



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Latin America
Country (ies):	Chile
Project Title:	Strengthening and development of instruments for the management, prevention and control of beaver (<i>Castor canadensis</i>), an invasive alien species in the Chilean Patagonia
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/CHI/034/GFF
GEF ID:	5506
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Environment (MMA), National Forest Corporation (CONAF), Wildlife Conservation Society-Chile (WCS), Agriculture and Livestock Service (SAG)
Project Duration:	3 years (2017-2020)

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	July 22 nd , 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	July 3, 2017
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	July 31, 2020
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	NA
Actual Implementation End Date³:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD2,153,882
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	USD5,636,703
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	USD933,826

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

⁴ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	USD1.161.983
--	--------------

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	September 4th, 2018
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	September, 2019
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	N/A
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	N/A
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	No

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Overall implementation progress rating:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Overall risk rating:	Low	Low

Status

Implementation Status <i>(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	2 nd PIR
--	---------------------

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁶ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Felipe Guerra Díaz, Project Coordinator	felipe.guerradiaz@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Hivy Ortiz Chour, RLC Senior Forestry Officer	hivy.Ortizchour@fao.org
Budget Holder	Eve Crowley, FAO Chile Representative	eve.crowley@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Hernán González, Technical Officer María Mercedes Proaño, RLC GEF Project Task Manager	hernan.gonzalez@fao.org mariamercedes.proano@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s):						
Outcome 1.1: Management and governance framework to ensure effective management and control of the invasion in the Magallanes Archipelago and Brunswick Peninsula	a) Score on the GEF tracking tool (section VI on IAS, questions 1,2,3)	a) 1/13	a) 3/13	a) 6/13	2/13 (based on GEF tracking tool)	S
	b) Presence of mechanism for the control and eradication of beaver in the Region of Magallanes, designed and validated with the participation of all stakeholders.	b) Absence of institutional mechanisms.		b) Control and eradication mechanism in place	With the approval of the Biodiversity and Protected Wild Areas Service (SBAP) in charge of the Ministry of the Environment, the coordination and governance plan is being designed with this institution as a leader for beaver management in coordination with all related actors during the GEF project.	

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					The technical and financial information from previous studies as well as those generated during the Project pilots are being systematized to generate the technical and financial strategy. The regulatory framework of the SBAP will efficiently address the legal gaps that existed with regard to beaver management on private land.	
	c) Number of hectares (Region of Magallanes excluding the Antarctic territory) vulnerable to beaver invasion, under effective management and control of beaver invasion	c) 0 hectares		c) 13,229,700 ha covered by the beaver management framework.	The beaver management protocols that are being developed in the pilots are close to completion, the coordinated information, monitoring and early warning system (SCIAT) that will be the viewing platform for all historic	

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					beaver records, as well as new records that show the progress of the species with the objective of monitoring to prioritize control and eradication actions.	
Outcome 1.2: Decision makers have updated, systematized and available information about beaver management in Magallanes, including data on operational zoning, spread, monitoring, early detection, recovery-restoration and research.	a) Score on the GEF tracking tool (section VI on IAS, questions 4,5,6);	a) 3/16	a) 8/16	a) 13/16	4/16	S
		b) There is no systematic and permanent monitoring and early warning system to ensure timely detection of beaver invasion.		b) 1	Conceptual model of the coordinated monitoring and early warning information system designed, structural model of the designed platform, historical data model of castor records designed	
Outcome 1.3: Regional institutions and civil society recognize the importance of beaver eradication	a) MMA, SAG and CONAF staff recognize the importance of the eradication of invasive species to	Little knowledge and insufficient institutional and citizens' capacities to control invasion. Lack of	a) 50% staff aware of the problem	a) 75% staff aware of the problem	A total of 7 institutions were sensitized: Army of Chile, Wildlife Conservation Society, Integrated	S

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
practices and restoration in the Region of Magallanes, including the recovery of riparian forests with endemic species.	biodiversity and productive areas of the Region;	communication and awareness of beaver problem			<p>Territorial Program for sheep (PTI ovino), Regional Ministry of Environment (SEREMI MMA), Development Corporation (CORFO), Regional Ministry of Agriculture (SEREMI AGRI) and the National Forestry Corporation (CONAF).</p> <p>Currently, work is being done to train CONAF personnel in Torres del Paine, park rangers in the Estrecho Park, armed forces and teachers, reaching 60% del staff.</p>	
	b) Staff of the MMA, SAG and CONAF assigned to control, management and eradication of beaver, implement best practices;		b)100% implementing and validating best practices		Model of best practices is in the process of validation by partners.	

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
	c) Number of members of civil society with improved knowledge and attitude on the impact of beaver as an invasive species in agricultural systems and vulnerable ecosystems.		c) 2,000 people have improved their knowledge and attitude on the impact of beaver	c) 3,000 people have improved their knowledge and attitude on the impact of beaver	<p>The implementation of the communications strategy, press management and the treatment that has been made of the beaver's problem in the regional, national and international media has allowed a significant public to be aware of the impact of the beaver on ecosystems of Patagonia.</p> <p>For example, Since its creation, in October 2018, as of July 31, 2019, the website received 1,512 visits, corresponding to unique users, equivalent to 151 visits per month. The newsletter is delivered to a database of 860 people.</p>	HS

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 2.1: Beaver invasion is under effective control in selected areas of native forest and peatlands ecosystem in the Region of Magallanes and in the recovery process of riparian forests with endemic species.	a) Number of hectares and kilometres free of beaver and under basic restoration (i. process of recovery of watercourses; ii. quantity of organic matter in basins)	a) Beaver control in Karukinka and Laguna Parrillar National Reserves according to budget and operational availability Watercourses affected (baseline to be defined in year 1 through satellite images, as part of a cooperation agreement between FAO and Google Earth)	a) 34,271 hectares/278 km free of beaver and 34,271 hectares/278 km in process to be free of beaver	a) 68,543 ha/574km of channels free of beaver (i. watercourses freed from beaver recovered to similar conditions as those watercourses not affected by beaver; ii. organic matter in sediments diminishes in the basins freed from beavers)	<p>Pilot actions in execution phase in La Paciencia valley, 5400ha/39,6 km of channels free of beaver).</p> <p>In Laguna Parrillar National Reserve Pilot, 18,000 hectares have been freed of beaver</p> <p>The surface corresponding to the San Juan river basin was covered by the project "Control, prevention and eradication of harmful fauna in the region of Magallanes" led by the agricultural and livestock service.</p> <p>During the annual meeting of national and regional managers it was established that the results obtained in the project serve to cover the surface of</p>	S

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					the San Juan river basin. This is equivalent to 50,000 hectares free of beaver, including baseline.	
	b) Number of hectares and kilometres under proven early detection of beaver invasion.	b) 0		b) Early detection in 1,499,100 ha/13,660 km of channels hectares	Early warning system protocol designed and ready to be implemented	
Outcome 2.2: Beaver invasion is under effective control in multifunctional private property in the Region of Magallanes.	a) number ha/ number km of channels in multifunctional private property free of beaver and under restoration;	Private landowners perform occasional incipient eradication activities Significant impact on farming systems	a) 22.621 ha /225km free of beaver and in process to be free of beaver	a) 45,243ha/ 450km hectares free of beaver	Pilot actions in execution phase in Marazzi river basin, 31,670.1ha/315 km of channels free of beaver. Livestock farms with agreements for work on their land: Estancia Cameron, Estancia California, Estancia Rosa Irene, Sección California, Estancia Florida, Estancia Rio Hondo, Estancia entre ríos, Estancia	S

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					Tres Hermanos, Estancia San Clemente, Estancia 6 de mayo, Estancia Laguna Cortada	
	b) number ha of forests in process of recovery (recovery of lenga trees <i>Nothofagus pumilio</i> and Antarctic beeches <i>Nothofagus Antarctica</i> in progress in affected areas)			b) 1000ha forest in process of recovery		
OUTCOME 3.1. Project implementation based on a results-based management approach and application of project findings and lessons learned in future operations facilitated.	Achievable and sustainable project outcomes	Project Outcomes Framework with indicators, baseline and goals of outcomes and outputs validated with key actors	30-40% progress in the achievement of project outcomes	Project outcomes are achieved and show sustainability	Project in progress with 30% progress. Approved semiannual and annual reports. For the entry of information from the key actors (SAG, CONAF and WCS) to the coordinated system of information, monitoring and early warning it was necessary to agree among the	S

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					key actors, what type of information is useful to generate the historical data model.	

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
1.1.1 Strategic and financial plan for the management of beaver as an invasive species	Q4Y3	Baseline study	Preparation of document with technical and financial information In preparation of the strategy with the technical and financial information of the historical documents on strategies of eradication of the beaver, the information generated in the pilots of the Laguna Parrillar reserve (completed), Karukinka Park and Marazzi River (soon to finish) as well as the update of the economic and social assessment of the impact of the beaver. This strategy must be adopted by the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Service (SBAP), a service that is in the approval phase at the congress. If the SBAP is not approved at the end of the GEF project, it is the Ministry of the Environment through its departments linked to the protection of biodiversity that must use the information in this strategy for optimal beaver management.				30%	Information at field level is collected to have good data on financial needs.

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹² As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹³ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

1.1.2 Coordination and governance plan of beaver management as an invasive species	Q4Y3	Baseline study	<p>Preparation of document with on beaver eradication, management, control and early warning actions</p> <p>The coordination and governance plan is being developed in parallel to the design of the coordinated information, monitoring and early warning system and the adaptive dispersion and zoning model.</p> <p>These products will guide decision makers on how to optimally manage the beaver's threat.</p> <p>With the dispersion model and adaptive zoning, binational beaver management actions can be designed.</p> <p>For this, it has been possible to establish information exchange agreements between the two countries through the Ministry of Environment of Chile and the General Secretariat of Environment and Sustainable Development of Argentina</p>			40%	
1.1.3 Evaluation of current and potential economic impact of beaver in Chilean Patagonia	Q4Y1	In hiring process	<p>Progress Report 1 approved. This report contains the identification and classification of social actors, the conceptual framework based on the concept of ecosystem services for economic and social valuation and the methodological tools for valuation.</p> <p>The second progress report (under review) contains the preliminary results of the economic and social assessment of the impact of the beaver.</p>			70%	
1.1.4 Validated regulatory framework for beaver management at municipal and regional level	Q4Y3	Baseline study.	<p>In an exploratory study on the possibility of generating sub-national regulatory frameworks such as rural municipal ordinances, the conclusion was that they do not have the technical or financial resources to monitor compliance with the ordinances. In addition, municipal ordinances must be linked to a law or decree, however, there is no national legal framework where, first, the beaver is defined as an invasive alien species and second, actions for its management.</p>			20%	At the last meeting of the committee of national directors, the coordination team expressed the intention to reformulate this product after the mid-term evaluation.

			It is assumed that the legal framework of the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Service (SBAP) incorporates this definition and the actions for its management					
1.2.1 Coordinated Information, Monitoring and Early Warning System (CMWS)	Q4Y2	- Baseline study to generate CMWS - Early warning system action protocol designed and ready to be approved	preparation of the historical data model, beaver information visualization platform and computer applications for new data entry				40%	
1.2.2. Spread and adaptive zoning model per management unit	Q4Y3	Baseline study of the historical information and generated by the pilots about beaver's distributions	Information needs for the dispersion model gathered. Review of new technologies for beaver monitoring				30%	
1.2.3. Sub Antarctic ecosystems recovery indicators applied in control and eradication pilot sites	Q4Y3	Diagnosis of beaver distribution to elaborate the matrix with ecosystem recovery criteria	Matrix of ecosystem recovery indicators impacted by beaver				100%	
1.2.4. Information exchange protocols between Chile	Q4Y3	Information exchange protocol elaborated	The environmental ministries of Chile and Argentina have generated agreements for the exchange of information on the beaver.				40%	when the historical data model of the CMWS is designed, the data entry protocols can be shared with the teams in Argentina

and Argentina at the regional, national and binational level								
1.3.1. Communication and awareness raising programmes for different target audiences	Q4Y3	Communication strategy elaborated	Communication strategy implemented, socialized communication products with different social actors (games, calendars, website, banner). Wide coverage in regional, national and international media				70%	
1.3.2. Capacity building programme for key stakeholders for the management and eradication of beaver	Q4Y2	Social actors identified, classified and mapped to begin capacity building programs	Press teams from public institutions and non-governmental organizations trained in strategic communication of the beaver problem. A total of 7 institutions were sensitized with (Army of Chile, Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Integrated Territorial Program for sheep (PTI ovino), Regional Ministry of Environment (SEREMI MMA), Development Corporation (CORFO), Regional Ministry of Agriculture (SEREMI AGRI) and the National Forestry Corporation (CONAF))				30%	Next stage, training of park rangers of the national forestry corporation (CONAF) in the province of Última Esperanza, park rangers of the Parque del Estrecho, Armed Forces and Teachers
2.1.1. Beaver eradication and basic restoration method designed and implemented in Karukinka Park	Q4Y3	Acquisition of necessary equipment to develop the pilot and begin of baseline study	Pilot started in November 2018. Campaigns can only be carried out during the summer and autumn months if the weather is favorable. In the case of the Patience Valley, the vulnerable sites are few since the tops of both slopes are too high and with a high slope. The only vulnerable dispersal sites are the mouth of the Sanchez River in seno Almirantazgo and the desired and despised lake towards the Azopardo River. The monitoring system is done at the same				30%	

			time as the trapping is done to prevent beavers from getting used to human presence.					
2.1.2. Beaver eradication and basic restoration method designed and implemented in Laguna Parrillar National Reserve and downstream private lands	Q4Y3	First stage in Laguna Parrillar National Reserve completed	Pilot completed, beaver management model in protected wild areas prepared Demonstration experience of beaver management divided into three stages. Baseline with beaver findings, capture of three beavers, reinvasion monitoring and beaver management model proposal as a proposal to be incorporated by the park rangers of the National Forestry Corporation (CONAF). Pilot actions are systematized pending publication in manuals of good practice in protected wildlife areas				100%	
2.1.3. Early Warning System (EWS) Method to be implemented in the Southeast area of Ultima Esperanza province, including the Torres del Paine National Park	Q4Y3	Early warning system protocol designed and ready to be approved	The elaborated operations diagram details which private and public actors involved in an effective SAT should be and is presented in two scenarios: (A) the ideal to implement an efficient system in Chile, which requires the existence of an MMA-dependent service responsible for conducting active surveillance, receiving reports, verifying information, confirming in the field, administering the database and executing responses; and (B) a temporarily functional SAT, considering the administrative system in force in Chile, in which the land activities would be carried out by the Agricultural and Livestock Service (SAG) or the National Forestry Corporation (CONAF) according to the jurisdiction corresponding to the responsibility of each institution				30%	Next stage, training for different social actors in the use of the platform of the coordinated system of information, monitoring and early warning and the early warning protocol
2.1.4. Systematization of best practices for beaver eradication,	Q4Y3		Only the pilot of the Laguna Parrillar Reserve is finished. The manual of this pilot experience is in the stage of selecting priority information (methodology, administrative aspects and financial aspects)				20%	

invasion monitoring and early warning								
2.2.1. Sustained control and restoration methodologies for multiple-use private property.	Q4Y3	First stage of the pilot in execution (baseline study in the field)	Pilot in execution Pilot started in May 2018. Complete baseline on beaver distribution on the pilot's surface. Public-private cooperation strategies in development with agreements between farmers for the management of beaver on their farms. Basic restoration monitoring system based on active actions (elimination of beavers and restitution of the riverbed)				70%	
2.2.2. Systematization of a 'best practices' model for multifunctional private property	Q4Y3		Pilot in execution is expected to end in September 2019.				10%	
Output 3.1.1. Project progress assessment and monitoring system			2 semiannual project progress reports (IPP) and two annual Project Execution Review (PIR) reports.				70%	Because the Project began in July, two semiannual Project Progress reports coincide with the Annual Project Execution Review Reports (PIR)
3.1.2 Mid-Term Independent Review (MTR) and Final Independent Evaluation (FIE)			Consultants for mid-term evaluation in the evaluation stage. It is expected that consultants can carry out field activities during the summer months				10%	

3.1.3 Publication and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned			The main publications of the project correspond to the manuals of good practices of the pilots as well as the study of the socioeconomic impact of the beaver, the coordinated information system, monitoring and early warning. These products have not yet finished. They are expected to be ready during the first half of 2020				20%	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-----	--



Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

Max 200 words:

The main achievements are related to the operationalization of the communication strategy of the Project, with a strong and powerful force idea: "The conservation of biodiversity and the ecosystems of Patagonia against the threat of the beaver". This is evidenced in the treatment of the information generated by the press media. From a focus on the slaughter of beavers towards a focus on impacts on biodiversity and conservation elements.

Another important achievement is the completion of the pilot of the Laguna Parrillar reserve with successful results in local beaver eradication and evidence of the beaver's progress in areas that had not been prospected.

Another important achievement is the advance in the Marazzi river pilot and the commitment of all the farmers linked to the pilot to allow the entry of the trappers team.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

Max 200 words:

The greatest challenges correspond to the climatic factor and the need to constantly sensitize the different actors that the GEF project does not have the objective of eradicating beavers, but that its objective is to improve the institutional frameworks for the management of invasive alien species, as well as to incorporate conservation of biodiversity and ecosystems of Patagonia.

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	The project is developing satisfactorily, however, it is necessary to consider that the weather can affect the execution of the pilots
Budget Holder	S	S	The project is developing satisfactorily. The coordinating agency is making the necessary arrangements and activities contributing to the development of a Management and governance framework to ensure effective management and control of the beaver invasion in the Magallanes Archipelago and Brunswick Peninsula. The main challenge is the very short season for field work in the Patagonia.

¹⁵ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	S	S	Communication strategy is a successful tool with high impact at regional, national and international level. Several newspapers are interested in invasive species control and eradication and the problem of beaver in Magallanes has been published also at international level with NatGeo. In relation to the coordination with Argentina it is important to mention an increase collaboration with the Provincia de Tierra del Fuego that have permanent communication with GEF personnel in Magallanes. Project major risk is associated to the establishment of the Biodiversity Service and Protected Areas (SBAP), because it will be the main responsible office to control invasive species in the country. Climate and geographical conditions in Karukika have been a major difficulty to implement the pilot in this area. Alternatives to complete the project results will be proposed during the midterm evaluation. Innovative methods using SEPAL are now in evaluation for better monitor beaver distribution in the area. Good collaboration with the MMA at local level is a plus for the appropriate implementation of the process.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	S	While the project is developing satisfactorily, a special attention needs to be paid to the institutional strengthening process. Once the project is over, the governance framework for beaver constant monitoring and eradication needs to be fully owned up by the regional institutions in order to ensure sustainability. A remarkable effort has been made in component two, where pilot actions have already finished and eradication has already taken place.

¹⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall classification (at submission)	Project (at project)	Risk project	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low			It is not necessary to modify the risk classification

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant .

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
--	------	---------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------------

¹⁸ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

¹⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁰ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	National and subnational authorities do not include IAS management measures, including beaver, in their institutional priorities.	L	The NBSAP, developed through a participatory process, identifies the impact of IAS and establishes the need for IAS management. The project deals specifically with the barriers that impede the implementation of management measures by regional institutions of Magallanes. Specifically, the project mitigates the risk through awareness-raising and specific training for target audiences, including officials and decision makers of the institutions involved in the eradication of the beaver. The consultation processes carried out during the design stage, allowed the regional authorities of Magallanes to work in planning activities during project implementation, and agree on field activities related to staff training needs (according to their responsibilities, as mentioned above), the identification of pilot sites, recognition of the ecological diversity of the territory, land tenure and social conditions to classify the different realities that exist in Magallanes. Consultation and awareness raising programmes with municipalities will facilitate the implementation of local practices. Awareness, information and outreach programmes for the civil society will also help to position the need for IAS control in the territory. Coordination with the GEF 4330 project in Chile and GEF 4768 project in Argentina will allow a better positioning at the local, national and international policy level.	The continuous diffusion and awareness of the different stakeholders through communication programs, capacity building and meetings with the authorities, allows managing this risk	
2	Potential funding gaps in the next EECF phase	L	The project will consider the necessary steps to agree on a participatory design of the action plan which includes a financial component in terms of costs as well as funding sources. Furthermore, the economic impact study of the beaver will provide the elements to negotiate additional resources. The participation of the private sector (breeders, forest and tourism) is an additional source of funding. The adoption of practices on private lands, based on the interest of eradicate IAS, will lead to the restoration of the same. Once these groups are trained in best practices implementation, they may apply them to their own territories with the assistance of government agencies	The coordination of the GEF Project together with the regional environmental secretariat have considered revising the regional funds to give sustainability to the GEF project. The objective is to enhance the coordinated system of information, monitoring and early warning and add other exotic species associated with the beaver such as mink, muskrat and yellow jacket wasp.	It may be necessary to consider other funding sources to carry out beaver eradication actions in other areas of the region, since the GEF project would be executed simultaneously with the FNDR project executed by the Agriculture and Livestock Service. This did not happen due to the delay of the start of the GEF project

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Climate change could increase the rate of invasion or lead to another beaver-related threat	M	IAS's threat to vulnerable ecosystems increases when they adapt to new conditions posing a risk of introduction or re-invasion, augmented by an increase in the number of extreme events (floods, droughts, etc.) or higher stress on native species which increases vulnerability. The Second National Communication to the UNFCCC (MMA, 2011) provides good detailed prospective models for the whole country, including the region of Magallanes, reporting on the prioritization of activities in the future management system. The project develops capacities for proactive and adaptive management enabling a more robust response to less favourable conditions as the ones projected in future climate scenarios. Climate change variables are monitored over relatively longer periods of time, beyond the PPG implementation, making difficult, during the design phase, to draw conclusions for the implementation phase. However, some conditions were identified that will help to develop strategies, namely, the role of tides and currents in the spread of the beaver, which enables to identify spread models and vulnerable sites, and hence, propose actions for beaver invasion control, management and early warning.	The project considers climate change for the elaboration of the dispersion model and early warning system managing the risk of advance of beaver	
4	Local communities and/or key stakeholders are not fully committed or do not adopt the practices proposed	L	The project supports and coordinates efforts to ensure that the plan integrates key stakeholders and understands their motivation and interests (Outcome 1.3). On the other hand, increasing institutional capacities and a thorough review of the institutional framework should reduce the number of practices against the objective of the project. Communication activities during the project aim at raising stakeholders' awareness of the IAS problem. Stakeholders of local communities, private sector, civil society, academia, were invited to participate in the design phase of this project. Workshops, site visits and landowners' visits were made to define training needs to address the problem recognized by these groups. At the local level, no stakeholders opposed to the project implementation were identified. There may be some resistance from animal defenders' groups, mainly based in the Metropolitan Region. During the implementation of the project, all internationally agreed standards in terms of humanitarian measures will be observed, because of conviction of the staff involved and to reduce the negative connotation that such intervention may have on people.	The project's communications team maintains constant communication with the different actors about the problem of invasive alien species, particularly the beaver. Communication is differentiated by type of actor, from the most technical or the most general. Focusing both on the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystems in Patagonia, as well as on the need to improve institutional frameworks for beaver management	The identification, classification and mapping of those involved, as well as the communication strategy, allows us to define the communication actions necessary to manage this risk

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
5	There is no access to private properties.	L	Consultations during the PPG phase and those foreseen in the project, suggest that the incorporation of farmers, as partners of the institutions participating in the project, would help to mitigate risks. By way of example, two private landowners have committed their participation in pilot activities. Agreements with private landowners were achieved during the PPG (including project endorsement letters), but given the nature of the property, their interest may lessen or the property may change ownership what would end up in new negotiations.	The project has maintained communication with the farmers and has established meetings with Magallanes Farmers Association (ASOGAMA) in order to maintain the cooperation of this economic sector. Due to this, all the owners who had not approved the entrance to their properties have given their approval to carry out beaver eradication actions.	
6	Restoration of ecosystems does not occur spontaneously or cannot be carried out after successful control and eradication operations	L	There are enough pristine ecosystems in Patagonia that can provide genetic material within proximities, including the same watersheds, for the reproduction of the main plant species. The project includes restoration activities to demonstrate the most appropriate and cost-effective methods. The scientific evidence compiled during the design phase of the project provides the basis to estimate this risk as minimal. The workshop 'Designing pilots to manage beaver invasion in Patagonia' was held in Punta Arenas, March 2015, during the PPG phase. Reference states for ecological restoration of ecosystems and management practices were analysed. During the session, input was received from the experience of forest restoration in Torres del Paine after the fire in 2010, the restoration plan of Cohiue forest in Magallanes, the work experience of SEREMIS of the Ministry of Agriculture and the MMA with seeds and the experience of the Centre for Agricultural and Environmental Studies of Magallanes. However, it is worth noting that restoration of temperate forests takes time before showing any changes, which may not be in line with the time framework of this project. Nevertheless, if there is no negative impact caused by flooding, the ecosystem will tend to restore itself. If there is an intervention, the process may be speeded up, but the forest will not be fully recovered within three years, which is the time framework of the project.	According to the matrix of recovery indicators, there are two types of actions (passive and active). The active ones involve the capture of beavers that impact a certain area and the breaking of the dam. Passives involve knowing the type of dominant vegetation to design recovery monitoring plans	

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
7	Delay in the execution of pilots due to the climate in the region	L	. The winter season can get ahead or be delayed by impacting the planning of pilot actions.	In the case of the Marazzi river pilot, the field campaigns have been better planned, prioritizing those higher areas where access is difficult in the fall and winter season. In the case of the Karukinka pilot, field campaigns can only be carried out in the summer months, which has made it difficult to meet the objectives. The coordination of the Project, together with the FAO, Ministry of Environment and WCS decided that eradication efforts will focus on a certain area in order to guarantee an optimal beaver management model, while the rest of the surface will be will make baseline to have a record of the beaver situation	

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High):

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
L	L	There are no changes in the final assessment.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²¹

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs	No	

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<div>Original NTE:</div> <div>Revised NTE:</div> <div>Justification:</div>

²¹ Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?

The project is encourage women participation in all activities, particularly on training activities associated to early warning systems, monitoring and communication and awareness raising programmes where there is a higher number of women working on this areas and where their contribution have higher impact in the society.

WCS has trained 10 women to perform different tasks related to beaver management (monitoring, trapping, measurement of environmental recovery indicators, etc.). However, they recognize that there is an important gender gap that is difficult to address in this region.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

There is no participation of indigenous communities in the project.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Informative meetings have been held with the partners and other involved actors with the objective of raising awareness, educating and communicating the actions that are being carried out in the project, as well as what kind of activities should have the support of the community.

The main challenge is to motivate the community about the impact of invasive alien species, particularly the beaver.

- **Aguas Magallanes (Water Company)**

- Date: October 26, 2017
 - Participants: Wladimir Gil, operations and infrastructure manager and Job Contreras, Head of the Production and Purification Department.
 - Purpose: Information, consultation and search for links for mutual collaboration
 - Outcomes: Agreement to work together in beaver management.
- Date: March 23, 2018
 - Participants: Job Contreras, Head of the Production and Purification Department
 - Purpose: now in the field the impact of the beaver in the facilities of Tierra del Fuego.
 - Outcomes: The project can help in the acquisition of more traps and a re-training or new training in the use of traps to improve their management and agreement to talk with the regional manager of the company generate collaboration agreement.

- **Armed forces (army, navy, air force)**

- Date: March 13, 2018
- Participants:
- Purpose: Inform and sensitize the Undersecretariat of Defense and Armed Forces on the issue of the beaver and its relationship with monitoring the progress of the species in military areas
- Outcomes: Nexus with the Armed Forces and the Undersecretariat for the Armed Forces for their involvement in awareness, education and capacity building programs.

Municipality of Timaukel (Tierra del Fuego)

- Date: May 18, 2018.
- Participants: Diego Rodríguez Ariztía, municipal administrator
- Purpose: Present GEF project and get support in the Tierra del Fuego Province
- Outcomes: Municipality committed to support in everything they can to make the GEF project succeed
-

- **Governance of Última Esperanza**

- Date: June 7, 2018.
- Participants: Ana Mayorga Bahamonde, Governor of Última Esperanza
- Purpose: Present GEF project to new authority and get support in Última Esperanza province
- Outcomes: Governance committed to support in everything they can to make the GEF project succeed

-

- **Governance of Tierra del Fuego**

- Date: June 21, 2018
- Participants: Margarita Norambuena Caviedes, Governor of Tierra del Fuego
- Purpose: Present GEF project to new authority and get support in Tierra del Fuego province
- Outcomes:
- stakeholder in the Early Warning System
- Outcomes: Institution's commitment to provide assistance in case of emergencies and confirmation of personnel for capacity building programs.

- **Police Service**

- Date: May 2, 2018
- Participants: General Gonzalo del Alcazar, Jefe de Zona
- Purpose: Present GEF project and get support in case of emergencies during pilot actions and as a key stakeholder in the Early Warning System
- Outcomes: Institution's commitment to provide assistance in case of emergencies and confirmation of personnel for capacity building programs.

- **Magallanes Farmers Association (ASOGAMA)**

- Date: May 14, 2018
- Participants: Grani Martic, President of ASOGAMA
- Purpose: Present GEF project and get support from the association to raise awareness of its members in the beaver problem
- Outcomes: Support as an association to congregate the farmers of the association in capacity building campaigns

- National Tourism Service and Regional Government
 - Date: July 06, 2018
 - Participants: María Angélica Olguín, Nancy Gómez
 - Purpose: Inform and commit support for dissemination and capacity building campaigns for beaver management
 - Outcomes: The national tourism service undertakes to participate in the training of its personnel as well as to link the associations of tour guides and operators.

The regional government territorial unit undertook to support and participate in the dissemination and training of its personnel in the use of the platform of the coordinated information, monitoring and early warning system

- Forestry institute (INFOR)
 - Date: December 14, 2018
 - Participants: Gerardo Vergara
 - Purpose: inform and train forest institute personnel in monitoring and beaver findings who will carry out native forest cadastre activities in the province of Última Esperanza
 - Outcomes: 10 people were trained to monitor beaver records. The results showed no presence of beaver in the monitored areas

- Strait of Magellan Park
 - Date: April 18, 2019
 - Participants: Paulina González
 - Purpose: Coordinate activities for capacity building for park rangers
 - Outcomes: On August 29, training will be carried out for personnel from the Strait Park on issues of beaver management (legislation, monitoring, trapping, beaver issues, etc.

- EXPLORA CONICYT
 - Date: July 30, 2019
 - Participants: Hermann Reiher, Cindy Galaz

- Purpose: link to the EXPLORA project of the national commission of science and technology (CONICYT) with the problem of beaver through its programs to disseminate science in educational centers.
 - Outcomes: The project will participate in the program "one thousand scientists, one thousand classrooms" in dissemination talks on the problem of invasive alien species such as the beaver and the conservation of Patagonian biodiversity
- Villa las Nieves school and Juan William school
- Date: June 7, 2019
 - Participants: Marcia Velásquez, Jorge Cabezas Arcos and Pamela Villagrán
 - Purpose: sensitize teachers in charge of the environment on the issue of beaver and deliver communication products to the teaching community (calendars and information folders). In addition, support was requested for future education and awareness campaigns
 - Outcomes: It was possible to compromise the support of both schools for the next campaigns, as well as to be part of the capacity building campaigns on various issues related to beaver as an invasive exotic species

8. Knowledge Management Activities

approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval

- The GEF-Castor project has made it possible to sensitize the different local and national social actors about the impact of the beaver on the ecosystems of the Magallanes region through a solid communication, education and awareness campaign. From this, the community has learned to value more its natural heritage and the need to conserve it against the need to manage the threat of invasive alien species.
- The use of new technologies such as drones has made it possible to demonstrate from another point of view the impact and progress of the beaver in the Magallanes region.-

<https://youtu.be/BunuMDAsdmY>

<https://youtu.be/kpOfokLG6qM>

<https://gefcastor.mma.gob.cl/>

<https://www.nationalgeographic.com/animals/2019/07/beaver-overpopulation-tierra-del-fuego/>

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	MMA	CASH	\$124.760	\$54.692		
		IN KIND	1.425.040	\$57.111		
National Government	CONAF	CASH	114.200	62.738		
		IN KIND	1.676.000	162.729		
National Government	SAG	CASH	16.965	13.702		
		IN KIND	1.149.405	744.993		
ONG	WCS	CASH	89.614	10.750		
		IN KIND	803.858	55.268		
Private	TERAIKE S.A.	IN KIND	2.243			
Private	Estancia Entre Ríos	CASH	2.243			
		IN KIND	12.125			
GEF Agency	FAO	CASH	20.000			
		IN KIND				
		TOTAL	5.636.703	1.161.983		

²² Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.