| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Relevance*** The extent to which an activity is adapted to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time  The extent to which the project is consistent with GEF operational programs or strategic priorities on which the project was funded.  Note: In retrospect, the question of relevance often becomes a question of whether the objectives of an intervention or its design are still appropriate given the changing circumstances. | How is the project located in the priorities of the regions where it is implemented? | 1. Budget allocated by the project partners for activities related to the EIT and its projects; ii) inclusion of the project in local priorities; iii) improvement of BD and carbon sequestration data, improvement in management plans of the project beneficiary communities and territorial planning. | Work plans of INDAP, CORFO and other project partners, budgets, interviews, local documents and policies, minutes of meetings between community organizations and partner committees, municipal input. Environmental studies and project baselines. |
| Is the project aligned with UNDP Chile and GEF priorities? | 1. GEF-5 operational plan targets; ii) UNDP-Chile country program targets 2015-2019; iii) UNDAF targets 2015-2019; i v) UNDP corporate targets 2015-2019. | UNDP and UNDAF Chile work plans, budgets, interviews, national documents and policies, minutes of meetings and development reports . |
| Is the project important for the municipalities or regions? | 1. Number of activities related to landscape management and certification promoted by the project and supported by governments, regional public services and municipalities. | Work plans, budgets, interviews, regional and local documents and policies, minutes of meetings |
| How does the project fit into the priorities and activities of the local beneficiaries? | 1. Alignment of EIT with regional priorities and development plans; ii) Beneficiary investments in sustainable agriculture and forestry systems; iii) Number of certified sustainable products | Work plans, budgets, interviews, regional and local documents and policies, minutes of meetings. |
| How did the beneficiaries and key stakeholders participate in the design and implementation stage of the project? Were local priorities included? | 1. Number of inquiries made; (ii) Number of adjustments to the project resulting from the inquiries; (iv) Stakeholder ownership of project objectives at national, regional and local levels. | 1. Project preparation documents; ii) interviews; iii) Regional, territorial, and local development policy documents. |
| Does the project consider national realities (policy and institutional framework) in both its design and implementation? | 1. Degree to which the project supports the objective of sustainable environmental management in government plans 2014-2018 and 2018-2022; Plans and programs of the Ministry of the Environment and its implementing partners; 2. Assessment of key stakeholders regarding the level of appropriateness of project design and implementation to national and local realities and existing capacities; 3. Consistency between the needs expressed by national stakeholders and the UNDP-GEF approach; 4. Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process | 1. Government program 2014-2018, 2019-2020; 2. Project documents; 3. Interviews with key Project partners and stakeholders; 4. Plans, goals, and budgets of MMA and partners. |
| Are the objectives, results, products and activities still valid, given the current context of project implementation? | 1. Environmental policy documents of the MMA, INDAP, CONAF, among others; ii) elaboration of regulations related to the FPA, forestry and agriculture promoting landscape approaches; iii) the project is included in planning and annual goals of the MMA and other partners; iv) productive landscape approach in land management plans; v) Number of communities that include practices and policies on agricultural production and sustainable forest exploitation; vi) Number of local municipalities that have incorporated regulations on sustainable land use; vii) Number of certifications/agreements made | Work plans, budgets, interviews, local policy documents, minutes of meetings |
| Does the project consider the specific needs of women, indigenous peoples and marginalized groups in its design and implementation?  Does the project attempt to change behaviors, roles among women, men, youth, elders and indigenous people present in the territories intervened by the project?  Is the project in line with national, regional and local policies, plans and priorities regarding the participation of women, indigenous communities and other marginalized groups? | 1. Number of specific consultations with specific groups during the elaboration and implementation of the project. 2. Number of policies and plans related to gender and indigenous peoples that can be applied to the project. | 1. CONADI’s national, regional, and local plans and policies; 2. Government plans 2014-2022; 3. Municipal and community organization plans |
| ***Effectiveness :***  The extent to which an objective was achieved or the probability of achieving it. | Are there logical links between expected project results and project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, implementation mechanisms, scope, budget, use of resources, etc.)? | 1. Level of coherence between the expected results and the design of the project's internal logic; ii) type of indicators to measure program success; iii) analysis of key stakeholders | Project documents, key project stakeholders, annual reports and budgets, substantive review and/or mid-term evaluation (if applicable) |
| What would be the additional contribution of the project to biodiversity protection activities, the improvement of carbon sinks, territorial planning with a landscape approach and the improvement in the living conditions of the communities in the regions where it is implemented?  Are sustainable soil management practices, sustainable productive activities, the protection of biodiversity and actions to recover soils and improve carbon sinks a priority for the actors, especially in the pilot regions? | 1. Additional budget for territorial ordering and field inspection activities; ii) inclusion of the project in local priorities of municipalities and communities; iii) inclusion of techniques to verify improvements in production practices and protection of biodiversity in the regions intervened by the project. | Work plans, annual budgets, interviews, local documents and policies, minutes of meetings |
| To what extent are the project objectives being met, nationally, regionally and locally? | 1. Regional/municipal strategies on sustainable agriculture and forestry; ii) national strategy on biodiversity and climate change; iii) number of hectares with sustainable production practices that respect biodiversity; iv) number of hectares of degraded soils improved and carbon sinks enhanced by the project. | Annual reports, activities, interviews. |
| Is there increased control of deforestation/burning by local and national authorities? | 1. Increase in the number/quality of inspections by local authorities/police; ii) amount of non-compliance with standards detected; iii) decrease in the number of unauthorized burns; iv) increase in control by beneficiary organizations | Reports, interviews. |
| Was it possible to involve the relevant authorities and stakeholders, both at the national and regional level, to establish a land management system with a landscape approach? | 1. Number of contacts with authorities; ii) Number of regional/local plans on sustainable agriculture and forestry; iii) Number of resources allocated by actors to certification activities; v) Number of new policies and regulations for forestry and sustainable agriculture | Reports, interviews, regional and local plans. |
| Are we succeeding in identifying more cost-effective alternatives for implementing sustainable agriculture and forestry activities and protecting biodiversity? | 1. Number of financial support alternatives identified; ii) Number of trainings carried out for national and local actors; iii) Number of plots for certification; iv) Number of companies with marketing agreements for sustainable and certified products. | Reports, studies, interviews, regional, local and national plans |
| Are the needs for change/introduction of new regulations being identified to facilitate the elimination of barriers to effective sustainable management of the territory? | 1. Number of studies on land tenure; ii) Number of agreements between authorities and relevant actors; iii) Number of regulatory projects in process or identified, to promote new sustainable land uses, financing of local producers, iv) elimination of overlapping competencies among government institutions. | Reports, studies, interviews, regional and national plans, platform reports. |
| Has it been possible to incorporate women, youth and indigenous communities in activities specially designed for these groups? | 1. Number of workshops and consultations with specific groups to design activities |  |
| ***Efficiency:*** Is the project being implemented efficiently in accordance with international and national norms and standards? | Are the annual work plans in line with project resources and objectives? | 1. Plans and budgets according to expected results | Annual plans, budgets, interviews. |
| Were necessary adjustments made to address different situations (adaptive management)? | 1. Plans and budgets according to expected results | Annual plans, minutes of meetings, reports, budgets, interviews, substantive review, risk analysis, PIR. |
| Was a system of monitoring and evaluation of activities implemented? | 1. Number of indicators, ii) targets; iii) Number of adjustments made | Annual plans, reports, interviews. |
| Were activities, outputs, and outcomes carried out as planned? | 1. Number of activities; ii) % of progress | Annual plans, reports, interviews. |
| How were project risks and assumptions managed; What has been the quality of mitigation strategies developed? | 1. Integrity of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design. 2. Quality of the information systems established to identify emerging risks | Project documents; quarterly and annual progress reports; project team, UNDP and key stakeholders |
| Was it possible to gather counterpart and/or additional resources for the project objectives? | 1. Amount of resources allocated by project partners | Annual plans, budgets, cash and in-kind expenditure reports by project partners, interviews, annual audits. |
| ***Results:***  The positive and negative, intended and unintended changes and effects produced by a development intervention.  In GEF terms, outcomes include direct project performance in the short to medium term and longer-term impact that includes global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects. | Is the project triggering and/or influencing certification activities agricultural and forestry production activities, better marketing of biodiversity and environmentally friendly products? | 1. Number of increased regional activities; ii) Number of increased regional/national livestock management policies; iii) Number of agreements for certification of sustainable products; iv) amount of training to communities | Annual plans, budgets, reports, interviews. |
| Have networks been established to exchange experiences between communities participating in the project?  Has it been possible to raise awareness among local communities and stakeholders about the effect of global environmental problems on their direct environment? | 1. Number of communities of practice with stable operation; 2. Number of training workshops held; 3. Number of practices implemented as a result of this exchange | Annual plans, budgets, reports, interviews, training reports, community meeting minutes |
| Are reductions in degraded soils, biodiversity conservation, enhancement of carbon sinks being achieved? | 1. Improvement in biodiversity indices in the project intervention regions; iii) Number of certified plots; iv) Number of agreements between producers and marketers of certified products | Annual plans, budgets, reports, interviews, biodiversity baseline studies, certification project reports |
| Has it been possible to see an improvement in capacities for carbon monitoring, planning and territory management based on project results? | 1. Number of trainings carried out; 2. Number of plots with biodiversity and carbon management and monitoring plans; 3. Number of communities trained to apply for financing lines for environmental protection projects | Annual plans, budgets, reports, interviews, training reports |
| Has a response - even if partial - to the specific needs and expectations of women within their communities been achieved? | 1. Number of consultations with women during the process of elaboration and execution of community plans and programs; 2. Number of community management plans including aspirations of women and other vulnerable groups 3. Change in the perception of women's roles before and after the program 4. Number of studies carried out | Project work plans, progress reports, consultancy reports, interviews with communities and specifically with women.. |
| Has a response - even if partial - to the specific needs and expectations of indigenous communities been achieved? | 1. Number of indigenous consultations during the process of developing community plans and programs; 2. Number of plans including aspirations of indigenous communities and other vulnerable groups; 3. Change in the perception of women's roles before and after the program 4. Number of studies carried out | Project work plans, progress reports, consultancy reports, community interviews |
| ***Sustainability:***  The likely ability of an intervention to continue to provide benefits for a period after its completion.  The project must be environmentally, financially, and socially sustainable. | Will the authorities and relevant stakeholders at the national and regional levels be able to continue implementing activities when the project ends? | 1. Number of medium and long term plans for management and certification of plots; ii) amount of permanent human and financial resources for training activities, protection and control of biodiversity by municipalities, regional and national governments; iii) budgets related to technical and financial support for farmers; iv) budgets and permanent practices of farmers to maintain the practices acquired by the project | Annual plans, budgets, reports, interviews. |
| Are the relevant authorities and stakeholders at the national and regional level acquiring the skills and knowledge to maintain and improve a system of territorial planning with a landscape approach, certification of sustainable plots and land use planning? | 1. Number of trainings carried out; ii) Number of medium and long term plans; iii) Status of certifications and territorial management and land use plans; iv) Number of experience of networks of communities of practice transmitted to peers who have not participated in the project. | Annual plans, budgets, reports, interviews. |
| Is there any impediment to the continuity of women and indigenous participation in territorial planning after the project has ended? | 1. Number of women-led community organizations in the IETs; 2. Number of communities with permanent financing; 3. Number of communities presenting and managing new projects in the IETs | Project progress reports, institutional support plans, projects submitted by communities |
| Are there any social, political, economic or technical factors that prevent the formulation of plans and policies to protect biodiversity and maintain financing policies and regulations on territorial planning based on a landscape approach in the country, once the project is completed? | 1. Number of agreements and/or cooperation between social actors; ii) amount of resources allocated to the topic (human and financial); iii) number of medium- and long-term institutional plans; iv) long-term financing plans for farmers | Annual plans, budgets, reports, interviews. |
| Are national, regional and local authorities and stakeholders empowered and committed to the issue in the medium and long term? | 1. Number of agreements and/or cooperation between social actors and government promotion entities; ii) amount of resources allocated to the topic by communities and related government entities (human and financial); iii) number of medium and long term institutional plans | Annual plans, budgets, reports, interviews. |