosystem environmental is represented in the ecosystem and is to be an environmental representation in the ecosystem representation in | | | Veinte o más planes de gestión forestal comunitaria para optimizar la conservación de la biodiversidad, los servicios del ecosistema y los valores productivos a lo largo del territorio | for the whole EM. However, it is plausible in the area that the project planned to intervene; ii) The original remaining vegetation (ecosystems of the MA) reaches only 15% of what it was (again the data seems erroneous, but plausible for the area to be intervened); iii) PP have 18% of the area of the EM (another data from PRODOC indicates 25%); iv) the EM is highly fragmented; and v) the participants have an average area of six to seven hectares, with most having only | |
| of los ecosy n envi | | minimum of 700,000 ha of | 3. the BM of the PP are adjacent to BM in the hands of | 4. Twenty or more community forest management plans implemented | one hectare or less. The above data show that the surface of EM in the hands of the PP is only 2.7%, which makes it illusory to think that the | |
| iced rate ed forest cosysten | | And the set of the set | 4. the products that the PP extract from the BM have consolidated and formal markets that value and use certification mechanisms | 5. Community-adapted forest monitoring techniques and guidelines developed and disseminated | project can achieve progress towards the impacts (i) and (ii), a situation that is aggravated by the fragmentation of the EM, which together with the small surface area of the PP (6-7 ha at most) makes the efforts to achieve such impacts unfeasible, beyond the period we are considering. It should also be remembered that, in general, biodiversity | |
| i) redu enable agro-e | | | | Certified production of timber and other forest products on at least 700,000 ha of land (>20 projects) | conservation requires, as PRODOC proposes, management at the landscape level, in which the combination of actions on connected lands is essential to achieve results. Such a situation, both because of the size of the PP property, the discontinuity of its ownership and the deterioration of the few mini-fragments of BM that the PP may have is of year low. | |
| anks to : red and | DSCAPES | | | 7. Microfinance mechanisms in place to increase market access by producer | probability that it is among these stakeholders. | |
| erved the ii) restor | Biodiversity of global importance preserved that the Chilean Mediterranean ecoregion; ii) restore Mediterranean ecoregion; iii) improved and proi sustraindelte manacement or LAND: sustraindelte manacement or LAND: sustraindelte manacement or LAND: a proved and proi sustraindelte manacement or LAND: a proved and proi sustraindelte manacement or LAND: a proved and proi a proved and proi between the sustraindelter a proved and proi a proved and proi between the sustraindelter a proved and proi between the sustraindelter a proved and proi between the sustraindelter a proved and proi a proved and proi between the sustraindelter a proved a proved and proi between the sustraindelter a proved a proved and proi between the sustraindelter a proved a proved and proved and proi between the sustraindelter a proved a proved a proved and proved a proved a proved a proved a proved a proved a proved a proved a proved a prove | | 1. Although it is not entirely clear, the statement is based on the assumption that there is territorial management in the detirranean Ecoregion; 2. subsidiarily, there is an assumption that there are n institutional and financial mechanisms for the corregion at the institutional and role the institutional and role conditions to improve the EM's and financial menagement in financial and institutional terms | 8. A formal Partners Committee of institutional stakeholders with clear accountability and governance mechanisms | | |
| tance prese ecoregion; ii) improvee | | | | 9.Modified instruments of the Ministry of the Environment to support the strategic objectives of global environmental protection and local sustainable development in the Mediterranean Ecoregion | The relationship of means to results is weak, firstly, because the result is ambiguous. However, the most relevant fact is that the products do not lead to territorial management in the Mediterranean Ecoregion being improved and strengthened at the institutional and financial level in the short or medium term, given that with the exception of product | |
| ity of global impor an Mediterranean nean ecoregion; i | | | | 10. At least three institutional instruments of non-MMA participating members of the Committee - financial, programmatic, and regulatory - reviewed to support the strategic objectives of environmental protection and sustainable local development in the Mediterranean Ecoregion. | 9 (1.2.2 in PRODOC), the rest of the products are located and impact exclusively during the development of the project, as they are project management instruments. Among the assumptions, it should be noted that the MMA does not have the institutional and role capacities and conditions to improve the EMs territorial management in the financial and institutional areas. The MMA is not in a position to coordinate and articulate changes in the management modality and methodologies used to support the PP sector. | |
| Biodivers. the Chilea Mediterra | | | | 11. A high-level Advisory Council (CATEM) to provide technical and strategic advice to the Committee. | | |

| Result 2 | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Impact | Result | Comments/Assumptions | Products | Analysis | |
| Biodiversity of global importance preserved thanks to : i) reduced rate of loss of forest ecosystems in the Chilean Mediterranean ecoregion; ii) restored and enabled forest ecosystems in the Chilean Mediterranean ecoregion; iii) improved and protected | 2. Demonstration and promotion of conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through land use, land use change and forestry, and local carbon monitoring systems | Comment: The statement of this result, is more similar to a product than a result. Assumptions: see assumptions 1, 2 and 3 of sub- result 1.1 | 12. Five pilot demonstrations of best practices, 200 ha each, for reducing carbon stock emissions or sequestering carbon such as forest fire suppression or prevention, reforestation, restoration, and improved land use planning and management. | As already indicated, this result, as it has weaknesses in being an actual result, constitutes a chain of means to results that discontinuous. On the other hand, assumptions 1, 2 and 3 attempt to undermine the achievement of what is sought at this point (see analysis of sub- result 1.1) | |
| Result 3 | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Impact | Result | Comments/Assumptions | Products | Analysis | | |
| Biodiversity of global importance preserved thanks to : i) reduced rate of loss of forest ecosystems in the Chilean Mediterranean ecoregion; ii) restored and enabled forest ecosystems in the Chilean Mediterranean ecoregion; iii) improved and protected agro-ecosystem environmental services | 3. Maintaining and improving the flow of forest and agro- ecosystem services to sustain the livelihoods of local communities. | Assumptions: The assumptions, regarding forest services, are the same as already indicated in sub- result 1.1 (assumptions 1,2 and 3). On the other hand, the average size of the PP plots, generates doubts about the possible levels of scaling in terms of maintaining and improving the flow of agro- ecosystem services. | 13. Sustainable Land Management practices are applied to at least 140.000 ha of productive landscape | The relationship between means to results is solid in this result, within the framework of what has been proposed, as well as in result 4. However, it shows weaknesses in terms of improving the flow of forest services (see Comments/Assumptions and analysis of sub-result 1.1.), as well as probable limitations in terms of agro- ecosystem services. | | |
| | | | 14. 10.000 ha of degraded agricultural lands are rehabilitated | | | |
| | | | 15. Micro-finance mechanisms in place to support transition from degraded lands to sustainable management | | | |

| Result 4 | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|---|---|--|
| Impact | Result | Comments/Assumptions | Products | Analysis | |
| Biodiversity of global importance preserved thanks to : i) reduced rate of loss of forest ecosystems in the Chilean Mediterranean ecoregion; ii) restored and enabled forest ecosystems in the Chilean Mediterranean ecoregion; iii) improved and protected agro-ecosystem environmental services. | Result 4. Community capacity development and knowledge management | | 16. No less than ten cross-cutting territorial Communities of Practice established 17. Ten ecoregion-wide training workshops on project development and management, the function of landscape management in achieving GEB, and the role of local communities 18. Knowledge management products from results and lessons learnt disseminated to CBOs, CSOs and others 19. Training programme on identification and tracking of indicators, and project participatory monitoring | The average ratio to results looks solid i this result | |