| ***Nº*** | ***Observation*** | ***Institution*** | ***Evaluators Response*** | ***Action taken*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***1*** | M&E. The report insists on the use of TT and the lack of a monitoring plan, even though the same text says that PRODOC includes monitoring instruments, which were applied during project implementation. Therefore, we believe that the wording is confusing and requires precision. | UNDP | The paragraphs were fixed, since it was indeed said that there was M&E for monitoring outputs, but there was no monitoring of the environmental and social variables of the CMS, the IET or the community projects (page 35). Paragraph on M&E is clarified in 3.2.3 | Accepted |
| ***2*** | Contribution to global biodiversity from local actions. From the current wording, it would be understood that there is no contribution from local work towards the conservation/restoration of BD. Although it could be considered that due to the scale and level of interconnection in the implementation, a greater impact is not generated, we think that it cannot be deduced that the local actions do not contribute to issues of BD and CC. It could even be contradictory to affirm it, when this GEF is approved under that objective. It may be a problem of wording or approach or of concepts being applied. | UNDP | The project contributes in terms of raising awareness among the population, which will undoubtedly have an impact in the long term in regards to conservation/restoration of biodiversity (CRBD). What is indicated is based on that: 1. Actions are carried out with landowners who have land that, in general, presents high levels of transformation and, for the same reason, the great majority of them are deprived of the ecosystem assets and habitats of the ecoregion they seek to protect or restore. This fact limits the possibility of innovating and developing CRBD practices, simply because such owners do not generally have areas with such assets; 2. Small landowners comprise only 25% of the surface of the ecoregion; 3. The activities carried out are essentially agricultural. There is no doubt that the project promoted highly sustainable agricultural activities in terms of non-contamination and the use of natural fertilizers and biocides. However, both in terms of surface and location (closely associated with housing and, in a relevant number of cases, urban or peri-urban), such activities are not linked to the territories with some value of CRBD and therefore marginally impact the possibilities of CRBD in the ecoregion. Additionally, it should be noted that what is referred to in the reports as agrobiodiversity essentially comprises introduced (crop) species that are not part of the biological diversity to be conserved/restored through the project in the ecoregion.4. In the second phase, the project made significant progress in the selection of EITs, using, as far as CRBD is concerned, criteria such as: 1.1. Are there any ecosystems in the landscape in conservation categories and/or under any category of official protection? 1.2. Are there watersheds in the landscape with remnants of natural ecosystems that are critical to the ecosystem service, providing water for human consumption and agricultural production? 1.3. Are there any threatened species in the landscape and/or plans for recovery, conservation and management of flora and fauna species? However, the project did not develop instruments to determine the areas, at a local and property level, where part of such ecosystems or habitats were present, which would have allowed for the capacity to carry out actions, in small producers' properties, that would contribute to the CRBD of the ecoregion and therefore to advance towards the result. Within this framework, the selection of locations and properties was made without having criteria for the CRBD in sight. If guidelines had been available for this purpose, some of the design problems mentioned in points 1 and 2 could have been mitigated. In this way, it would have been possible to identify some areas in which to develop innovative and very valuable experiences with respect to the CRBD; 5. Although it is clear from the above that there was no possibility, due to project design problems and management weaknesses, of developing initiatives related to the CRBD, it should be pointed out that if innovative initiatives had been developed in this respect (see 4), they would have been limited in their replicability and scalability by what was indicated in 1 and 2. As far as carbon capture is concerned, the activities were simply carried out at a very limited level and no attempts at implementation in other IET were observed. Finally, with regard to forest and agro-ecosystem services, it can be seen that a significant percentage of the sustainable agricultural practices developed were carried out in orchards, i.e., they cover very small areas and, in many cases, have low additionality. This is because orchards, in general, do not present problems of sustainability in land use. In the case of water, an important part of the activities was recycling gray water, collecting rainwater, and increasing the efficiency of irrigation. All of these activities, as we have pointed out, and as recognized by the users, contribute to the well-being and quality of the population's visa. However, they do not contribute to the services of the forest and the agro-ecosystem, either by increasing the water available, or by increasing the stability and resilience of the water sources. |  |
| ***3*** | Clearly the two stages of the project, before EMT and after evaluation, must be distinguished in the analyses. This is to better distinguish the advances in indicators, methodological proposal and the management team. Sometimes there may be cross analysis, which could be confusing. | UNDP | Paragraphs and headings are added in 3.2.1 to better differentiate the two periods | Accepted |
| ***4*** | It is also important to highlight the problems in project design, which are well explained in the report, but not in the executive summary.  | UNDP | A paragraph was added to the executive summary on design issues. | Accepted |
|  | ***General Comments*** | MMA |  |  |
| ***5*** | The format used to present the systematization of observations and responses (comments) in the Excel spreadsheet, as well as the use of indications inviting review of the response to a particular observation in another section, delayed the review work. |  | Our apologies, but presentation in a separate table format for comments and clean report text was requested by UNDP | Clarified |
| ***6*** | The document "Final Evaluation Report Project GEF 88249" dated November 19, is in form and content, very similar to that previously delivered on October 15, and presents a structure that does not allow clearly identify the evaluation, which in the opinion of the evaluators, is made to the two stages of project development (before and after the Midterm Evaluation). |  | The structure of the report follows the standard of UNDP/GEF evaluations | Clarified |
| ***7*** | The report indicates that the final evaluation seeks to verify, on the one hand, the fulfillment of the expected results of the project, as established in its logical framework (original design), and on the other hand, that it was carried out in a complete and extensive manner, considering the changes introduced from previous evaluations and the response delivered by the GEF-CMS project to the changes proposed in them (adaptive management strategies implemented). However, the evaluation trend of the first phase of the project prevails.  |  | Indeed, a final evaluation covers every project, from its design, through its execution and all the resulting changes as part of the adaptive management performed. The report does not focus on the first phase of the project; section 3.2 includes all aspects of the implementation of both phases. Paragraphs and headings are added in 3.2.1 to better differentiate the two periods. | Clarified |
|  | a) Regarding the criteria 1.- General quality of monitoring and evaluation, 2.- Monitoring and evaluation design at the beginning of the project and 3.- Execution of the monitoring and evaluation plan. The rating given is not consistent with the statements presented in the evaluation report, which indicates that despite the fact that at the beginning the project did not have an effective monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, the report states that "this aspect improved in the second stage of the project, highlighting that it focused on technical assistance tasks, compliance with goals and deadlines and other conditions for the implementation of community projects and other products. The M&E system implemented during the period 2017-2020, consisted of a series of procedures that were designed to follow the progress of individual community projects, at the territorial level (IET) and at the global level of the CMS, a system that was called by the implementing team "three-level M&E" ... Therefore, in this case, we consider, at least a score equal to or higher than four 4 (moderately satisfactory), to be fair. |  | The report states that there was no effective M&E system and concludes that it improved during the second phase and 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 changes desired in the different dimensions at the local and territorial level.The rating is based on the fact that M&E needs to follow the variables that the project intended to change, but in this case, no indicators related to this aspect are verified. | Not Accepted |
|  | b) The same happens with the evaluation of the criteria 1.- General quality of the implementation and execution of the project, 2.- Execution of the Implementing Agency and, 3.- Execution of the Executing Agency, where it is inappropriate that the first two are qualified with a score of 4 (moderately satisfactory) and only the last one is qualified with a score of 3 (moderately unsatisfactory). All three criteria should be evaluated with the same rating, at least moderately satisfactory (4). |  | The overall rating of the project is 4 and recognizes the improvements made during the second phase. However, the implementation of the executing agency is 3 due to the fact that both stages of the project are qualified, noting the challenges still pending. | Not Accepted |
|  | c) The evaluation applied to criteria 1.- General quality of the project's results, 2.- Effectiveness and 3.- Efficiency, of 3 moderately unsatisfactory, does not seem adequate to us. These were rated as moderately unsatisfactory with a score of 3. If the fulfillment of the expected products and goals for each result is reviewed, added to the 88 percent of budget execution at the time of the evaluation process, the rating should be equal to or higher than four 4 (moderately satisfactory). |  | Effectiveness not only measures the products of a project, but also the progress/achievement of its main results, a situation that in the CMS the results have been very modest. | Not Accepted |
| ***8*** | 5. As indicated in the comments provided above, the evaluation report is considered to have a strong tendency to review the project's results and achievements in light of the original project design. It does not deepen the analysis in the development of the second phase of the project, and the adaptive management measures taken in response to the recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation and that were reflected in the document of Substantive Review, where an adjustment to the project results framework is proposed, including the indicators and goals at the level of results (outcomes), as well as the products (outputs) for each of the results, as an alternative to the modification of the initial goals and indicators, proposed by the project team, which was discarded as an option by suggestion from UNDP Chile and UNDP New York. |  | Because this is a final evaluation, the project design, and what it was intended to achieve, must be analyzed first, and then, subsequently, the analysis of the adaptive management when the project is completed. Section 3 covers all of the findings and an effort has been made to separate the two stages of the project. For the changes proposed to UNDP, the evaluators have not found any documents that make such claims. | Clarified |
| ***9*** | 6. In this sense, the evaluation report presents the actions, efforts and results achieved from the second half of the project's execution, only as successes without a major impact. Statements such as the following: "The activities developed by the project are mainly agricultural, therefore, not relevant, nor projected for the conservation of the various species and habitats of the Mediterranean Ecoregion. On the other hand, the types of land and type of property in which such activities were developed do not correspond with the types of land and type of property predominant in the 352 thousand hectares covered by the IET," are questionable, since it is precisely this type of activities that generate a direct impact on biodiversity. In this sense, the different actions generated by the project, led by the communities themselves, aimed at implementing pilots with the possibility of scaling up, unleashing a process of change and demonstrating that with changes in traditional practices and the incorporation of small-scale agro-ecological practices, it is possible to increase the sustainability of land use and ecosystem services, and make a more sustainable use of biodiversity. |  | See response to observation No. 2. In particular, with respect to the statement that "it is precisely this type of activity that generates a direct impact on biodiversity", it should be noted that the agricultural activities that were the object of the project's attention, as mentioned above, both in terms of surface area and location (closely associated with housing and, in a significant number of cases, urban or peri-urban), are located far from the territories with some CRBD value and therefore have a marginal impact on the possibilities of CRBD in the ecoregion.  | Clarified |
| ***10*** | 7. It is recognized that there was an effort to complement those statements that were present throughout the document delivered at the first opportunity, which lacked data or sources to support them, improving in part the tenor of some expressions used. |  | The evaluators made the analysis based on the information provided by the project, interviews and independent references. See Annex of the documents reviewed. The methodology included a wide range of actors consulted (70), including public officials, beneficiaries and grassroots organizations, indigenous groups and women. | Clarified |
| ***11*** | 8. Notwithstanding the above, there are still some statements, that in our opinion, result from a little objectivity, are devoid of an exhaustive analysis based on evidence and information from data raised from various sources, and the corresponding application of qualitative data analysis methodologies, which allows one to identify common patterns, contrast intuitions, assessments or tentative hypotheses and protect the analysis from any bias. |  | It would be good to specify clearly what are the shortcomings of the analysis to which the commentary refers. | Not Accepted |
| ***12*** | 9. Similarly, there are still certain statements and ideas that are presented repeatedly throughout the document, making it a confusing read. |  | Please clarify what the confusing paragraphs are. | Not Accepted |
| ***13*** | 10. For all the above reasons, it is considered that the evaluation is partial, not very consistent and not rigorous enough. |   | Please indicate what specific shortcomings were found. | Not Accepted |
| ***14*** | 11. Finally, it is noted that some of the findings and recommendations suggested may be considered valuable in the design of future projects of this nature. |  | The evaluators made a significant effort to understand the reasons that led CMS to the results obtained. It would be difficult to draw good findings and conclusions from poor methodology and lack of objectivity. | Clarified |
|  | **Observations and Comments on the Report** | **National Coordinator GEF CMS Project (MMA)** |  |  |
| ***15*** | 1. Regarding the audit itinerary. In accordance with the TOR of the National Consultant (page 16) and the International Consultant (page 11). "the evaluator is required to provide an audit itinerary detailing how all comments have (or have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report". |  | The audit itinerary was delivered. | Clarified |
| ***16*** | An Excel file called "observations and answers sheet" was received with the final version of the report on 20.11.2020. However, this file does not provide an orderly, clear, and/or comprehensive detail of how all comments have been (or have not been) addressed in the final evaluation report. All comments received should be listed in one column (indicating who provided them) and a second column, for each comment, should detail how they have been addressed (or not). |  | Unfortunately, the separate report delivery format from the comment table was a suggestion from UNDP. The Excel table -even though it is not exactly the one proposed by UNDP due to the large number of comments (229), of reviewers (10) and its large length, did not make it possible to compile them as desired- However, it provides all the required information: page where the comment is made, text commented on, comment made, and the answers to each of them (organized by rows instead of columns). | Clarified |
| ***17*** | Specific comments made by the GEF CMS Project Team are erroneously assigned to the Ministry of Environment (MMA). This should be corrected as the observations and comments of the GEF CMS Project Team do not necessarily represent the opinion of the MMA or UNDP. |  | This request was not made before. Because the project is executed by a specific institution, the general practice of evaluation is not to differentiate between the project team and the executing entity | Not Accepted |
| ***16*** | The file sent does not identify any of the general observations and comments made by the GEF CMS Project Team on 28.10.2020. The document is attached again for inclusion and consideration in the audit trail. Even in the case that the evaluators have considered that these observations and comments could be redundant, considering the specific observations and comments included, it is appropriate that they be incorporated and responded to in the audit itinerary. |  | General comments were included in the responses to the project-specific comments because they were repetitive and lengthy. | Not Accepted |
|  | 2. Regarding section 3.2.1 Adaptive management (p. 25-31) |  |  |  |
| ***19*** | The report does not mention the October 2016 - March 2017 Work Plan as a relevant milestone for the adaptive management of the project. This document includes, among other things, a synthesis of the main lessons learned from the first implementation phase, the proposal to anticipate the Mid-Term Evaluation and the need to organize and strengthen the project team. The plan was approved in the 21.11.2016 session of the Partners' Steering Committee and allowed for a very important transition phase to give continuity to the project and improve its performance towards the results, with all the preliminary assumptions, options and strategic guidelines available at that time. |  | The above document is mentioned in section 3.2.3 on adaptive management and is placed as an example of how each POA should have been carried out. Unfortunately, this was only an isolated document within the M&E process, an exception and not a consistent behavior. | Clarified |
| ***20*** | The report states that "it should be noted that the proposed structure in PRODOC could not be fully implemented due to its size and because, in some places, the PGTMA was duplicated with some existing instances, as well as the technical committee (CATEM) seemed redundant with the CS. This is evidence of the confusion in PRODOC regarding project implementation arrangements, particularly in relation to the Multi-stakeholder Management Platforms, which were not clearly defined and were confused with "institutions" (for example, the three pilot IET had a formal institutional structure, two of which were Model Forests and one of which was the Municipality of Alhué). In other words, the PGTMA, according to PRODOC, appeared to be pre-existing, formal institutions with a strong dependence on a central, regional or local public agency. After the EMT, the PGTMA were redefined (see page 4 of the RS) and their development in each IET was promoted as a logical, natural and ad-hoc result of the process led by the communities themselves (Civil Society Organizations co-executing and Community Organizations executing community projects) and not as a previous structure as a requirement for implementing an IET (it is exactly the opposite: the IET allows for the development of the platform, only when there is a common objective, it is possible to define the organization that the communities will give to achieve it). Therefore, and as the definition adopted after the EMT makes explicit, a PGTMA is an "instance of public-private participation, formal or non-formal (...) and responds to the dynamics of each initiative at a territorial scale". And this same fact explains why most IET platforms are still in the process of construction or consolidation, with different degrees of development and where community organizations have a relevant role. |  | PRODOC (page 56) indicates that the PGTMAs "will be formed" once the IET have been chosen. It also refers to who the members could be, where a wide spectrum is mentioned: institutions, local governments, community organizations, for example. The important thing is that it defined the conformation of the PGTMA with the "relevant actors of the territory", so an analysis of actors would have to be done for each IET. No "confusion" is seen in this. Finally, the paragraph does not focus only on the PGTMA, but also mentions CATEM, CTP and other instances that were not finally implemented. | Clarified |
| ***21*** | The report analyzes the changes that SR made to the project's logical framework. However, a number of important conceptual and strategic definitions are not considered. These are included in the body of the SR document (pp. 2-5) in relation to key aspects (e.g., Territorial Scale Initiative and its development stages, scopes of the landscape and the community approach, Multi-stakeholder Territorial Management Platform, and Integrated Territorial Management Plan, among others). The strategic and operational grouping of the 4 reordered product "families" were not taken into account either (which explains, to a large extent, the adaptation of the implementation strategy guided by an effort to integrate results 1, 2, 3 and 4). This would have overcome the difficulties generated by the absence of a budget allocated to component 4 and to rationalize - for the benefit of project continuity - the enormous complexity of PRODOC's original implementation strategy in one context. In addition, the overly ambitious goals established for the MML indicators could not be significantly modified. Unfortunately, the report does not take into account these strategic and operational definitions of adaptive management formalized in the RS when evaluating results (see section 3.3), and is guided only by PRODOC. An example is the emphasis placed by the evaluators when they point out that "in RS the product 1.1.3 is eliminated: Twenty or more community forest management plans 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" (p. 30, bold of the evaluators). The adjustments applied at the product "family" level (see Figure 4, p. 17 of the RS) show that the actions of recovery and management of native forests, carbon quantification, recovery and management of agricultural lands and communities of practice, are all inserted in the framework of community projects (designed and executed by the communities). These in turn respond to the Integrated Territorial Management Plans (PGTI) of each IET, designed and led by the co-executing civil society organizations. Therefore, it is very relevant to consider the definition of PGTI established in the RS: "Strategic and operational instrument, elaborated in a participatory manner, for the deployment of an initiative at a territorial scale within the framework of the objectives of conservation and development of the territory" (pages 4 and 5 of the RS). Clearly this instrument has a different scope to that of a "community forest management plan" (or to that which, from a more scientific-technical viewpoint, could be assimilated to ecological planning of the territory). It aims to integrate, in the same document, the priorities of the communities that inhabit productive socio-ecological landscapes, with the objectives of recovering degraded soils, resilience to the effects of climate change (especially in relation to water availability and use) and biodiversity conservation (which does not consider traditional "protected areas" or large-scale reforestation schemes - for reasons of cost and physical limitations - but rather changes in land use modes through replicable agro-ecological practices, reducing threats to biodiversity in territories where remaining native ecosystems are mostly classified as endangered, critically endangered and vulnerable). |  | With respect to this issue, section 3.2.1 analyzes the changes from RS, describing the main ones that resulted in better implementation of community products and projects. All the methodological documents that emerged from RS were analyzed and discussed in detail with the project team, concluding that the purpose of the second phase of the CMS was to "implement" IETs and community projects, since the basis for these was not considered to be good, and there was not any relationship between the objectives of community projects and IET. There is a very important difference between what was proposed in the documents and what was actually implemented, leading to the fact that it is still not possible to know the environmental and social benefits of the initiatives, nor to collect this information until today. On the other hand, it should be noted that a final evaluation seeks to focus on the expected and achieved accomplishments, critically examining the presumed chains of results, processes and achievements, as well as the contextual factors that may improve or hinder the achievement of the results. In this sense, all the documents indicated in the commentary were considered. However, the emphasis of the evaluation is on the levels of achievement, and were achieved with respect to the expected ones, considering the contextual factors and the adaptive management actions carried out. With respect to such actions, the adaptive value they have is compared according to the progress towards the results achieved. In this framework, the elimination of product 1.1.3 is highlighted, so when analyzing the limited progress in conservation/restoration of BD (CRBD), the chain of results that explains this situation was analyzed and there, among other causes, it was identified. Thus, beyond what is proposed, when it is said that ...the development of strategies, actions for recovery and management of native forests, carbon quantification, recovery and management of agricultural lands and communities of practice, have all been inserted into the framework of community projects (designed and executed by the communities), the evaluation work requires seeing the extent to which progress was made towards the results and goals established. | Clarified |
| ***22*** | The report mentions the recommendations made by the EMT, including a table identifying all of the recommendations. However, for most of them, the way in which the project responded to them is not exhaustively analyzed. In fact, as noted in the previous version of the report, there are a number of working documents generated from the EMT recommendations that account for changes in the project implementation strategy - and which are consistent with RS and adaptive project management on all fronts - that unfortunately are not even mentioned in this evaluation. It is worth noting that these types of documents and responses to the EMT provide evidence of the monitoring and evaluation capacity that the project demonstrated in the second implementation phase, which also reflects the operational and strategic options that the project took and adapted in order to privilege an integral approach to conservation, production, good living and governance in the design, implementation and follow-up of IETs and community projects, including the development of the PGTIs and ad-hoc multi-stakeholder management platforms, as part of community-led processes. As an example, the Guide for the Development of IET (2018) and the Guide for Land Planning with a Landscape Perspective (2018), provide a conceptual and methodological framework that accounts for the critical path of development for sustainable socio-ecological landscapes. However, the evaluation report does not analyze how these tools (and in particular the critical path) were applied in the elaboration of the Integral Territorial Management Plans (PGTI) and in the community projects (with emphasis on the 3 new PGTI after the EMT). What are the objectives of the PGTI? What strategic lines were defined for each PGTI? How do the community projects implemented in each ITMP respond to these objectives and strategic lines? This type of analysis, of what was actually done after the EMT, is not shown in the report. Certainly, this has a direct effect on the way project results are evaluated, where the emphasis of the evaluators is on the fulfillment (or not) of PRODOC's goals and indicators, and not on the strategic, methodological and operational framework applied after the EMT as an adaptive management response. |  | See previous answer. It should be clarified that the evaluators did not focus only on PRODOC-which is the initial guiding instrument that establishes the strategy of what the CMS intended to achieve, and which it was mandatory to make comparisons against, in order to justify changes-and not even on the indicators (please see section 3.3). The analysis focuses on how the project team was organized, how situations were addressed, how planning was done, how monitoring was done, what environmental and social attributes of the pilot projects were desired to maintain/increase, IETs and their measurement, and their alignment with the project's objectives, and how beneficiaries were selected. None of the above elements were found in the first or second phase of the guidance documents, planning, M&E, community projects, or the PGTI.With respect to the last paragraph of the commentary, it is worth reiterating the point made above regarding what UNDP defines as an evaluation under GEF projects. It indicates that the evaluation seeks to focus on expected and achieved accomplishments by critically examining presumed results chains, processes and outcomes, as well as contextual factors that may enhance or hinder the achievement of results. As indicated and as outlined in the UNDP-GEF guide, we have sought to focus on expected and achieved accomplishments. | Clarified |
| ***23*** | The report states: "Indicators for gender and indigenous peoples 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" (p. 29, my emphasis). The indicators for gender and indigenous peoples do not refer to "percentage of participation", but rather to the proportion of community organizations implementing projects that are led by women and indigenous people. This is related to the capacity to lead, make decisions and articulate to the communities for the development of the projects (it is not mere participation). Two articles are shared (UNDP and IIED) that shed light on this aspect:Women ally with nature to adapt to climate change | International Institute for Environment and Development (iied.org)UNDP project strengthens women's leadership in climate change adaptation: UNDP in Chile (undp.org) |  | Indeed, there is confusion in this indicator: "% of women in OC boards in charge of community projects". However, the fundamental problem is that the CMS says it has 56% women on OC boards (PIR 2019), but since there is no baseline, there is no way to compare whether there is an increase or decrease in this rate. In addition, interviews conducted indicate that women were participating in these directives before CMS began and have been taking turns with men (virtually in the minority in most cases), so it is also difficult to discern the actual influence of CMS on this issue. It should be noted that the CMS has always reported the participation of women in terms of % of beneficiaries and trainees, with the exception of the IRP 2019, where it indicates this 56% of women in OC boards. Finally, it should be noted that an indicator is intended to measure a difference in status between the beginning and end of an intervention.Something similar occurs with the indicator for native peoples: "% of native peoples in the directives of indigenous community projects," which is difficult to understand, since it does not make much sense for indigenous community projects to be led by other ethnic groups. | Not Accepted |
|  | The report notes that the changes introduced after the EMT "constituted a major structural reform of the project, both in its organization and approach" (p. 31, my emphasis). This is indeed the case. However, in assessing the outputs achieved by the project and their relationship to outcomes 1, 2, and 3, this major structural reform in its organization and approach is not considered as a framework. An example of this is the conclusion reached by the evaluators: "the project's execution failed to develop criteria for identifying assets, and for action, pertinent 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 focus on these assets and, therefore, did not generate, by aggregation, benefits for the conservation of the macro-region's biodiversity, or benefits of a global nature" (page 63, my emphasis). This conclusion seems to be based on a top-down approach to landscape planning, which is different from the approach actually applied by the project, especially after the EMT, which was oriented towards the management of productive socio-ecological landscapes (bottom-up) and the EMT, which was oriented towards the management of productive socio-ecological landscapes (bottom-up). In this conclusion, it can be seen that the evaluators assign a preponderant emphasis to the identification of "assets" (or conservation objects), as opposed to the emphasis that the project assigned, especially after the EMT, to the participatory identification of expressions of the society-nature relationship based on the 4 dimensions for the development of sustainable productive socio-ecological landscapes (conservation, sustainable production, good living and governance) with territorial relevance. Therefore, this conclusion is very debatable, given that for each new IET developed, the Guide for the Development of IET (2018) was used as methodological orientation (including training for civil society organizations) - which the same evaluators highlight as "a great contribution to fill a crucial methodological gap for the development of the project" (page 48), allowing the generation of Integral Territorial Management Plans (PGTI) and the portfolio of community projects that were financed with transfers from the GEF CMS. Therefore, it is quite surprising that the evaluators highlight that the actions developed "did not generate, by aggregation, benefits for the conservation of the macro-region's biodiversity, nor did they generate benefits of a global nature". In the evaluators' opinion, did the actions developed not generate any biodiversity benefits and global environmental benefits at any scale? This question remains unanswered in the report and it is possible that this is due, in part, to the fact that the nature, contents and scope of the Integrated Territorial Management Plans (PGTI) and community projects generated after the EMT have not been adequately considered in their own territorial and socio-environmental contexts. Only as an example, the following summarizes the strategic vision and strategic lines of the 3 PGTI developed by the co-executing civil society organizations with respect to which the achievement of results by the community projects developed in each IET should be evaluated, beyond the mere comparison with the goals of the MML indicators: |  | Landscape planning in a GEF project must make available to users criteria for what the tool is intended to achieve. This is what was done with the selection of IET. In this case, since the project sought to move towards CRBD outcomes, decision (non-decision) criteria were established that weighted landscapes according to the level at which they contained elements of value from the perspective of conservation of the Mediterranean ecoregion. In this sense, the commentator is wrong when he speaks of the evaluation being carried out under a "top-down" approach. The evaluation has always referred to criteria for decision making. The criteria are not decisions and therefore cannot be qualified as top-down. The evaluation has valued the bottom-up decision-making that drives the project. Part of the limitations of the project's results lie in the fact that the criteria were not made available to the users, criteria that their bottom-up decision making was building, property, local and, by aggregation, ecoregional advances that allowed significant progress towards the project's desired results. These contributions required an M&E system that would develop and systematize information on community projects and their contribution to the IET and the objectives of the CMS, a situation that has not been recorded. With respect to replication and scaling up, the evaluators have explained on several occasions in the report that this is unlikely to occur due to the selection of beneficiaries at the local and property level. Also, and for greater detail, the evaluators based their analysis on available project information and methodological tools, among other sources. | Not Accepted |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PGTI** | **Strategic view** | **Strategic Lines** |
| IET Pumanque-Lolol | Adaptation to climate change through the restoration of natural heritage, sustainable productive practices and strengthening of their community capacities for sustainable territorial development | 1. Protection, conservation and restoration of native forest and scrubland, and watersheds critical to water supply.2. Adoption of agro-ecological practices for agricultural production resilient to climate change3. Strengthening of community organizational capabilities, management of traditional knowledge and know-how, farmers' lifestyles and education for sustainable development. |
| IET Putú-Huenchullamí | Generate protection, conservation and sustainable management of the natural resources and biodiversity of the basin. | Awareness raising work on the protection and conservation of biodiversity and natural resources - Establish good practices in forestry and agricultural management- Consider limits, commitments and regulations for the extension of forest plantations in the territory - To provide knowledge of local environmental management and tools for the management of natural resources and community waste. |

 |  | IDEM the above |  |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PGTI** | **Strategic view** | **Strategic Lines** |
|  |  | 2. Support in sustainable water management for adaptation to climate change.- Establish technification in the systems and practices of collection, conduction and use of water.- To consider the decrease in rainfall and periods of drought as natural conditions for climate change. |

 |  | IDEM the above |  |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| IET San Nicolás  | Conserve biodiversity, sustainable land management and strengthen resilience to climate change through the consolidation of the integrated agro-ecological model managed by the farmers' committees of the territory. | Manage water and soil resources integrally as ecosystem services to improve agro-ecological production and adaptation to climate change.2. Protect, conserve and recover agro-diversity to enhance intra- and inter-predial biological corridors encompassed as a territorial unit.3. Strengthen the capabilities of farming committees through the acquisition and use of knowledge for sustainable rural development, increasing their role in the self-management of their partnerships with public and private stakeholders in the territory. |

 |  | IDEM the above |  |
|  | 3. Regarding section 5.1 Conclusions (p. 63-66) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ***25*** | The report notes that "the project's focus on smallholder sectors, which have land that is generally highly transformed. For this reason, most are deprived of the ecosystem assets and habitats of the ecoregion they seek to protect, or restore. This generated difficulty when designing activities relevant to the project's objective and, therefore, the project was unable to develop experiences that were scalable to the ecoregion" (p. 63). This conclusion is striking for at least two reasons: first, less than 15% of the original plant cover remains in the Mediterranean ecoregion (PRODOC, p. 12); and second, the project aims to generate environmental benefits "by community organizations" (those that are strongly related to the people who live in the rural areas of the territories, the vast majority of whom are engaged in peasant family agriculture and depend on the ecosystem services provided by the remaining ecosystems). Additionally, the project does not seek to generate only the "protection of ecosystem assets and habitats", but to manage productive socio-ecological landscapes (in contexts where ecosystems are more or less degraded, as appropriate in each territory). These include relevant and feasible actions for the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services in such realities. Environmental benefits are also generated through changes in productive activities, reduction of threats to biodiversity, diversification of land use (including agrobiodiversity) as opposed to monocultures, etc. |  | Please see previous responses. | Clarified |
| ***26*** | The report notes that "evidence for baseline determination for community projects is not present" (p. 64). This conclusion is not correct. All community project documents provided to the evaluators contain information on a) the territory (or landscape) and specific sector in which the project is implemented; b) the current situation of the territory (or landscape) and sector (including characterization of the natural biophysical system, productive land uses, lifestyles, and communities and their relationships); c) problems that the communities in the sector where the project will be implemented have with the management of natural resources (water, soils, biodiversity) and what the project seeks to address; d) causes and effects (or negative consequences) that these problems produce in the communities of the sector; e) what causes will be addressed by the project; f) what solutions will be developed by the community to address these causes; and g) what positive benefits or consequences will be achieved. In addition, project documents include a monitoring and evaluation section (risks, compliance and results indicators). |  | Baselines are generic for IET and community projects. Also, no indicators were designed to monitor progress in the environmental and social variables of the pilot projects, nor is it seen how these are aligned with overall environmental benefits. It was also found that many beneficiaries joined the CMS in order to access project funds, which when they did not do so quickly, they also withdrew. Regarding the limited progress of the project, it has already been explained on several occasions that this is not only related to the number of hectares, but that the limited possibility of replicating the experience, the lack of adequate indicators, the absence of an exit strategy and even less experience systemization factors that have been considered in the analysis. | Clarified |
| ***27*** | The report states that "in terms of the project's physical impact, the limited progress of the project led to the perception by project users of the initiatives in which they participated as improving production and their quality of life, where there is an environmental or nature care component" (pp. 64-65). The project's focus is precisely integral: conservation, production, good living and governance. If the project participants perceived the initiatives as productive improvement associated with nature care, it is a significant achievement. On the other hand, I do not agree that the project has made "limited progress", since this statement seems to be only considering the number of hectares effectively covered with direct actions, or the expected effect on the state or functionality of biodiversity in patches of native forest (which in the Mediterranean ecoregion are usually in the hands of large landowners or in mountain areas of difficult access). However, it does not consider, for example, the mobilization of a significant number of people from small-scale family agriculture in the generation of concrete, replicable and high-impact actions at the level of the property and localities (through the aggregation of demonstrative actions, such as agro-ecological lighthouses, restoration pilots, biodiverse orchards, among others) where the projects were implemented. Scaling up (only expected to occur after the execution of any project) is not only through a large increase in the area of native forest or agricultural areas under sustainable practices, it will also occur through the replicability of agro-ecological practices and the approach of building sustainable productive socio-ecological landscapes that have been demonstrated in the territories. |  | Scaling up can be defined in terms of possibilities that the experience can be transferred to other users, but if there is no information, no lessons learned, no indicators and no exit approach, then the possibilities begin to decline rapidly, as evidenced by many project beneficiaries who are waiting for other projects to arrive. A small number of them show a willingness to look for projects themselves. | Clarified |
| ***28*** | The report points out, with respect to the sustainability of the project, that the accompaniment for new initiatives "will not take place in the short and medium term, as there is no focus on the continuation of what has been done, and in the absence of an articulated strategy with the project's partner services, will prevent them from being able to fill the methodological and financial gap left by the CMS" (p. 66). The certainty with which this conclusion is assured is striking (it could be better weighted as "unlikely to happen", but to say that "it will not happen" is beyond the evaluators' capacity to decree). On the other hand, in this same report the evaluators highlight experiences such as Pedregoso (p. 65) or point out the cases of Alhué and San Nicolás (p. 53) in their relationship with public institutions (CONAF, ASCC, Municipality). It is clear that the process of knowledge management (lessons learned from the communities, which is currently being implemented by a consulting team, and the current implementation of 4 versions of the course for the management of sustainable socio-ecological landscapes with social leaders), will make it possible to better consider this aspect. In addition, the project provided continuity resources to the San Nicolás Farmers' Coordinating Committee, two new agro-ecological groups in Vega de Salas and Carrizal (Cajón del Achibueno) and the Llames Pelehue Neighborhood Council (Lonquimay) for the development of actions to expand their IET and community projects. Regarding the contribution of the GEF CMS on the applied approach, two articles of interest are attached below: Sustainable Productive Practices and its Contribution to the National Plan of Landscape Restoration - MMANature-based solutions to climate change: stories from Chile | International Institute for Environment and Development (iied.org) |  | The term will be changed to "probability” | Accepted |
| ***29*** | There was no process of graduation for SGP Chile. Chile, initially among the upgraded countries, decided to close its SGP country program. It has developed a separate FSP with UNDP as the GEF Agency and the Ministry of Environment as the national executing agency | UNDP | Okay, we had a misunderstanding of the situation. The text was modified. | Accepted |
| ***30*** | Where are these 2m from? If I remember correctly the logframe includes reference to “8 iniciativas a nivel territorial (>1.200.000 ha)” | UNDP | The figure is corrected for the one in the Project Results Framework. However, the 2M ha also appear in PRODOC (see project description, strategy, page 47) | Accepted |
| ***31*** | Same comment as above. While there is an agreement on the fact that some of the initial targets were not realistic, as also pointed out in the MTR and PIRs, I don’t recall any reference to 2m ha. | UNDP | IDEM the above | Accepted |
| ***32*** | It should be clarified here that the tracking tools were not completed at CEO endorsement, and are not completed for SGP projects, including UCPs.In the past there were conversations with monitoring colleagues that for community-based projects (like the GEF SGP projects, or the project in Chile) it did not make sense to compile tracking tools, especially in cases like Chile where the tracking tools were not completed in the CEO phase and there was no baseline.Since GEF6 tracking tools have been replaced with GEF Core Indicators. | UNDP | It should be mentioned that this is not a merely a community project or a SGP, but a multifocal project, where biodiversity, soil degradation and climate change mitigation converge. As mentioned above, the tracking tools for each focal area must be developed at the beginning, middle and end of the project period. Although it is true that the M&E of GEF projects has changed to "core indicators" and the use of tracking tools has been discontinued, this is only effective for projects developed after GEF-6 (or June 2014). GEF-6 projects onwards could use one or the other alternative, but they always had to be evaluated at the beginning, mid-term and end of the project. With respect to the CMS, this project is GEF-5 and did not use the tracking tools. However, it also did not use the core indicators (or sub-indicators) to see compliance for each GEF focal area, so it did not adequately track the environmental variables that it wanted to improve with the CMS. | Clarified |
| ***33*** | This section is not clear to me. Is this a judgment on PIRs? | UNDP | It is not a judgment, it is what was observed in the contents of the analyzed PIRs. | Clarified |