IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION REPORT
Region: LCR
Country: Chile
Project ID: PO58299
Grant No.: TF 023902

GEF Medium-Size Project

VALDIVIAN FOREST ZONE PROJECT: PRIVATE-PUBLIC MECHANISMS FOR BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION IN REGION TEN

June 30, 2004

IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION REPORT

CHILE

VALDIVIAN FOREST ZONE PROJECT: PRIVATE-PUBLIC MECHANISMS FOR BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION IN REGION TEN

GEF-MSP Grant No. TF 023902

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CEA	Agrarian and Environmental Research Center
CIPMA	Environmental Planning and Research Center
CODEFF	Wildlife Protection Committee
CONADI	Corporación Nacional de Desarrollo Indígena
CONAF	National Forestry Agency
CONAMA	National Environmental Commission
CORMA	Corporación Nacional de la Madera
DED	German Development Service
DPA	Demonstration Protected Area
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FDLA	*Fondo de las Américas* (Fund of the Americas)
GEF	Global Environment Facility
ha	hectare(s)
IA	Implementing Agency
ICR	Implementation and Completion Report
LCR	Latin America and the Caribbean Region
LDP	Land Development Plan
LDPC	Land Development Plans for Conservation
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MSP	medium-size project
MTE	Midterm Evaluation
NESsT	Non-Profit Enterprise and Self-Sustainability Team
PA	Protected Area
PPA	Private Protected Area
PPCh	*Corporación Parques para Chile*
PPS	Parks for Chile Corporation
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SAG	Livestock and Agricultural Service
SNASPE	National System of Public Protected Wild Areas
TA	technical assistance
TM	task manager
WB	World Bank
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION REPORT

CHILE

VALDIVIAN FOREST ZONE PROJECT: PRIVATE-PUBLIC MECHANISMS FOR BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION IN REGION X

GEF-MSP Grant No. TF 028372

CONTENTS

IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION REPORT

CHILE

I. BASIC DATA

1. Date of Completion Report:	December 30, 2003
2. Project Title:	Valdivian Forest Zone: Public-Private Mechanisms for Biodiversity Conservation in Region X
3. GEF Allocation:	US$726,670
4. Grant Recipient:	Environmental Planning and Research Center (*Centro de Investigación y Planificación del Medio Ambiente*-CIPMA)
	5.World Bank Manager/Task Team: Robert Davis, January 2002–June 2004; Robert Kirmse, September 2000–December 2001

6. Goals and Objectives:

The **project goal** was to enhance the conservation of the Valdivian temperate forests by increasing the private sector's role in expanding the coverage, territorial distribution, and ecological representation of this endangered ecosystem under protected area management.

Specific **project objectives** were to (1) promote the development of an institutional mechanism to facilitate better coordination between private and public sector actions for conserving biodiversity of the Valdivian rainforest in Region X; (2) improve the level of knowledge of the value of a private sector approach to the conservation of biodiversity among private protected area (PPA) owners, associated professionals and technicians, and the public at large in Region X; (3) achieve a commitment from three existing PPA owners to participate in a more formal, technically sound approach to conservation management in compliance with SNAPSE criteria; (4) use the pilot areas for demonstration and for support of outreach to other landowners in areas in which biodiversity levels are high ; and (5) develop a body of experience and **lessons learned** from the private sector approach to biodiversity conservation as the basis to develop one or more PPA management models that could be replicated elsewhere in the country and region.

Expected **project outcomes** were the (1) establishment of a regional entity composed of representatives from the public and private sector that would promote the development of PPAs in Region X; (2) development and implementation of a program designed to strengthen the management of existing, and promote the creation of new, PPAs located in priority Valdivian forest conservation sites within Region X; (3) conversion of three PPAs located in priority ecological sites within the region into Demonstration Protected Areas (DPAs) to promote improved management on private lands; and (4) dissemination of PPA management models and lessons learned from project activities elsewhere in Region X to other regions in Chile and beyond.

As a result of the project's Midterm Evaluation (MTE), changes were made. First, it was agreed that the originally envisioned mixed public-private sector regional entity to be established under the project (component A) would be replaced by a not-for-profit private organization. Although the "public" component would not be part of the new organization, the strategic cooperation with the public sector would be an essential part of its new design. Second, the role of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) was reoriented to become more fully involved in monitoring the project's progress and validating the resulting proposals and recommendations. Third, the promotion program (component B) was redesigned at the operational level. As a result, the implementation of nonmonetary incentives to support PPAs was transferred to the Environmental Planning and Research Center (CIPMA), changing its focus to respond better to the needs of the target groups. At the same time, the experiences of the project-supported DPAs were integrated more fully in the project's training activities. Fourth, the project's operational aspects (component D) were revised. As a result, management responsibilities were decentralized to CIPMA's headquarters in Valdivia, and the two field components—the promotion program (component B) and the DPAs (component C)—were combined under a single coordinating entity.

None of these changes affected the project's expected outcomes.

7. Financial Information:

Three disbursements totaling US$ 726,670 were made to the project. The first disbursement of US$ 295,000 was made on December 31, 2000; the second disbursement of US$ 207,674 was made on December 31, 2002; and the final disbursement of US $223,996 was made on June 30, 2003. For information on the initial and final budget allocations by component and on cofinancing and leveraged resources, see tables 1 and 2, respectively.

The project's financial reports were audited for three periods: August 2000–August 2001, September 2001–December 2002, and January 2003–December 2003. Each report was reviewed by the Bank's financial management specialist and ultimately found acceptable.

Table 1A. Initial and final budget per component *(US$)*

Components	*GEF*		*CIPMA*		*Others*		*TOTAL*	
	Planned	*Actual*	*Planned*	*Actual*	*Planned*	*Actual*	*Planned*	*Actual*
Component A	87,750	78,610					87,750	78,610
Component B	150,000	185,582				2,986	150,000	188,568
Component C	296,250	260,170			230,900	286,341	527,150	546,511
Component D	192,670	202,308	58,500	58,500			251,170	260,808
Total	**726,670**	**726,670**	**58,500**	**58,500**	**230,900**	**289,327**	**1,016,070**	**1,074,497**

Table 1B. Initial and final budget of "other" institutions *(US$)*

Institution	*Planned*	*Actual*
Comité Pro Defensa de la Fauna y Flora (CODEFF)	36,000	35,978
Fundación Senda Darwin	41,000	72,298
Fondo de las Américas (FDLA)	106,900	81,839
Universidad Austral de Chile-Facultad de Filosofía y Humanidades	10,500	10,506
Universidad Austral de Chile-Facultad de Ciencias Forestales	26,000	52,656
Corporación Nacional Forestal (CONAF)	10,500	9,300
Total	**230,900**	**262,577**
Returned by FDLA		26,750
Total	**230,900**	**289,327**

Table 2. Cofinancing and leveraged resources *(US$)*

Cofinancing (type/source)	*Others*		*Total*		*Total disbursement*	
	Proposed	*Actual*	*Proposed*	*Actual*	*Proposed*	*Actual*
Grants		226,600[a]				226,600
Loans		15,000[b]				15,000
Credits (interest earned)		7,061[c]				7,061
Donations		16,000[d]				16,000
In kind	28,000	100,000e			28,000	100,000
Volunteer work		14,000[f]				14,000
Total	**28,000**	**378,661**			**28,000**	**378,661**

Notes:

a. Consists of grants from (1) *Fundación AVINA* to support the creation of PPCh (US$110,000); (2) Rainforest Concern Foundation to purchase and manage the Namuncahue PPA (US$101,000); (3) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to support a study on appropriate incentives for the creation of PPAs (US$13,100); and (4) DED to publish 4 manuals relevant to PPAs (US$2,500).

b. Loan from CIPMA to PPCh to purchase multimedia equipment.

c. Interest from the special account.

d. Donations from the PPCh's founding members to purchase and restore the Namuncahue DPA.

e. Support from DED to cover oneprofessional's salary for 24 months.

f. Estimated value of professional voluntary support to the project from 2 part-time professionals.

II. PROJECT IMPACT ANALYSIS

1. Project Impact:

All project objectives were met and performance indicators achieved (see table 3; for greater detail, refer to section 6, Cost Effectiveness, and to appendix 1).

The goal of this project was to enhance the conservation of the Valdivian temperate forests by increasing the private sector's role in expanding the coverage, territorial distribution, and ecological representation of this endangered ecosystem under protected area management. One impact directly attributable to the project is the creation of the first three CONAF-certified PPAs in Chile, 2,394 hectares (ha) in aggregate. An additional 14 PPAs, an aggregate of approximately 9,000 ha, received project-supported assistance. While these latter PPAs have yet to be certified, they all are potential candidates and need only to meet the certification criteria outstanding. Finally, under the project, some 190 land managers involved to varying degrees in private conservation initiatives affecting an additional 35,000 ha participated in one or more capacity building, training, and/or technical assistance (TA) activities.

The project significantly strengthened the role of the PPAs in Region X. First, to conserve biodiversity, the project gave PPAs greater visibility, social value, and recognition, in part, through demonstrating how many private protected areas already existed in the region. One hundred and fifty PPAs were registered through the project, far exceeding expectations. The project also contributed to major recognition of the important role that small and medium PPAs can play in regional conservation strategies, particularly within biological connectivity objectives on a landscape level.

Furthermore, the project developed significant new planning methods, TA, and applied incentives for PPAs, providing substantive tools needed to improve the quality of conservation management in the region. Once developed and tested, these tools were made widely available to stakeholders and the public through numerous articles; contributions to books, working papers, manuals, and technical support guides; pamphlets; and press briefs.

The project also supported the creation of the first two organizations of landowners and managers of PPAs in Chile, both in Region X. The creation of these associations opened up new possibilities for the owner of a PPA to not only exchange information with fellow PPA stakeholders but also gain access to resources and information more available to organized entities.

Finally, the project institutionalized its experience and recommendations relevant to private sector conservation in Chile in two ways. First, it significantly influenced the formation of relevant regulations included in the *Reglamento de Áreas Silvestres Protegidas Privadas*, which gave official recognition and eligibility criteria to establish PPAs in Chile. Second, the project succeeded at getting special incentives for PPAs included in the government's proposed *Ley de Recuperación y Fomento del Bosque Nativo*.

Table 3. Project activities and results

Project goal in relation to national objectives	*Indicators in project brief*	*Results*
Enhance conservation of Valdivian temperate forests by increasing private sector's role in expanding the coverage, territorial distribution, and ecological representation of this endangered ecosystem under protected area management.	Increase number and management quality of PPAs within Valdivian temperate forests.	At initiation of project, there were 26 PPAs in Region X. At end of project, there were 163.
Project purpose		
Strengthen role of private sector in design, development, and management of PPAs in Region X; emphasis on Valdivian forests ecosystems.	Increase number of PPAs with management plans and official recognition in Region X.	Three PPAs in Region X were first to be officially certified in Chile.
Project outcomes (outputs)		
A. Establish a regional entity composed of representatives from public and private sectors that will promote development of private and public protected areas in Region X.	A.1. Steering Committee (SC) established with an agreed agenda and schedule for 11 meetings over 3 years. A.2. Formal creation of a public/private regional entity whose design will be approved by PSC.	A.1. Steering Committee established and 9 meetings completed over 3-year period.[1] A.2. Creation of a regional nongovernmental organization (*Corporación Parques Para Chile*) .
B. Develop and implement program to promote creation and management of protected areas on private lands located in priority ecological sites in Region X.	B.1. Training in management of PAs and biodiversity conservation for 160 landowners, extension agents, public sector, indigenous groups, and NGOs. B.2. 400 individuals/institutions informed. B.3. 30 landowners/managers of PPA assisted.	B.1. 210 beneficiaries trained. B.2. 800 institutions/individuals informed. B.3. 38 landowners/managers of PPAs assisted.
C. Three demonstration protected areas (DPAs) established and managed on private lands.[This row should be shrunk vertically]	C.1. 3 DPAs established within first 6 months of project and agreements signed by owners/ managers. C.2. Management plans of DPAs approved and certified by CONAF within first year of project.	C.1. Three DPAs established between months 3 and 6 of project including completion of their respective formal agreements with landowners. C.2.Three management plans developed, certified by CONAF, and implemented.
D. Project management and dissemination of experiences, lessons learned, and PPA management model to other regions in Chile and internationally.	D.1. Publication of document summarizing lessons learned and discussion of document at national seminar. D.2. Final evaluation completed.	D.1. Eighteen relevant publications prepared (excluding pamphlets, manuals, and press briefs) and distributed; national seminar completed. D.2. Final evaluation completed.

[1]The PSC was projected to convene a minimum of 3 working sessions per year for a total of 9 sessions, but not to exceed 11 sessions, during the project implementation period.

2. Project Sustainability:

The basic approach to ensure the sustainability of the project's achievements, future growth, and replication incorporating perspectives from the field and at the national level. These include (1)

building capacity in the entities responsible for the management of the three project-supported DPAs; (2) establishing a shared vision of the role of PPAs in the conservation of biodiversity in Region X; (3) promoting the establishment of PPA landowner and management organizations; (4) establishing a regional entity capable of continuing to promote PPA development; and (5) significantly contributing to the creation of an enabling environment for institutions through legal mechanisms, in order to promote the future development of PPAs in Chile.

Specifically, at the field level, there is significant evidence that each of the three co-executing institutions in charge of its respective DPA has developed independent programs of work resulting in non-project-supported achievements. Elements of these work programs included basic and applied research, environmental restoration, environmental education, greater conservation integration with neighboring communities, information dissemination, and outreach to other PPAs. These activities and achievements indicate that these three PPAs likely will continue to play valuable demonstration roles following project completion.

At the regional level, the project supported the development of a strategic vision of the role of PPAs in promoting the conservation of biodiversity in Region X. This vision was achieved through the project's contributions—in association with other NGOs, including WWF and the *Fundación Senda Darwin* consortium—to promote a vision of interconnectivity between conservation landscape units through the creation of a biological corridor between the coastal and Andes mountain ranges in the north of Region X. This vision was incorporated in the Regional Strategy for Biodiversity Conservation for Region X and will serve as a road map for organized PPA landowners and managers in the province of Valdivia. Participating in the Corridor also will advance their respective initiatives and the achievement of conservation objectives.

A second regional element that will promote project sustainability was the creation of a regional entity, an outgrowth of the project's institutional component (component A). The *Corporación Parques para Chile* (PPCh), is a not-for-profit, private organization whose legal enabling status is in the final stages of approval.[1] Its primary mandate will be to facilitate the conservation in perpetuity of particularly valuable natural sites by supporting the creation of well-planned and managed PPAs. When connected to one another and to other public protected areas, these PPAs will benefit sustainable local development, promote responsible citizenship regarding the protection of biodiversity, and disseminate information on their own biological, social, and cultural assets (see www.parquesparachile.cl).

The structure of the PPCh consists of (1) an assembly of members, (2) a board elected by the assembly, (3) an executive secretariat responsible for executing the NGO's mission , and (4) a scientific-technical committee to guide decisions related to new land purchases and the management of the organization's own demonstration areas. All PPCh programs, projects, studies, and services will be organized in distinct areas: development, research, land management, and services. During the first three years, the *Corporación* will operate under a strategic cooperation agreement with CIPMA. During this initial period, major funding is expected from *Fundación AVINA,* Rainforest Concern Foundation, and a number of relevant national and international donors for in-kind contributions of products and services. The PPCh initially will concentrate its work in Regions X and XI, in which more than 50 percent of all the PPAs registered in Chile are located. The organization already has taken possession of its first DPA.[2]

[1] The creation of PPCh was approved by the Ministry of Justice and the State Defense Council in January 2004.
[2] The Namuncahue property (district of Pucón) consists of 116 ha purchased with a contribution from the Rainforest Concern Foundation.

A third regional element consisted of the establishment of two PPA landowner and manager organizations in Region X. The first in the country, these organizations were created in the provinces of Valdivia (32 members) and Chiloé (32 members). Both entities were products of the project development program, which met the fundamental need to create a means for social interaction among PPA managers. Such interaction is key to gaining access to incentives and public development tools available only to organized landowner associations. These nascent organizations will play a fundamental role in the creation and coordination of future private conservation initiatives in Region X by multiplying the number of existing PPAs and supporting the definition of management standards that could serve as the basis for their future certification. Most PPAs in Region X are small and medium-sized holdings. Thus such organizations also will increase the effectiveness PPAs have in achieving conservation objectives through facilitating greater territorial interconnectivity and influence over the formulation of public policies relevant to the private sector's role in conservation efforts.

Finally, at a national level, the project has had a significant effect on shaping a new enabling institutional framework comprised of national PPA regulations, which were enacted through presidential decree in June 2003. These regulations will support existing PPAs and create new ones (see section 3 below).[3] The project's outcomes and impacts already have demonstrated its contribution to sustainability through lessons learned and recommendations that were incorporated in the new regulations with the accompanying incentives and procedures. Related to the enactment of new regulations, the project increased the institutional capacity of CONAF, the legal national entity responsible for declaring PPAs officially protected areas in Chile. This capacity growth was achieved primarily through CONAF's participation in project activities, particularly in the development and use of PPA eligibility assessment criteria and the assessment and assignment of appropriate management categories.

The future role and status of the project-supported DPAs will depend on the commitment of each private institution responsible for managing its respective area. In the case of DPA *Senda Darwin*, this role is strongly incorporated in its future work program. *Senda Darwin* likely will remain a demonstration area for project-supported PPAs in Chiloé, including those represented by the previously mentioned landowner association. In the case of the Curiñanco DPA, the DPA is incorporated in the mission of the organization; preprogrammed activities are underway and need to be completed. The situation of the San Pablo DPA is less clear given that the *Universidad Austral de Chile-Facultad de Ciencias Forestales* has yet to create an institutional unit responsible for receiving visitors to the area, a task being met informally.

The PPA organizations in Valdivia and Chiloé have demonstrated a high level of commitment and capacity. For example, *Asociación Gremial de Áreas Protegidas Privadas de Valdivia* members have organized along three priority themes—ecotourism, ecological restoration, and sustainable management—and are developing and implementing a number of relevant projects. Nevertheless, the future of these PPAs rides on their ability to obtain the resources necessary to consolidate existing working procedures and eventually to expand their range of actions and impact. In the shorter term, their future depends on strengthening their existing organizations, generating support, and continuing to incorporate key PPA stakeholders.

With respect to the creation of PPCh, its future sustainability will rest on its ability to (1) articulate and convince the public sector of the objectives and role of PPAs and (2) secure

[3] The PPA regulations incorporated approximately 90percent of the recommendations made by the project. "CIPMA Working Document 57" (Valdivia, 2004).

financing to achieve these objectives. The public sector's support has been favorable, as demonstrated in the project's high impact on modifying the existing institutional framework to accommodate PPAs in biodiversity conservation in Chile. Future PPCh financing will depend on success in marketing and the sale of specialized support services to owners interested in the creation of PPAs. Such success is indicated by a recent feasibility study.[4]

During project implementation, the impact achieved through the institutionalization of private sector approaches in biodiversity conservation both regionally and nationally were very visible and direct and not affected by implementation constraints. It is possible to project a successful future in which the PPA institutional framework evolves and matures with growing institutional legitimacy as it reaches ever more beneficiaries. Nevertheless, as outlined in the proposed *Ley de Recuperación y Fomento del Bosque Nativo*, the continued growth of private PPA initiatives must occur with limited incentives—including information and TA.

With respect to incentives, the PPA regulation makes no provision for public-sector support to prospective PPA managers. Moreover, the existing regulations arguably provide disincentives to the creation of PPAs, in particular, by requiring PPA owners seeking certification to present a System Management Plan and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The latter is due when activities or works might have substantial negative environmental impacts. In refining existing regulations, less bureaucratic language would be more stakeholder friendly.

With respect to legitimacy, the critical factor appears to be the negative image of public institutions, specifically CONAF and CONAMA, held by potential PPA landowners. These two institutions are and will remain critical to the future development of PPAs in Chile—due to the former's responsibility for supervising certified PPAs and the latter's responsibility for the regulation itself. It is probable that a number of PPA managers, especially large landowners, may resist evaluation and oversight by the institutions.

3. **Replicability:**

The approach adopted in project design to support the replication of achievements was based on the development and establishment of three mechanisms: (1) enabling policies, (2) a proper incentive system, and (3) development and dissemination of appropriate management methods and practices.

As noted above, one of the project's major achievements was to facilitate and influence the formulation of the national PPA regulations enacted on June 5, 2003, through presidential decree. Key provisions of the new regulations will facilitate the creation of new PPAs throughout the country. These provisions include (1) establishing management categories that reflect the diverse range of Chile's PPAs equivalent to public PA categories, (2) simplifying the eligibility criteria and procedures for PPA designation, and (3) requiring management plans only when extractive activities would be part of the PPA.[5]

---

[4] The Non-Profit Enterprise and Self-Sustainability Team (NESsT), an organization with expertise in developing corporations that work in the civil-society sector, indicated that prospects are favorable for PPCh to reach financial self-sustainability in three years.

[5] The development of a management plan for a hypothetical 1,000-ha PPA is estimated to cost US$7,000, a sum that is beyond the means of most of the small- and medium-sized landowners/managers in the region. Furthermore, the new regulations provide for no financial assistance to prepare the management plan. As a result, requiring management plans for strict conservation objectives in PPAs could act as a disincentive for PPA creation.

The large experiential database derived from the implementation of the project's field components proved highly useful in developing an incentive system that targets potential PPA landowners and managers interested in private "conservation efforts." One significant lesson learned derived from the project's promotion program was the importance of nonmonetary incentives to landowners and managers interested in the creation of PPAs. Personalized TA proved to be most effective in improving PPA management. Examples include demonstrating the linkages between management practices and basic biodiversity conservation concepts, ecological restoration, and land development for conservation.

As a result of project-supported, field-based activities, a number of methods and tools developed during implementation were particularly valuable to the small- and medium-sized landowners and managers. For example, the project designed and tested a proposal for Land Development Plans for Conservation (LDPCs) that combined productive land use with conservation zone objectives. The LDPCs were particularly applicable to PPAs. The methodology was applied through capacity building and personal training of interested landowners.[6] Guidance through best practices was provided to interested stakeholders through visits to DPAs, participation in training workshops with hands-on exposure, and provision of technical support guides. These interventions included trail construction; ecological restoration; ecosystem management (for example, forests and grasslands); and natural resources management (for example, apiculture and nonwood forest products).

The stakeholders most likely to replicate project achievements are the direct project beneficiaries. These consist of all types of landowners, predominately the medium- and smallholder. Replication already has been documented in non-project-supported field activities including trail construction, ecological restoration, and livestock and forest management practices. Moreover, in the last phases of the project, CIPMA received at least 10 requests for specialized support to manage PPAs not registered by the project. These PPAs ranged from 40 ha to 4,000 ha. Demand is estimated to grow based on the findings of the NESsT feasibility study. The study concluded that of the approximately 60 landowners and managers of PPAs not directly involved in the project, approximately 30 percent are interested in contracting some type of support services (TA for PPA analysis, conservation management plan preparation, preparation of ecotourism development plans).

4. Stakeholder Involvement:

Stakeholder involvement in the project occurred primarily through the (1) participation of co-executing agencies in project implementation; (2) institutional representation on the PSC; (3) beneficiaries who participated directly in the project, mainly through training and TA activities supported by the promotion program; and (4) indirect beneficiaries.

The **co-executing agencies** can be divided into two categories. The first comprises the direct executing agencies (*Fundación Senda Darwin, Universidad Austral de Chile-Facultad de Ciencias Forestales*, *Fondo de las Américas,* and CODEFF). The second category comprises those agencies that shared common goals and for which cooperative agreements were established (CONAF, *Universidad Austral de Chile-Facultad de Filosofia y Artes*, WWF, CONAMA Region X, Mapu Lahual Parks, and DED).

[6] The principle outcomes of this methodology were the definition of (1) a clear vision and objectives of the PPA and (2) conservation objectives, zoning, and management norms based on distinct types of land use that combine to contribute to the area's conservation objective.

In addition to the co-executing agencies mentioned above, institutional participation on the **Project Steering Committee** (PSC) included CONAMA (Santiago), CONAF (Valdivia and Region X, respectively), CODEFF (Valdivia), CORMA (Region X), and CONADI (Region X) the Association of Forestry Engineers for the Protection of Native Forests, Coalition for the Conservation of the Coastal Range, and Center of Agricultural and Environmental Research (CEA). Specific sessions were attended by representatives of other stakeholders including NGOs, public agencies, private entities, academicians, participants in the project's promotion program, and PPA representative .

An estimated 210 **direct beneficiaries** participated in the project, mainly through training and TA activities supported under the project's promotion program. These beneficiaries included civil servants, municipal officials, and other communities. The project had an estimated 1,150 **indirect beneficiaries**. They consisted of three groups, mainly, landowners registered in the promotion program who received support material (100), attendees of seminars and public events disseminating the project's outcomes (250), and people who received information about the project through publications and other means (800).

One key **lesson learned** involved the project's institutional arrangements. In the project's original design, the co-executing organizations and PSC were to play the leading role in the first and second levels of public involvement, respectively. Ostensibly, the PSC members were to share the responsibility of project implementation with CIPMA. However, this collaboration never occurred due to two main obstacles. First, the time and energy required to coordinate the actions of the co-executing organizations were underestimated. Second, coordinating the representatives of the four co-executing organizations forming the PSC (three of which are based in Santiago) with the technical heads in charge of implementing the relevant cooperation agreements was difficult. As a result, the roles and responsibilities of the co-executing organizations and the PSC were redefined following the MTE. The responsibilities of the PSC were reoriented to a monitoring and advisory role.

A second **lesson learned** involved the enormous demand for nonmonetary incentives offered by the project's promotion program (155 conservation initiatives in private lands). Since it was impossible to provide the offered incentives to all the potential beneficiaries, it was necessary to prioritize through targeting the promotion activities. Targeting inevitably caused frustration among nonselected landowners. Following the MTE, the project's promotion program attempted to alleviate this situation by sending supporting materials to all registered landowners.

Finally, one aspect of the project's stakeholder involvement that proved particularly weak was the failure to promote the importance of the project among the region's political authorities. This failure was due in part to the high turnover of regional *intendentes* (three during the project's execution period). A second factor was the Valdivia field office's emphasis on developing close collaborative relationships at the technical level with the regional directors of public agencies involved in project execution (for example, CONAF and CONAMA), rather than with political appointees. The Valdivia office lacked staff with the right skills for initiating and following through with high-level political dialogues in order to promote the project at this level.

5. Monitoring and Evaluation:

The project's initial approach to monitoring and evaluation (M&E) was based on following progress and outcomes related to the goals set forth in each component. CIPMA and each co-executing organization responsible for implementing activities were required to fill out monitoring forms by activity and submit them monthly to CIPMA's project coordination unit.

These forms served as the main input for drafting the monthly, semiannual, and annual reports and for the midterm and final evaluations.

In practice, this monitoring procedure never operated smoothly, mostly due to delayed activity records and progress files. Eventually, a system evolved in which co-executors focused their efforts on the preparation of the required annual reports, while the permanent registration and systematic evaluation of progress and outcomes were left to CIPMA. Added to CIPMA's technical and financial supervision of co-executed activities, these tasks added a heavy administrative burden for CIPMA. These new responsibilities impeded CIPMA's completing other essential tasks related to design, outcome analysis, recommendations, publications, outreach, and leadership of the PSC.

For the DPAs, the failure of the monitoring system was resolved successfully through monitoring guidelines developed specifically to evaluate the effectiveness of the DPAs in meeting their stated conservation objectives. This procedure was used during the project's initial phase (prior to the MTE), which made it useful in assessing the project's the impact on effective conservation by each demonstration PPA.

The MTE was conducted approximately 18 months after the initiation of project implementation and proved decisive to the timely identification of certain aspects that required adjustment. The evaluation was conducted by component (that is, the PSC, promotion program, and DPAs). Each component was assessed by a consultant who had received a detailed Terms of Reference for his or her work. The evaluation included interviews with beneficiaries, co-executors, and partner organizations; field visits; and revision of multiple support documents.

6. Cost Effectiveness:

The approach to cost effectiveness was based on a benchmark methodology. The project achieved or exceeded all of its expected outcomes on time and within budget (tables 3 and 4). Thirty-six milestones arrayed by outcome and time period are presented in table 4. Of these, 32 fully met (100 percent) initial projections, and 4 exceeded them. With respect to the latter, the project exceeded its projected outcomes in the following areas: (1) number of PPA landowners trained (131 percent); (2) number of institutions and individuals informed about all aspects of PPAs—purpose, certification aspects, incentives—(200 percent); and (3) number of PPA landowners who received TA (120 percent). The high productivity achieved in terms of publications printed and disseminated deserves special mention. This goal exceeded the benchmark by 775 percent (not counting the numerous project press releases published during the three years of its execution).

The project also achieved a number of unexpected outcomes. The most significant was its contribution to the preparation of 12 Land Development Plans for Conservation (LDPCs) and the creation of two PPA landowner associations. Regarding the LDPCs, due to landowner initiative, TA was requested and taken a step further. The result was a useful product that required a much greater level of beneficiary input and time, including producing the baseline and land use zoning and preparing maps. Similarly, given the project's emphasis on providing assistance to the individual landowner as opposed to the creation of associations, the creation of the associations also was notable. For a list of outcomes, both *expected and achieved*, see appendix 1.

Despite these achievements, three outcomes involved greater costs in terms of resources and/or time than initially envisioned. First, coordinating the promotion program and supervising and monitoring its activities during the first half of the project imposed large demands on staff time, so resources that could have been used for other purposes were diverted. Following the MTE,

these demands were resolved through the redesign of the **development** program. The project then began to execute all PPA support activities directly, eliminating the need to supervise contractors.

The second unforeseen demand on time and resources came from the higher than expected demand to certify the DPAs on behalf of CONAF and the efforts to do so. Delays were attributed primarily to problems in submitting the required management plans and the associated review and approval process. These delays were resolved by linking future disbursements associated with the execution of DPA management plans to meeting the commitments associated with acquiring their certification.

The third costly activity was delay in publication of the Park Ranger Training Manual due to the higher than expected preparation, editing, and production costs.

Table 4. Degree of compliance of expected outcomes according to goals per period

Out-comes	*Goals for months 1-6*	*Degree of progress (%)*	*Goals for months 7-12*	*Degree of progress (%)s*	*Goals for months 13-18*	*Degree of progress (%)*	*Goals for months 19-24*	*Degree of progress (%)*	*Goals for months 25-30*	*Degree of progress (%)*	*Goals for months 31 -36*	*Degree of progress (%)*
A.	Establish Consortium of Co-Executing Orgs.	100	Sessions 1–3 of PSC held with follow-up	100	Sessions 4–5 of PSC held with follow-up	100	Sessions 6–7 of PSC held with follow-up	100	Sessions 8–9 of PSC held with follow-up	100		
	Steering Committee established	100							Contribution to formulation of PPA regulations by CONAMA	100[a]	Regional organization established and financed	100[b]
B.	Park Ranger Manual published	100	Register of potential beneficiaries completed	100	Beneficiaries trained (50)	100	Beneficiaries trained (120)	100	Beneficiaries trained (160)	131-326[c]	Promotion Program Model prepared	100
	Promotion Program designed	100	Call for bids to NGOs concluded	100	Institutions/ individuals informed (100)	100	Institutions/ individuals informed (200)	100	Institutions/individuals informed (400)	200[d]	Two thematic workshops held	100
					10 PPAs technically assisted	100	20 PPAs technically assisted	100	30 PPAs technically assisted	120[e]		
C.	DPAs selected and agreements reached with landowners	100	Conservation Management Plans designed	100	Management Plans achieve stated 6-months' goals	100	Management Plans certified by CONAF	100	Management Plans achieve stated 2-year goals	100	PPA Management Model prepared	100

Out-comes	*Goals for months 1-6*	*Degree of progress (%)*	*Goals for months 7-12*	*Degree of progress (%)s*	*Goals for months 13-18*	*Degree of progress (%)*	*Goals for months 19-24*	*Degree of progress (%)*	*Goals for months 25-30*	*Degree of progress (%)*	*Goals for months 31 -36*	*Degree of progress (%)*
D.	Coordinating Unit established	100	Dissemination Strategy designed	100	2 publications with relevant outcomes	100	Midterm evaluation completed	100	2 publications with relevant outcomes	775[f]	Final assessment has been concluded and lessons disseminated in a national seminar	100
	Monitoring and Evaluation Plan designed	100										

Notes:

a. This contribution was focused on the recommendations made to the CONAMA for the preparation for the PPA regulations and conservation incentives design included in the bill for Native Forest Recovery and Forestry Development. Likewise, the project worked with CONAMA Region X to prepare the Regional Strategy for Biodiversity Conservation.

b. The organization established is the *Corporación Parques Para Chile*, whose legal personality is being processed and which has initial funding for the actions related to the implementation of a demonstration area and the development of a community ecotourism project.

c. Overall, attendees at the different training activities totaled 522, including PPA landowners, civil servants, municipal officers, members of other communities, and NGO staff. The beneficiaries who attended at least one activity totaled 210. This figure was added to an additional 100 individuals who did not attend the training activities but received supporting material– manuals and technical guides–especially prepared as part of the information access incentive included among the PPA support mechanisms of the promotion program.

d. At least 800 PPA landowners and other stakeholders have been provided with information about the project directly and through events, publications, and electronic means. Individuals and institutions who have indirectly received related information are estimated to be at least four times that figure, or 3,200.

e. A total of 25 PPA landowners attended the technical assistance workshops during the first phase of the promotion program. TA was provided to an additional 12 landowners during the second phase through the preparation of 9 Land Development Plans (LDPs) for Conservation and of 3 land development proposals for conservation. Another 2 LDPs are being prepared by CIPMA.

f. Eleven articles in magazines; 3 book chapters; 4 working documents; 6 supporting documents; 6 brochures; 34 press releases, information in 3 bulletins, and an updated Web site are part of the project's publications to date. More are expected in the next months**.**

7. Special Project Circumstances:

Two special circumstances affected project implementation. First, the Valdivian Forest Zone Project was the first in Chile to be prepared and submitted to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Council for approval. Consequently, despite the Bank's relative rapid approval of the project concept, significant delays occurred due to the need for obtaining the endorsement of CONAMA, Chile's GEF focal point and the absence of established review and approval procedures at the time of project submission. This latter difficulty delayed project start-up by approximately 16 months.

The second circumstance was the (advantageous) overlap between the project implementation period and the government's designation of the PPA concept as a priority in the country's national environmental agenda for 2002–06. In the agenda, the approval of PPA regulations was specifically identified as one of the national priorities for 2002. In recognition of the opportunity presented by this coincidence, the sixth and seventh sessions of the PSC were used to formulate the recommendations. CIPMA forwarded them to CONAMA for consideration in the formulation of PPA regulations. These sessions were attended by the CONAMA team responsible for formulating the regulations, who welcomed the project inputs. This cooperation was further demonstrated by the favorable acceptance of a project document submitted by CIPMA during a joint workshop organized by CONAMA in December 2002. The document outlined the recommendations to be considered in drafting the PPA regulations. As mentioned, almost 90 of the recommendations forwarded by CIPMA were adopted in the final draft of the regulations.

8. Institutional Capacity/Partner Assessments:

CIPMA. The administration and management of the project was split between CIPMA's headquarters in Santiago and the Valdivia project field office, which actually implemented the project. Prior to the project, CIPMA's main area of work in 20 years had been environmental public policy research and advocacy.

Adjustments were made during the course of the project to shift authority and resources to the Valdivia field office, creating an effective project unit. Key changes included promoting the Valdivia office's regional coordinator to project director with full authority for project decisions and hiring an accountant for the Valdivian office to ensure fiscal oversight of field activities. The full transition took place over the course of a year.

One of the project's strengths was the diverse skills of the project team, which consisted of a sociologist, architect, environmental biologist, natural resource economist, journalist, accountant, forester, botanist, veterinarian, tourism business specialist, and secretary. According to the Bank's two task managers (TMs), the technical implementation was fully satisfactory and the staff well qualified. At the MTE, the accountant and accounting system were evaluated by a Bank financial management specialist and also found to be fully satisfactory. According to supervisory staff, the administration and management of the project were satisfactory as well (even though the project was initiated during major change in CIPMA's executive board). Finally, the project staff were highly motivated, which contributed to their ability to overcome early institutional difficulties and find solutions to obstacles encountered.

The principal cofinancier of the project was the Foundation of the Americas, which contributed US$100,000 in cash to the development component. The foundation was key in working with CIPMA to restructure the development component at midterm. Other implementation partners included CONAF and the faculty of philosophy and humanities of the *Universidad Austral de Chile*, whose contributions were fully satisfactory. Three principal partners in the development of

the privately owned demonstration protected areas were the faculty of forestry sciences of the *Universidad Austral de Chile*, Senda-Darwin Foundation, and CODEFF, each of which owned land dedicated to one of the demonstration areas. Each of these institutions met the targets by project closure, and all of the areas were certified by CONAMA as PPAs. In several instances, CIPMA's lack of control over counterparts' contributions may have slowed the work. Despite this trade-off, working with various stakeholders inevitably increased the outreach and impact of the project.

More specifically, the co-executing organizations carried out their activities with in a highly professional manner. Their performance was supported by prior experiences in practical projects, as well as by the expertise and assistance provided by their institutions. The most relevant outcomes related to their institutional capacities were the:

- CONAF team's broad PA planning and management experience. This team was involved with CIPMA in the joint design and implementation of the certification procedure of Demonstration Protected Areas.
- Major contribution made by the faculty of forestry sciences of the *Universidad Austral de Chile* in the development of conservation models based on the sustainable management of native forest resources. The faculty have more than 21 years of practical experience in the San Pablo de Tregua DPA.
- Valuable contributions made by the faculty of philosophy and humanities of the *Universidad Austral de Chile* (1) to disseminate the project within the university community, and through local and national media and specialized publications, and (2) to provide office space, equipment, and facilities.
- Contributions of the *Fondo de las Américas* in the (1) design of the promotion program, (2) preparation and guidance of the public bid process, and (3) project's midterm assessment and subsequent redesign.
- Appropriate design and implementation of the summons for the first phase of the promotion program, in the charge of the CEA-CODEFF Consortium. The response to the promotion exceeded all expectations.
- Dedicated work of the *Fundación Senda Darwin* to implement the sustainability project for the promotion program's first phase, which originated the PPA Association of Chiloé.
- Decisive contribution made by the Mapu Lahual Association to design and apply conservation incentives with a relevant cultural focus to promote PAs in the Region X coastal range.

The main weaknesses of co-executing organizations were:

- Budgetary restrictions in hiring staff in charge of implementing DPAs. These resources, not considered in the original budget, were provided by the project.
- Time restrictions in participating in the technical coordination meetings or in the PSC sessions.
- Difficulties in linking the execution of their responsibilities to the purpose, focus, and expected outcomes of the overall project. These difficulties affected the coordination of the different components.

World Bank. Support provided by the World Bank, the project's GEF Implementing Agency (IA), was critical during the project's preparation and implementation phases. During preparation, the Bank TM played a key role in approving the project concept. In addition, the Bank TM and an FAO expert traveled to Santiago to discuss the idea with CIPMA and make relevant recommendations. Following GEF's approval of a request for preparation resources, a second visit by the Bank TM and FAO expert was decisive for full project preparation. It should be noted that both professionals participated actively with CIPMA's board and project preparation team in the discussion of the project's design and final draft. Likewise, the TM's guidance was extremely helpful in answering the multiple inquiries made by the project's external consultants and GEF reviewers.

During implementation, the TM's semiannual visits provided valuable input for monitoring project progress and for tailoring specific approaches and strategies. Additional useful inputs were the advance reports requested from CIPMA prior to each visit and the joint preparation of the supervision reports (*Aides Mémoire*). The Aides Mémoire set forth the agreements reached to address inquiries made by the World Bank and/or to overcome any implementation difficulty. The discussion with the TM following the MTE concerning the redesign of the project's components also was critical.

9. **Incremental Cost Analysis Evaluation:**

The project's initial assumptions regarding public-private investments for the promotion of PPAs remain valid. As project completion neared, no other initiatives were identified in Chile in which specific support mechanisms and actions to strengthen private biodiversity conservation efforts were available to potential PPA landowners. Nevertheless, as anticipated by the project, the private conservation movement continues to grow, an indicator of the sustainability of the phenomenon.[7]

In the national context, progress in establishing the regulatory framework for PPAs advanced much faster during the project than was anticipated during preparation. The project was able to capitalize on this momentum, providing recommendations and lessons learned during the national dialogues. However, this progress on regulations has not increased the public resources available for PPA promotion. Similarly, the future availability of incentives depends on, first, the passage of the *Ley de Recuperación y Fomento del Bosque Nativo*, which is being discussed in the Congress and includes special incentives for PPAs. Incentives also depend on the design of other

[7] This conclusion is supported by the recent major land acquisitions by private agents for biodiversity conservation. Examples from Region X include the establishment of the Huilo-Huilo Ecological Reserve in the district of Panguipulli (60,000 ha) in 2001; and the recent purchase of a tract of land in the coastal range in the district of Corral (province of Valdivia) by WWF, The Nature Conservancy, and Conservation International (60,000 ha) in November 2003.

mechanisms–such as technical assistance, which would form part of the public promotion programs for landowners–that still need to be designed and evaluated.

III. SUMMARY OF MAIN LESSONS LEARNED

Some of the major lessons learned from the design and implementation of the three-year medium-sized project (MSP) are:

- **Profile of the PPA Landowner**. Some hold the view that private conservation is an amenity that only the wealthy can afford. However, under the project's promotion component, small- and medium-sized farmers, or *campesinos*, who often are dependent on subsistence economies, dominated the landowners in the register. Campesinos totaled approximately two-thirds of the registered landowners, for whom conservation appeared to be a significant activity and one that complements productive uses.
- **Participant Motivation**. In addition to the importance of financial incentives in the creation of PPAs, an individual's sense of stewardship for the land appears to play an important role in the establishment of a PPA.
- **Role of Nonmonetary Incentives**. PPA landowners often regarded as highly valuable the nonmonetary incentives that facilitated their participation in the creation of PPAs. Discernible preferences included access to expert information about basic conservation concepts, as well as field training and TA that involved support activities on their own lands.
- **Field Presence**. The effective implementation of PPAs required the existence of a manager or stable caretaker, with a work shift that enabled him/her to execute, coordinate, or supervise field tasks and make decisions based on environmental, economic and/or organizational contexts. A key practice, therefore, is to provide landowners with the necessary support to enable sound planning and adequate monitoring and follow-up. These actions will ensure that field-based interventions accomplish their purpose: of conserving biodiversity.
- **Significance of PPAs to Biodiversity Conservation in Region X**. While some 75 PPAs in the region devote fewer than 100 ha to conservation, in aggregate, these PPAs represent a significant factor in the conservation of biodiversity through their potential to contribute to geographical interconnectivity of conservation landscapes. This connectivity assumes and requires a certain degree of social connectivity among PPA managers, and between them and other relevant stakeholders, to ensure sound land-use decisionmaking.
- **PPA Management Categories.** There is a need to consider a broad range of management categories for PPAs. These categories should differentiate conservation objectives clearly (for example, strict preservation versus sustainable extractive use of natural resources). Clear categories will reflect the diversity of existing initiatives and ensure compatibility with existing National System of Public Protected Wild Areas (SNASPE) categories. Similarly, where relevant, the planning requirements for PPAs should be differentiated according to the multiple management categories and should require management plans only for PPAs that include consumptive uses.
- **PPA Administration.** PPA decision-making systems are organizational processes consisting of family, social, or economic units; the type of unit affects the style and effectiveness of management actions. Unlike publicly protected areas, whose objectives are defined in the decree law that regulates their constitution, the will of a private owner to preserve an area is seldom explicit and lacks documented support.
- **PPA Monitoring.** To be effective, monitoring PPAs requires the design of standardized procedures based on easily verifiable field indicators. Indicators should cover the range of PPA management dimensions, which include legal, conservation management, and community arrangements.
- **Midterm Evaluation**. While the MTE was very demanding, *it proved critical to achieve the needed changes in project design and management.* The MTE was particularly relevant to gain the support of the agency that cofunded the project's promotion program.

- **Project Monitoring**. The application of a research-action approach (that is, a real-time applied research approach) was critical, first, to the timely analysis of the outcomes achieved. This approach also ensured that the redesign of the project following the MTE, as well as the formulation of policy recommendations, had a positive impact on the national institutional framework for private conservation under discussion in Chile.
- **Risk of Overcentralization of Project Management**. CIPMA's management is centralized in Santiago. During the first yearandahalf, as the MTE reflected, this centralization impeded the project's implementation. Although the financial and technical supervision of co-executed activities took place in Valdivia from the outset, centralized management restricted the power of the project coordinator to perform the necessary supervisory activities. This situation was resolved following the MTE by decentralizing project management responsibilities to Valdivia.
- **Interinstitutional Arrangements**. The formula adopted to co-execute certain project components with partner institutions had both advantages and disadvantages. Some main advantages related to gaining access to the expertise of several institutions, including the inputs provided by the professionals who were on the co-executing teams. The formula's disadvantages related to the difficulties in establishing effective cooperation with institutions that considered the resources provided only as an additional source of funding and that failed to position themselves in the much broader context of the project objectives.
- **Public-Private Partnerships in Biodiversity Conservation**. The successful cooperation accomplished with public agencies, such as CONAF and CONAMA, was critical to project success. In both cases , outcomes exceeded expectations and demonstrated that public-private partnerships for biodiversity conservation goals are possible. These successes can best be explained by the great level of consistency achieved between the practical experience gained through the project and the need for sound inputs required by the evolving institutional framework of private sector biodiversity conservation in Chile. Hence, the recommendations based on strong empirical support proved to be a valuable input to policy formulation by the public agencies concerned.

IV. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT STATUS

The project's finances were audited on three occasions, covering the periods August 2000–August 2001, September 2001–December 2002, and January 2003–December 2003. The auditors were from the firm, Guerra y Raby, Asociados. Although the auditors had issued an unqualified ("clean") opinion on the first audit, the audit arrived late. In addition, because the audit lacked information on the Compliance with Trust Fund Agreement clauses, Cumulative Investment, Statement of Expenses (SOE), and Special Account Statements with their corresponding audit opinions, the Bank found the audit unacceptable. Subsequently, this missing information was provided by CIPMA in a supplementary document, reviewed by the Bank and found to be acceptable.

On the second and third audits, the auditors gave unqualified opinions on the Statement of Sources and Uses of Funds, SOE, and Special Account Statement. Audits were found acceptable by the Bank's financial management unit. The final audit was cleared by the Bank on May 25, 2004. Each report was reviewed by the Bank's financial management unit , and the followup managed by the Task Manager in cooperation with the unit and CIPMA.

Appendix. List of Expected and Unexpected Project Outcomes

The following *expected outcomes achieved* during the project are worth noting:

Steering Committee:

- Nine sessions on such issues as a diagnostic of private and protected areas of Region X, public initiatives for the development of private conservation, targeting criteria of the CIPMA-GEF promotion program, recommendations for the PPA regulations, model to estimate the costs for PPA establishment and management, and regional conservation strategies
- Regional seminar on private biodiversity conservation initiatives carried out in Region X and relevant experiences to contribute to the design of an appropriate institutional framework
- Cooperation agreement signed with CONAMA Region X to contribute to the design and preparation of a regional biodiversity conservation strategy
- Recommendations for the PPA regulations that were a major input to their preparation and for the design of conservation bonuses that were included in the Native Forest Recovery and Forestry Development bill
- Legal establishment, feasibility study, and funding for a specialized PPA promotion and support organization to ensure the continuity of project impacts.

Promotion Program:

- Summoning, registration, and preparation of a database with 155 landowners of conservation initiatives; analysis of their profiles; design of selection criteria; and targeting of priority areas within the province of Valdivia
- Training for 522 attendees—PPA owners, civil servants, members of other communities, and NGO staff—through courses and workshops on basic concepts for biological conservation, PPA planning and management, design and construction of trails, land development for conservation, nonwood forest products, ecological restoration, and private land conservation networking
- Preparation and distribution of support documents to 100 PPA landowners who were not selected for other incentives. Topics included basic biological conservation concepts; design, building, and maintenance of trails; nonwood forest products; and PPA planning and management
- Editing and publication of a park ranger training manual prepared under the cooperation agreement with CONAF
- Four conferences at the *Universidad Austral de Chile*, organized by the Institute of Social Communications, with invited lecturers on topics related to the project
- Sponsorship of one undergraduate anthropology thesis at the *Universidad Austral de Chile* on the Mapu-Lahual Parks
- Sponsorship of a thesis in education at the *Universidad Austral de Chile* on the preparation of a park ranger training curriculum in agriculture for vocational schools in Region X.
- During the project's closing seminar, public acknowledgement of three networks of PPA landowners and managers in Region X.

Demonstration Pilot Areas:

- Preparation by the applicable co-executing agencies of conservation management plans for three demonstration PPAs based on methodologies validated at a national level and the Terms of Reference agreed with CONAF
- Implementation of conservation management programs in the three demonstration PPAs, including construction of infrastructure for public use (visitor centers, trails, camping areas);

ecological restoration; monitoring of wildlife; interpretive guides; training; and dissemination of information about the programs" to PPA landowners, other communities, civil servants, and NGOs
- Design and implementation of a monitoring methodology to assess the progress and contribution of the project to the effectiveness of conservation management programs carried out in each demonstration PPA
- Systematic analysis of the planning and management costs in each DPA based on an ad hoc conceptual model of proposed conservation efforts
- Implementation of the first national PPA certification procedure, done jointly with CONAF and applied to the three project DPAs.

Monitoring and Assessment:
- Systematic management and statistical analysis of the promotion program's register of beneficiaries
- Development of a conservation effort concept and its validation through a PPA establishment and management cost model applied to the 3 DPAs and to 13 other properties registered under the promotion program
- Development of a typology of PPA landowners based on their needs and motivations
- Study of incentive preferences among 30 landowners involved in the promotion program and among the attendees at the first Chilean meeting of private conservation
- Design of appropriate incentives for private conservation based on the lessons learned from the project's field components (DPAs and promotion program)
- Publications to date of, among others, 11 magazine articles; 3 book chapters; 4 working documents; 6 supporting documents for PPA managers; 6 brochures; 34 press releases, and information in 3 bulletins; as well as an updated Web site. More publications are expected in the next months**.**
- National seminar to disseminate the project's results, lessons, and recommendations.

In addition, the following *unexpected positive outcomes achieved* are worthy of mention:

- Establishment of a consortium of CIPMA, WWF, and *Fundación Senda Darwin* to design and develop a Biological Corridor between the coastal and the Los Andes mountain ranges in the northern area of Region X (province of Valdivia)
- Cooperation agreement with the Mapu Lahual Parks to develop a support subprogram for field conservation initiatives carried in the district of San Juan de la Costa
- Preparation of LDPCs and proposals made jointly with 12 landowners through an ad hoc methodology created especially for the scale and characteristics of the selected PPAs and under the validation framework of technical assistance incentives
- Participation as a partner organization of the *Fundación Senda Darwin* to ensure the continuity of the results achieved in the promotion program's first stage in the province of Chiloé
- Preparation of a video on trail design, building, and maintenance as part of a project-sponsored thesis developed by *Universidad Austral de Chile* journalism students
- Facilitation of the networking of Region X PPAs by supporting the creation of two associations of private landowners and managers of conservation initiatives in the provinces of Valdivia and Chiloé
- Preparation of a video to disseminate to PPAs involved in the second phase of the promotion program and to ensure the public awareness of their organizations
- Participation in the organizing committee and sponsorship of the first National Meeting of Private Conservation, held in Pucón in November 2002

- Sponsorship of a master's degree thesis in tropical agriculture at the University of Göttingen on the socioeconomic aspects, motivations, and costs of PPAs involved in the project
- The appointment of the project director to vice president of the regional advisory council for the conservation and development of state-protected areas in the Los Lagos region, established by CONAF Region X, and established in Puerto Montt on August 13, 2003
- Organization of the first exhibition of PPAs during the project's final seminar
- Support for adding Oncol Park as a DPA demonstration area through activities such as a study of the area's ecotourism potential and recommendations related to PPA administration and management
- Acquisition of a 166-ha park in the district of Pucón to serve as a demonstration area of the private conservation organization established to maintain continuity of the project's impacts
- Final assessment workshop to gather comments and inputs from steering committee members and other relevant stakeholders and partners
- Workshop with forest industries companies to explore ways to link forest certification with the establishment of PPAs in lands devoted to forestry management.