



## **Mid-Term Review of FAO-GEF Project**

**FAO Project ID: GCP/CHI/050/GFF**

**GEF Project ID: 10718**

Restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services at the landscape scale on productive agroforestry areas and their natural environment.

### **Final Report – Executive Summary**

**Data collection conducted between 28 of August and 23 of September of 2025.**

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS**

**Santiago, Chile**

**April 2026**

# Mid-Term Review

Restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services at the landscape scale on productive agroforestry areas and their natural environment.

---

## Implementing agency

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

## Implementing partners

Ministry of the Environment, and National Forestry Corporation

## Funding

Global Environment Facility

---

Germán Luebert and Pía Palma-Inzunza

## Review Team

Aníbal Labra

## Review Manager

November 20, 2025



# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....4

Acronyms and abbreviations.....5

Executive summary .....6

# Acknowledgements

The review team, consisting of consultants Germán Luebert and Pía Palma-Inzunza, under the management of Aníbal Labra, specialist in monitoring and evaluation of environmental projects at FAO Chile, would like to thank those who provided support, facilitated, and/or participated in this process.

The review highlights the active collaboration of the staff of the FAO national office in Chile. Special thanks to Eve Crowley, Representative, and Andrea Sáez, Program Associate. Thank you very much for your willingness to be interviewed and for your ongoing support.

We are grateful for the valuable support of Emilia Brentan, Portfolio Monitoring Specialist at the FAO-GEF/FAO-HQ Coordination Unit, who provided technical assistance and quality control throughout the review process. Her contribution was essential in strengthening the technical consistency and rigor of the report.

We would also like to acknowledge Andrea Cabezas, the National Project Coordinator, the professional team responsible for implementing the different components, the territorial facilitators, and the support teams who were attentive to the requirements of the review. We are also especially grateful to Jaime Valdés, member of the project team and focal point for the review. His support in the logistics of fieldwork and in organizing relevant documentation was fundamental to the development of this work.

We also extend our gratitude to the state institutions, especially the authorities and officials of the Ministry of the Environment, the National Forestry Corporation, and the Agricultural Development Institute. Thank you very much for your time and the valuable information you provided.

Finally, we would like to thank the officials and representatives of municipalities, regional governments, and other state institutions, as well as the beneficiary groups who gave their time to be interviewed and/or to accompany the review during the collection of information in the field.

# Acronyms and abbreviations

<b>BD</b>	Biodiversity
<b>BH</b>	<i>Budget Holder</i>
<b>BTOR</b>	Back to Office Report, Travel Report
<b>CDP</b>	Project Steering Committee
<b>CGP</b>	Project Management Committee
<b>CLPI</b>	Free, Prior, and Informed Consent
<b>CNP</b>	National Project Coordinator
<b>CONAF</b>	National Forestry Corporation
<b>DNP</b>	National Project Director
<b>FAO</b>	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
<b>UC FAO-GEF</b>	FAO-GEF Coordination Unit (FAO Headquarters, Rome)
<b>GEF</b>	Global Environment Facility
<b>GORE</b>	Sub-National Government
<b>GTO</b>	GEF Technical Officer
<b>INDAP</b>	National Institute for Agricultural Development
<b>MMA</b>	Ministry of the Environment
<b>M&amp;E</b>	Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organization
<b>LTO</b>	Lead Technical Officer
<b>PFO-GEF</b>	GEF Operational Focal Point
<b>PIF</b>	Project Identification Form
<b>PIR</b>	Annual Project Implementation Review Reports
<b>PPG</b>	Project Preparation Grant Document GEF
<b>PPR</b>	Semiannual Project Progress Report
<b>PRODOC</b>	Project Document
<b>PTF</b>	<i>Project Task Force</i> , interdisciplinary project working group (FAO)
<b>PTPA</b>	Annual Work Plan and Budget
<b>MTR</b>	Mid-Term Review
<b>SAS</b>	Environmental and Social Safeguards
<b>SBAP</b>	Service for Biodiversity and Protected Areas
<b>SEREMI</b>	Regional Ministerial Secretariat
<b>TdC</b>	Theory of Change
<b>TdR</b>	Terms of Reference
<b>PMU</b>	Project Management Unit
<b>UNEG</b>	United Nations Evaluation Group
<b>USD</b>	United States dollar

## Executive summary

- RE1. The project "Restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services at the landscape scale on productive agroforestry areas and their natural environment" - hereinafter referred to as the "Project" - is an initiative financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and jointly executed by the Chilean Ministry of the Environment (MMA) and the National Forestry Corporation (CONAF).
- RE2. It has a total budget of USD \$43,076,878, of which USD \$5,674,032 corresponds to the grant provided by the GEF and USD \$37,402,846 to co-financing committed by various national partner institutions and the FAO.
- RE3. It formally began on November 7, 2022, with its kick-off workshop on April 17, 2023, and is expected to be completed on November 6, 2027, for a total duration of 60 months.
- RE4. According to the guidelines for managing GEF-funded projects, halfway through their implementation period projects financed by the fund must undergo a Mid-Term Review (MTR). This report was prepared in that context.
- RE5. The objective of the review was to conduct an independent assessment of the relevance of the project's design and actions implemented at mid-term, its effectiveness in product development and the achievement of results and objectives, the efficient use of resources, the incorporation of cross-cutting perspectives, the review of factors that may be affecting the performance of the Project, and the likelihood that the effects obtained will be sustained once funding ceases (sustainability).
- RE6. The purpose of this was to be accountable to stakeholders, draw lessons learned, and make recommendations aimed at improving, correcting, and/or enhancing the project's performance in the future.

## Main findings

### Relevance

- RE7. The project is highly relevant. It responds decisively to the needs and interests of the local beneficiary communities, the priorities of GEF-7, the strategies of the FAO, and the priorities of the Chilean government in terms of restoration.

### Effectiveness

- RE8. In the medium term, progress toward the goals associated with results and the development of the products defined in the Prodoc is advancing at a slower pace than planned, reflecting implementation challenges that still need to be overcome.
- RE9. Although performance is unfavorable between what was planned and what has been achieved, both key actors and the MTR understand that, with the strengthening of some key areas, it is likely that the goals will be met and, above all, that decisive progress will be made in the Project's theory of change.
- RE10. Despite the difficulties observed in implementation, the project shows signs of progress toward establishing enabling environments and strengthening institutional and community capacities.

## **Efficiency**

- RE11. The project has executed 36% of the budget planned for the mid-term and has a significant margin of resources still available (76% of the total for the five years). While this situation represents a weakness in time management, it is also an opportunity to strengthen investment in pending outputs and to adjust actions in the second phase of implementation.
- RE12. While the MTR recognizes recent efforts to accelerate execution and strengthen technical and administrative management, it estimates that, even with increased spending, the remaining implementation time will not be sufficient to execute the entire budget, consolidate the expected results, and ensure the sustainability of ongoing actions. In this regard, it considers it necessary to assess the possibility of requesting an extension of the implementation period in order to guarantee the fulfillment of key outputs, the consolidation of the processes initiated, and the achievement of expected results and impacts.

## **Performance factors**

### **Design**

- RE13. During the project design stage, the elements required by GEF-7 were incorporated and the procedures followed. However, weaknesses were identified in the formulation of some targets associated with outcome indicators and in the narrative statement of the intended impacts.

### **Implementation**

- RE14. FAO has complied with the basic functions and quality standards required by the GEF in its guidelines and fiduciary standards.
- RE15. In its role as implementing agency, it has satisfactorily accompanied the process of identification, preparation, formulation, and implementation of the project, ensuring technical and administrative quality in each phase of the cycle.

### **Execution**

- RE16. The MMA and CONAF, as executing and co-executing entities, respectively, have performed as planned. Both institutions have integrated and contributed strategic and operational guidance to the Steering Committee. When deemed necessary, they have encouraged their members to maintain the alignment and contribution of the Project to the deployment of the PNRP and to integrate and/or adjust some products so that they respond coherently to the context of transformation that both institutions are undergoing.

### **Co-financing**

- RE17. As of June 2025, the institutions that committed to co-financing have reported and documented a contribution equivalent to 78% of the total assumed, i.e., \$29,148.92 of \$37,402.84 USD.
- RE18. It is noteworthy that, although the project has a high level of reported co-financing, this volume of resources has not yet translated into greater programmatic effectiveness or proportional progress in some of the outcome indicators.
- RE19. This is explained by the fact that a significant part of the co-financing comes from existing institutional programs and budgets, mainly aimed at strengthening environmental governance (an area in which the Project shows significant progress), as well as regional restoration actions that, in some cases, intersect with the landscapes of intervention but, nevertheless, these contributions are not being systematically accounted for as effective contributions to the achievement of the project's goals.

### **Monitoring and evaluation**

RE20. The Project has a Monitoring and Evaluation System (M&E) tailored to the initiative's monitoring and accountability needs. The M&E system that has been implemented has enabled and facilitated the Project's adequate and timely fulfillment of its accountability responsibilities through semi-annual and annual reports.

### **Cross-cutting perspectives**

RE21. The Project has consistently integrated gender and Indigenous Peoples' perspectives into the intervention cycle.

RE22. For the MTR, the gender approach and the inclusion of Indigenous Peoples constitute one of the most robust areas of the Project with the greatest potential for replication and scaling up.

### **Safeguards**

RE23. In accordance with its moderate risk categorization and GEF guidelines, the Project has taken the necessary measures to avoid harmful effects on the communities and habitats where it operates.

### **Sustainability**

RE24. The implementation challenges and the still incipient results being achieved by the Project, added to the fact that 76% of the total budget remains to be executed, limit the MTR's ability to assess the likelihood that the effects obtained and processes promoted will be sustained once funding ceases.

RE25. Furthermore, the imminent change of government introduces uncertainty regarding the continuity of environmental and restoration policies and, consequently, the support that the new administration will provide to the Project.

## **Conclusions**

RE26. The Project is highly relevant given the magnitude of soil degradation, biodiversity loss, and the fragility of ecosystem services in the intervention areas in particular and in the country in general.

RE27. Its design is strongly aligned with the priorities of GEF-7 in terms of land degradation and biodiversity, with the FAO Strategy, and with the policies and commitments of the Chilean State, particularly the National Landscape Restoration Plan (PNRP) and the recent Law 21.600, which creates the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Service (SBAP). It constitutes a relevant and timely programmatic response to an environmental problem that affects both the provision of ecosystem services and the livelihoods of the rural populations participating in the project.

RE28. The high relevance contrasts with the observed effectiveness. In the medium term, the programmatic progress observed is less than expected. Progress in meeting the indicators and outputs shows lower technical execution than planned, which has limited the generation of tangible intermediate results.

RE29. Despite this reality, the Project shows signs, albeit incipient, of contributing to institutional and community strengthening, laying a solid foundation for the second half of its implementation.

RE30. The establishment of governance bodies at the national, regional, and local levels; the strengthening of technical capacities; the systematic incorporation of a gender and indigenous peoples' perspective; the creation of territorial linkages; and the successful implementation of the Project in the pilot landscapes constitute significant advances that contribute to its theory of change.

RE31. From an efficiency perspective, the project shows a financial under-execution of 64% compared to the medium-term plan. While this situation reflects weaknesses in time management and in the synchronization between technical and administrative programming, it also represents a strategic

opportunity to redirect efforts, prioritize key products, and introduce corrections that will accelerate implementation during the second phase.

RE32. A strong point to highlight is the mainstreaming of gender and intercultural perspectives. The actions deployed have ensured meaningful participation by women and indigenous communities, parity in governance bodies, and fostered collaboration with specialized public programs.

RE33. Signs of sustainability are not evident. The low effectiveness observed, the volume of resources pending execution, and the imminent change in government administration create an uncertain scenario.

RE34. To improve the prospects for continuity of results and processes, it will be essential to consolidate public policy instruments, strengthen and anchor governance bodies, institutionalize territorial alliances with local and private actors, and maintain the visibility of the project's achievements as a demonstration of a viable path toward the restoration of Chile's degraded landscapes.

## Lessons Learned

- **Lesson learned 1. Conceptual clarity as an enabling condition.**

*GEF classification: 12. Communication and dissemination.*

Having a common definition and narrative of the concepts of "landscape restoration" and "restorative practices" is essential for all stakeholders to understand and take ownership of the intervention.

- **Lesson learned 2. Results framework as a flexible planning and management tool.**

*GEF classification: 1. Project design, evaluation, and planning.*

Conceiving the results framework as a flexible planning tool that can be adapted to different scenarios and subject to review, even from the early stages of the project if relevant adjustments and/or clarifications are required, would have been essential, as it enables and facilitates the generation of agile and timely responses to design weaknesses or inaccuracies, as well as to an institutional context that may be changing.

- **Lesson learned 3. It is more effective to conceive of the intervention from the communes and/or regions towards the landscape than from the landscape towards these political-administrative units.**

*GEF classification: 17. Local context/challenges of the project site.*

The delimitation of landscapes using ecological criteria does not interact smoothly with the municipal and regional scales. The evidence gathered shows that it is more effective and relevant to conceive of intervention from the municipalities and/or regions towards the landscape, and not the other way around. While the delimitation of landscapes using ecological criteria provides technical value, reversing the approach facilitates understanding, participation, and ownership by local actors and ensures better coordination with the way the State operates in the territory.

- **Lesson learned 4. Coordination with public programs strengthens effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability.**

*GEF classification: 16. Scaling up.*

Shared planning and joint action with public programs present in the territory are a key strategy for the project; they expand its scope, strengthen the efficiency and effectiveness of implementation, and at the same time increase the prospects for financial and institutional sustainability of interventions in the medium and long term.

- **Lesson learned 5. Synergistic businesses that bring people together.**

*GEF classification: 3. Integrated approaches*

In the intervention territory, it is possible to develop business models that drive restoration and conceive restoration actions as business opportunities. This approach would also have the capacity to attract other agents that may not have been initially considered.

- **Lesson learned 6. Balance between territorial and programmatic scope and operational realism.**

*GEF rating: 2. Project management, including financial and human resources aspects.*

It is important to maintain an appropriate balance between the territorial and programmatic scope of the project and the actual implementation capacities on the ground. Calibrating this relationship makes it possible to avoid frustration and work overload and ensures the effectiveness, quality, and depth of the actions and processes promoted.

- **Lesson learned 7. Incentives mobilize, but require adequate management of expectations.**

*GEF classification: 17. Local context/challenges of the project site.*

The project generates greater interest and commitment from local communities and governments that perceive tangible benefits in their communities and/or regions. At the same time, proper management of expectations is essential to maintain trust, avoid exaggerated perceptions, and ensure sustained and constructive participation.

- **Lesson learned 8. Real restoration efforts are invisible.**

*GEF classification: 11. Knowledge, collaboration, and learning.*

Numerous public programs, civil society organizations, and state-owned and private companies are carrying out restoration actions. Many of these initiatives are not systematically recorded or calculated in a national system that reflects the country's actual efforts.

## Recommendations

### **Recommendation 1. To the Project team on the need to methodologically specify the measurement and recalculate (downward or upward) the targets associated with Core Indicators 3 and 4.**

It is recommended to refine the methodology for measuring "hectares under restoration" and then, once the instruments have been defined, to project realistic financial, programmatic, and operational targets.

- **Suggestion 1.** Break down the targets into:
  - Hectares in the process of restoration with works executed for Core Indicators 3.
  - Hectares under planning or comprehensive restoration management for Core Indicators 4.
- **Suggestion 2.** Prepare a technical data sheet for the indicators, detailing the methodologies and instruments developed to measure them.
- **Suggestion 3.** Break down the goals and methods by family of restoration practices and estimate the contribution of each pilot landscape to their achievement.
- **Suggestion 4.** Incorporate as a contribution to the goals the actions in the intervention territory promoted by public programs that co-finance the Project.
- **Suggestion 5.** Include the contribution that the business models to be promoted could have on the hectares under restoration.

### **Recommendation 2. To the Project team, FAO, and partner institutions on piloting a "counter" for areas under restoration.**

As a complement to the voluntary registration currently being promoted, it is recommended that the Project pilot (in a commune or landscape) the comprehensive mapping of public programs, civil society actions, and private and state-owned companies that are contributing or have the potential to contribute to the restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services in the selected territory.

With this information, design and test a prototype registration, monitoring, and calculation system that allows for estimating the area restored from 2020 to date and projecting its contribution towards 2030.

This experience could serve as a basis for strengthening the Chilean government's monitoring capabilities and for exploring the feasibility of incorporating it into SIMBIO and scaling up the methodology nationally.

**Recommendation 3. To the project team, FAO, and partner institutions on the orientation and institutionalization of capacity building.**

To strengthen the commitment of institutional partners, amplify the impact of interventions, and improve sustainability prospects, it is recommended that the planned diploma course be taught (or at least prioritized) to the PRODESAL and PDTI teams of the municipalities participating in the project.

- **Suggestion 1.** It would be beneficial for the diploma course to be theoretical and practical in nature, with an emphasis on restorative production practices, so that participants can apply the knowledge in their daily work and thus transfer it to producers and communities, thereby ensuring a multiplier effect in the adoption of restoration practices.
- **Suggestion 2.** To ensure its legitimacy, continuity, and recognition beyond the life of the project, it is suggested that the diploma course be institutionalized with university endorsement and that the sponsorship of INDAP, MMA, CONAF, FAO, and the municipalities be made visible.
- **Suggestion 3.** If, in order to meet high quality standards and ensure the anchoring of the training space, the project professionals need to devote more time than planned to the development of this product and financial resources greater than those stipulated, it is suggested, as a compensatory measure, to revise downward the target of indicator 6 of result 2.1 (8,800 people trained).
- **Suggestion 4.** It would be beneficial to bring alternative awareness-raising and training strategies to institutional and private actors who may be outside this space but who also have the potential to contribute to the goals of the Project in particular and the PNRP in general.

**Recommendation 4. To the project team, FAO, partner institutions, and other stakeholders on the targeting of efforts.**

In order to concentrate efforts, ensure the quality and depth of interventions, and improve the possibilities for systematization for replication and scalability, it is recommended to prioritize Project action in those municipalities that have demonstrated the greatest political will and active participation to date and that in turn have clear potential to contribute to the restoration goals formulated and opportunities for coordination and additional public and private financing.

This focus would allow for more robust and visible learning, which could then be transferred to other territories in later stages.

**Recommendation 5. To the Project team, FAO, partner institutions, and other stakeholders on local restoration plans.**

It is recommended that priority be given to the design and implementation of local restoration plans, with a significant portion of the team's and partner institutions' work devoted to directly supporting their development and implementation.

- **Suggestion 1.** Promote the plans as foundational milestones that define the municipality as a territory "under restoration."
- **Suggestion 2.** Consider the portion of the landscape corresponding to the municipality as a priority territory, without ruling out the possibility of implementing actions outside the delimited area. Not only small landowners, but also medium and large producers, as well as companies with a presence in the territory.
- **Suggestion 3.** In addition to the technical standards specific to this type of planning, consider the following aspects in its design and implementation:
  - Establishment of mechanisms for inter-institutional, multi-level, and multi-stakeholder participation and coordination. Including forestry companies and civil society organizations, in addition to government and community actors.
  - Ensuring consistency with current national, regional, and local public policy instruments.

- Align its implementation with the annual work plans of institutional programs (e.g., INDAP).
  - Providing them with a clear roadmap and a realistic financing plan.
  - Define institutional and community responsibilities for implementation.
  - Include a capacity-building program.
- **Suggestion 4.** To strengthen its legitimacy and sustainability, the Project could contribute to the deployment of communication strategies that highlight and raise the profile of local actors, with demonstration projects, the promotion of synergistic business models, and the development of restoration capacities (e.g., through the diploma course).

**Recommendation 6. To the Project team on strengthening communication in local and regional spaces.**

It is recommended to develop and disseminate communication and/or edu-communication products that support the socialization and appropriation of the Project in local spaces, highlighting the commitment and role of regional and municipal institutional actors in the restoration processes.

These products should also contribute to the construction of a common language around the concept of "landscape in restoration," thus facilitating appropriation and shared understanding among the different actors involved.

**Recommendation 7. To the Project team, FAO, and partner institutions on the business models to be piloted.**

It is recommended that the Project develop business models directly linked to restoration needs, so that there is a synergistic relationship between the supported ventures and the expected restoration objectives.

Good examples are: the use of biomass for pellets, biochar, or other purposes; the control of invasive species; regenerative livestock farming in degraded pastures; improving honey productivity and quality through the establishment of honeybee biological corridors; offering water harvesting services (e.g., fog catchers); strengthening private nurseries of native species; creating agricultural bio-input companies and/or agroecology training services, among others.

- **Suggestion 1.** In line with lesson learned 6, it is important to strike a balance between the scope and level of innovation of the business models to be developed and the actual operational and financial possibilities of the project. A good calibration could be achieved by:
  - Supporting innovative businesses that are in the early stages of development (e.g., fog catchers).
  - Prioritizing the most realistic and viable alternatives, even beyond the examples mentioned.
  - Supporting cross-cutting models applicable in different pilot landscapes, establishing one or two "flagship" initiatives that concentrate learning, generate visibility, and facilitate scalability and/or replicability. and/or
  - Reducing the target number of business models to be developed.
- **Suggestion 2.** Use an analysis that establishes the link between the benefits and co-benefits of the business models to be promoted as input for their selection and feasibility.
- **Suggestion 3.** Assess the possibility of programmatically linking the development of business models with other projects under implementation, and of leveraging additional resources from, for example, the GEF small grants program, CORFO funds, regional governments, business programs, among others.

**Recommendation 8. To the project team, FAO, and partner institutions on the consolidation of an emblematic gender-transformative pilot project.**

It is recommended that at least one commune or pilot landscape be selected where programmatic, communication, and knowledge management efforts are redoubled, so that it becomes a national benchmark for inclusive restoration. This territory should explicitly highlight the role of women, eventually articulating gender and interculturality in an intersectional manner, and clearly showing and demonstrating how

restoration can generate environmental, social, and productive benefits that recognize cultural diversity and strengthen equity.

- **Suggestion.** Given the characteristics of the territory, the profile of the beneficiary groups, and the progress made to date, the MTR suggests that the Lanalhue–Nahuelbuta landscape be chosen as a benchmark.

**Recommendation 9. To the project team, FAO, and partner institutions on extending the implementation period.**

In order to ensure full budget execution, address programmatic challenges and opportunities, and achieve the committed goals, it is recommended to consider requesting a project extension for a maximum of 18 months.

**Recommendation 10. To the project team and FAO on sustainability and mitigation of risks inherent in changes in state administration.**

To mitigate the risks inherent in a change in central government administration, it is recommended that a transfer plan be drawn up for the new government, incorporating actions to raise the profile and validate the new authorities and officials. At the same time, with the additional aim of improving the prospects for sustainability, it is recommended that the link be strengthened and that an attempt be made to formalize the commitment of local and regional governments to the project in particular and to landscape restoration in general.

**Appendix 4. GEF rating table**

GEF - FAO Criteria / subcriteria	Ranking <sup>1 y 2</sup>	Comentarios breves
<b>A. STRATEGIC RELEVANCE</b>		
A1. Overall strategic relevance	<b>AS</b>	The project is highly relevant. It responds decisively to the needs and interests of the local beneficiary populations, the priorities of GEF-7, FAO strategies, and the Chilean government's restoration priorities.
A1.1. Alignment with GEF and FAO strategic priorities	<b>AS</b>	
A1.2. Relevance to national, regional, and global priorities and to the needs of beneficiaries	<b>AS</b>	
A1.3. Complementarity with other ongoing interventions	<b>AS</b>	
<b>B. EFFECTIVENESS</b>		
B1. Overall assessment of project results	<b>MI</b> The level of results achieved is lower than expected and/or there have been significant shortcomings.	The project is behind schedule. Only one result indicator has fully achieved its midterm target.
B.1.1. Delivery of project outputs	<b>MS</b> <b>MS</b> The level of results achieved is more or less as expected and/or there were moderate deficiencies.	The project is behind schedule. However, some of the outputs committed to in the Prodoc have been achieved, others are in progress, and others have not yet begun to be developed.
B1.2. Progress toward project results and objectives:		

<sup>1</sup> Highly Satisfactory (HS); Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU); Could not be evaluated (CE)

<sup>2</sup> Some criteria, in addition to their rating, have specific descriptors. These are included in the table and are also detailed at the end of the appendix.

Outcome 1.1. Institutional arrangements, public policy objectives, instruments, and restoration plans aligned for the comprehensive restoration of degraded landscapes.	<b>MS</b> The level of results achieved is more or less as expected and/or there were moderate deficiencies.	Progress has been made in developing public policy instruments and establishing governance bodies.
Outcome 1.2. Monitoring and prioritization system for landscape restoration designed and in use by relevant institutions	<b>MU</b> The level of results achieved is lower than expected and/or there have been significant shortcomings.	No substantive progress has been observed in the establishment of a robust monitoring system. Good progress has been made in capacity building.
Outcome 2.1. Agroforestry landscapes and their natural environments integrated into restoration for the demonstration and scaling up of nature-based solutions, instruments, financing and investment models. MS	<b>MS</b> The level of results achieved is more or less as expected and/or there were moderate deficiencies.	The project has been successfully implemented in the target areas, bringing together stakeholders and beginning restoration work.
Outcome 2.2. Demonstrated generation of benefits from restoration-based economies in the agroforestry sector.	<b>MU</b> The level of results achieved is lower than expected and/or there have been significant shortcomings.	Although the project is behind schedule, it is on track to get back on course. It has begun identifying producers and selecting projects to support.
Outcome 3.1. Knowledge Management Strategy and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System based on adaptive management and the delivery of measurable and verifiable results.	<b>S</b> The level of results achieved is as expected and/or there were no deficiencies or these were minor.	The project has effectively designed and implemented knowledge management, communication, and M&E plans.
Overall assessment of progress toward project results and objectives:	<b>MS</b> The level of results achieved is more or less as expected and/or there were moderate deficiencies.	Although the project is behind schedule, it is beginning to show signs of contributing to the results and objectives set.
<b>C. EFFICIENCY</b>		
C1. Efficiency	<b>MS</b>	The project has executed 36% of the budget planned for the mid-term and has a significant margin of resources still available (76% of the total for the five years). While this situation represents a weakness, it is also an opportunity to strengthen investment in pending products and to adjust actions in the second phase of implementation.
<b>D. SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT RESULTS</b>		
D1. Overall probability of sustainability	<b>ML</b> There are moderate risks to sustainability.	The low effectiveness observed in the delivery of key products and in the fulfillment of intermediate indicators, and the insipidity of the results being achieved by the Project, added to the fact that 76% of the total budget remains to be executed, limits the possibilities for the RMT to assess the probabilities that the effects obtained and processes promoted will be sustained once funding ceases. However, the moderation of the risks identified to date suggests that, if the project achieves its results, these risks will not affect its sustainability.

D1.1. Financial Risks	<b>ML</b> There are moderate risks to sustainability.	No substantial associated risks are observed. Although there are delays in implementation, the project will present a series of alternative climate finance instruments and promote business models in the pilot landscapes.
D1.2. Sociopolitical risks	<b>L</b> There are few or no risks to sustainability	No substantial risks are observed. The project seeks to ensure adequate representation of women, youth, indigenous peoples, and local communities, disadvantaged and vulnerable people, as well as the private sector, civil society, and government actors whose support is essential to achieving these results.
D1.3. Institutional and governance risks	<b>ML</b> There are moderate risks to sustainability	The change of administration in the State, which will take place in March 2026, is an obvious political risk. The project is preparing an advocacy plan aimed at successfully transferring the initiative to the new administration.
D1.4. Environmental risks	<b>L</b> There are few or no risks to sustainability	No significant environmental risks that could jeopardize sustainability have been identified.
<b>E. FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE</b>		
E1. Project design and maturity	<b>S</b>	The results matrix has some deficiencies in the formulation of goals, sources of verification, and minor inconsistencies in vertical logic.
E2. Quality of project implementation	<b>S</b> There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies, and the quality of implementation or execution meets expectations.	The FAO, in its role as implementing agency, has satisfactorily accompanied the process of identification, preparation, formulation, and implementation of the Project, ensuring technical and administrative quality in each phase of the cycle.
E2.1. Quality of project implementation by FAO (BH, LTO, etc.)	<b>S</b> There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies, and the quality of implementation or execution meets expectations.	The programmatic and administrative areas of the FAO Representation in Chile have maintained close and coordinated monitoring, providing technical guidance, operational support, and continuous supervision.
E2.2. Project supervision (CDP, PTF, etc.)	<b>S</b>	FAO has proven mechanisms for technical and financial monitoring and supervision.
E3. Quality of project implementation	<b>S</b> There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies, and the quality of implementation or execution meets expectations.	The MMA and CONAF, as executing and co-executing entities, respectively, have performed as planned. Both institutions have integrated and contributed strategic and operational guidance to the steering committee.
E3.1. Project execution and management (performance of the PMU and partners in execution, administration, contracting, etc.)	<b>S</b> There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies,	Overall project management is satisfactory. It is desirable to shorten the time required for contracting services and purchasing goods.

	and the quality of implementation or execution meets expectations.	
E4. Financial management and co-financing	<b>S</b>	As of June 2025, the institutions that committed to co-financing have reported a contribution equivalent to 78% of the total assumed, i.e., \$29,148.92 of \$37,402.84 USD.
E5. Project partnerships and stakeholder participation	<b>S</b>	The various stakeholders have been kept informed. In addition, the Project has established consultation and community participation mechanisms to ensure that the voices of local communities and interest groups are heard and considered.
E6. Communication, knowledge management, and knowledge products	<b>S</b>	The Project has effectively designed and implemented its communications and knowledge management plan.
E7. Overall quality of M&E	<b>S</b> There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies, and the quality of the M&E design or implementation meets expectations.	The project has a standardized monitoring and evaluation system tailored to the initiative's monitoring and accountability needs. In addition, it has a professional dedicated exclusively to monitoring the GEF project portfolio. This minimizes the learning curve for monitoring new projects and improves the efficiency of information flow to FAO's institutional counterparts or "internal clients."
E7.1. M&E Design	<b>S</b> There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies, and the quality of the M&E design or implementation meets expectations.	
E7.2. M&E implementation plan (including human and financial resources)	<b>S</b> There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies, and the quality of the M&E design or implementation meets expectations.	
E8. Overall assessment of factors affecting performance	<b>S</b>	
<b>F. CROSS-CUTTING DIMENSIONS</b>		
F1. Gender and other dimensions of equality	<b>HS</b>	The project has consistently integrated gender and indigenous peoples' perspectives into the intervention cycle.
F3. Environmental and social safeguards	<b>S</b>	In accordance with its moderate risk classification and GEF guidelines, the project has taken the necessary measures to avoid harmful effects on the communities and habitats where it operates.
<b>Overall project rating</b>	<b>MS</b>	The project is highly relevant, and its execution and implementation are satisfactory, as are its monitoring and evaluation. Cross-cutting dimensions have been successfully integrated, and factors have not significantly affected the project. In terms of effectiveness, there are opportunities for improvement and interesting challenges. For the RMT, with adjustments, it is very likely that the project will be able to meet its programmatic and budgetary goals and make decisive progress

		in the theory of change that it has proposed to pursue.
--	--	---

## Ranking Table

### Score for Effectiveness

<b>Score</b>	<b>Description</b>
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	"The level of results achieved exceeds expectations and/or there were no deficiencies."
Satisfactory (S)	"The level of results achieved is as expected and/or there were no deficiencies or these were minor."
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	"The level of results achieved is more or less as expected and/or there were moderate deficiencies."
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MI)	"The level of results achieved is lower than expected and/or there have been significant deficiencies."
Unsatisfactory (U)	"The level of results achieved is substantially lower than expected and/or there were major deficiencies."
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	"An insignificant level of results achieved and/or there have been severe deficiencies."
Could not be evaluated (CE)	The information available does not allow for an assessment of the level of results achieved.

### Score for Sustainability

<b>Score</b>	<b>Description</b>
Likely (L)	There are few or no risks to sustainability
Moderately Likely (ML)	There are moderate risks to sustainability
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	There are significant risks to sustainability
Unlikely (U)	There are severe risks to sustainability
Could not be assessed (CA)	It is not possible to assess the expected incidence or magnitude of risks to sustainability

### Scoring for Monitoring and Evaluation Design and Implementation

<b>Score</b>	<b>Description</b>
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	There were no deficiencies, and the quality of the M&E design or implementation exceeds expectations.
Satisfactory (S)	There were no deficiencies or there were minor deficiencies, and the quality of the M&E design or implementation meets expectations.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	There were some deficiencies, and the quality of the M&E design or implementation more or less meets expectations.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MI)	There were significant deficiencies, and the quality of the M&E design or implementation is lower than expected.
Unsatisfactory (U)	There were major deficiencies, and the quality of the M&E design or implementation is substantially lower than expected.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	There were severe deficiencies in the quality of the M&E design and implementation.
Could not be evaluated (CE)	The available information does not allow for an assessment of the quality of the M&E design and implementation.

**Scoring for Project Implementation and Execution (to be assessed separately)**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Description</b>
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	There were no deficiencies, and the quality of implementation or execution exceeded expectations.
Satisfactory (S)	There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies, and the quality of implementation or execution met expectations.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	There were some deficiencies, and the quality of implementation or execution more or less met expectations.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MI)	There were significant deficiencies, and the quality of implementation or execution was somewhat lower than expected.
Unsatisfactory (U)	There were major deficiencies and the quality of implementation or execution is substantially lower than expected.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	There were severe deficiencies in the quality of implementation or execution.
Could not be evaluated (CE)	The available information does not allow for an evaluation of the quality of implementation or execution.

## Appendix 5. GEF Co-financing Table

Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement/approval (in USD)	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2025 (in USD)
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente (MMA)	GRANT	\$2.000.000	\$1.270.000
	IN KIND	\$12.651.577	\$11.966.062
Corporación Nacional Forestal (CONAF)	GRANT	\$11.859.167	\$9.763.240
	IN KIND	\$2.324.867	\$746.794
Instituto de Desarrollo Agropecuario (INDAP)	IN KIND	\$6.360.919	\$950.324
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)	GRANT	\$1.365.266	\$3.860.660
	IN KIND	\$521.050	\$461.840
FAO	IN KIND	\$320.000	\$130.000
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$37.402.846</b>	<b>\$28.198.596</b>

## Appendix 6. GEF Risk Matrix

RISK CATEGORIES	RATINGS	ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION MEASURES
<b>CONTEXT</b>		
Climate	Moderate	Climate risks identified as forest fires may jeopardize the success of the project. However, the Chilean government is increasingly better prepared to respond to this type of emergency.
Environment and Social	Moderate	Measures have been taken to avoid harmful impacts on the communities and habitats where the project is being implemented. Community participation has been sought, including women, youth, and indigenous peoples.
Political and Governance	Moderate	The change of administration in the State, which will take place in March 2026, is an obvious political risk. The project is preparing an advocacy plan aimed at successfully transferring the initiative to the new administration.
<b>INNOVATION</b>		
Institutional and Policy	Moderate	The project has promoted and encouraged coordination among institutional and political actors at different levels. A possible change in priorities by the new state administration taking office in March 2026 could cause setbacks in the process of strengthening governance bodies. In addition to a transfer plan, the project has worked at different levels, including the national level. In the event of setbacks, regional and municipal authorities will maintain the governance of the project at the local level.
Technological	Low	No technological risks associated with the project have been identified.
Financial and Business Model	Low	No substantial risks have been identified. Although there have been delays in implementation, the project will present a series of alternative climate finance instruments and promote business models in the pilot landscapes.
<b>EXECUTION</b>		
Capacity for Implementation	Low	No significant risks are observed. Institutional partners and other stakeholders have the necessary and sufficient capacity to implement the initiative.
Fiduciary	Low	No substantial risks are observed. Both FAO and MMA have procedures in place to ensure sound and transparent budget management.
Stakeholder	Low	No substantial risks are observed. The project seeks to ensure adequate representation of women, youth, indigenous peoples and local communities, disadvantaged and vulnerable people, as well as the private sector, civil society and government actors whose support is essential to achieving these results.

Overall Risk Rating	Moderate	No significant risks are observed. Risks classified as moderate have appropriate mitigation measures associated with them.
---------------------	----------	--