# TERMINAL EVALUATION

| | |
|---|---|
| Project ID: | 9766 |
| Project Name: | Mainstreaming Conservation of Coastal Wetlands of Chile's South Center Biodiversity Hotspot through Adaptive Management of Coastal Area Ecosystems |
| Countr(ies): | Chile |
| Implementing Agency: | UNEP |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# I. Overview

## A. Description

Project name
Mainstreaming Conservation of Coastal Wetlands of Chile's South Center Biodiversity Hotspot through Adaptive Management of Coastal Area Ecosystems

Country
Chile

| GEF ID | Implementing Agency |
|---|---|
| 9766 | UNEP |

Executing Entity
Ministry of the Environment EM

| Trust Fund | Project Type |
|---|---|
| GET | FSP |

Objective
Chile is one of only five places in the world with a Mediterranean climate, where the Project area is located, recognized as one of the 35 biodiversity Hotspots, not only for their high levels of wealth and endemism in plant and animal species, but also for being regions with high risk of species extinction. This is especially relevant regarding coastal landscapes and ecosystems, having in this area several types of coastal wetlands, such as salt marshes, brackish and salty coastal lagoons, tidal plains and estuaries and with the presence of different gradients, making for a high level of time-space heterogeneity and therefore the availability of habitats for a wide range of aquatic and shoreline species, in particular migratory birds. The threats and environmental degradation factors in the Chilean Mediterranean Eco-Region, are for the most part the result of human activities, which play a key role in the advancing deterioration of the coastal ecosystem functions and habitats. The main factors are habitat loss, fragmentation and degradation caused by agricultural activities, urban expansion and infrastructure, and the scarce legal protection given to these ecosystems. The objective of the Project is to improve the ecological condition and degree of conservation of ecologically valuable coastal ecosystems in South-Central Chile, including the wetlands and associated watersheds, incorporating them into local development efforts through sustainable management, improving coastal landscape management, reducing pressures on these habitats occupied by diverse migratory species with different conservation problems, and reducing threats to and pressures on the supporting watersheds that contribute to locally significant human activities. This Project contributes to fulfilling the GEF VI objectives BD-4 Program 9 and LD-3 Program 4, which will be undertaken through three components. The first seeks to mainstream the importance of BD conservation and LD problems in coastal landscapes to decision-makers and relevant stakeholders, the second to strengthen political and regulatory frameworks regarding coastal conservation among the diverse institutions with mandates in coastal and watershed areas, and the third, to implement and systematize an array of initiatives in five pilot landscapes to be replicated at the national level by the main institutions involved. The pilot ecosystems are located between Coquimbo and Araucania, representing different socio-environmental conditions, and these will play a relevant role in generating the data and evidence necessary for demonstrating the need to apply a focus that considers the whole watershed, with strengthened inter-institutional coordination and with productive sectors applying

environmentally sustainable practices for conserving and sustainably managing coastal landscapes when these are not protected areas. Each one of the pilots will contribute concrete evidence according to their individual realities regarding threats and present circumstances and will make it possible to have a wide range of options that can be replicated in similar situations. This project will bring together stakeholders from various national, regional and local institutions, committed for the duration of Project implementation, and led by a Steering Committee, which will be in charge of monitoring fulfilment of objectives, a process that will be supervised by the implementing agency, UN Environment. The Project includes a gender focus, where equal opportunity and development actions are proposed for both men and women, and also as a contribution to women's empowerment, for the purpose of increasing their participation and decision-making, as well as their access to the Project's socio-economic services and benefits. The aims and objectives of this project are consistent with the commitments made by Chile as signatory of the Ramsar Convention, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), and the Convention on the Conservation of Wild Migratory Species (CMS). Chile has been making efforts to comply with these commitments, approving in the year 2003 its National Biodiversity Strategy (ENB), which led in 2005 to the National Strategy for the Conservation and Rational Use of Chile's Wetlands (ENH), with its respective Action Plan. Later, the National Wetlands Committee was created, formally in 2013, as well as the National Committee for Ecological Recovery (2017) by means of a framework document, for the purpose of achieving effective ecological recovery in degraded areas.

## B. Key Dates

| | |
|---|---|
| CEO Endorsement/Approval<br>8/29/2019 | Agency Approval<br>8/29/2019 |
| Implementation Start<br>11/15/2019 | First Disbursement<br>1/17/2020 |
| Expected MTR<br>2/27/2023 | MTR Submission<br>9/11/2026 |
| Actual MTR<br>2/28/2023 | Expected Completion<br>3/31/2025 |
| Actual Completion<br>3/31/2025 | Actual TE<br>5/4/2026 |
| TE Submission<br>9/11/2026 | Final Disbursement |

## C. Disbursements

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Financing<br>5,635,750.00 | Cumulative Disbursement<br>5,101,804.00 |

# II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

### A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings

The project significantly increased awareness of wetland value and strengthened institutional ownership through knowledge generation and dissemination, supporting informed decision-making and replication of key products. It also contributed substantially to the implementation of the Urban Wetlands Law and the national regulatory framework, while demonstrating sustainable wetland use in pilot landscapes, though municipal uptake remained uneven and some tools require further refinement.

### B. Stakeholder Engagement

Multi-level stakeholder engagement has been effective since the start of the project, facilitating participation and cooperation during project implementation and promoting ownership and policy influence. Even though, engagement was strengthened by addressing MTR recommendations, reinforcing municipal capacities and knowledge management to promote the sustainability of achievements.

### C. Gender Equality

The project's primary gender-responsive measure consisted of promoting balanced participation of women and men through open calls and inclusive communication materials, ensuring equitable access to project activities. In addition, a targeted empowerment initiative was implemented in the Queule pilot, where a group of women artisans strengthened their capacities and economic organization. However, beyond this case, gender-responsive actions were not systematically integrated across all pilot landscapes, limiting their scope and transformative potential.

### D. Knowledge Management

The project did not include a specific knowledge Management Approach; however, knowledge management was a core driver of project effectiveness, systematically supporting results achievement, capacity strengthening, and policy influence. Through structured generation, dissemination, and institutionalization of technical products, the project ensured both broad access and practical application of knowledge. The replication of key tools, such as wetland delimitation guidelines used in new urban wetland declarations, demonstrates that knowledge was actively used rather than merely shared, reinforcing sustainability.

## III. Core Indicators

**Indicator 3 Area of land and ecosystems under restoration**

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 21000 | 4200 | 4099.97 |

**Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration**

| Disaggregation Type | Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cropland | | 10,500.00 | 2,000.00 | 3,974.23 |

**Indicator 3.2 Area of forest and forest land under restoration**

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10,000.00 | 2,000.00 | 43.32 |

**Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and woodland under restoration**

| Disaggregation Type | Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

**Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) under restoration**

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 500.00 | 200.00 | 82.42 |

**Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)**

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 290000 | 225940 | 304139 |

**Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)**

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |

**Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations**

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |

**Type/Name of Third Party Certification**

**Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems**

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 290,000.00 | 225,940.00 | 304,139.00 |

**Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided**

| Disaggregation Type | Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

**Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported**

| Name of the OECMs | WDPA-ID | Total Ha (Expected at PIF) | Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Total Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Documents (Document(s) that justifies the HCVF)**

| Title |
|---|
| |

**Indicator 5 Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (excluding protected areas)**

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |

**Indicator 5.1 Fisheries under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations**

| Number (Expected at PIF) | Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Number (Achieved at MTR) | Number (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |

**Type/name of the third-party certification**

**Indicator 5.2 Large Marine Ecosystems with reduced pollution and hypoxia**

| Number (Expected at PIF) | Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Number (Achieved at MTR) | Number (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |

| LME at PIF | LME at CEO Endorsement | LME at MTR | LME at TE |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |

**Indicator 5.3 Marine OECMs supported**

| Name of the OECMs | WDPA-ID | Total Ha (Expected at PIF) | Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Total Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated**

| Total Target Benefit | (At PIF) | (At CEO Endorsement) | (Achieved at MTR) | (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Expected metric tons of $CO_2e$ (direct)** | | 5993467 | | 2324463 |
| **Expected metric tons of $CO_2e$ (indirect)** | | | | |

**Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector**

| Total Target Benefit | (At PIF) | (At CEO Endorsement) | (Achieved at MTR) | (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Expected metric tons of $CO_2e$ (direct)** | | 5,993,467 | 0 | 2,324,463 |
| **Expected metric tons of $CO_2e$ (indirect)** | | | | |
| **Anticipated start year of accounting** | | | | |
| **Duration of accounting** | | 20 | | |

**Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector**

| Total Target Benefit | (At PIF) | (At CEO Endorsement) | (Achieved at MTR) | (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Expected metric tons of $CO_2e$ (direct)** | | | | |
| **Expected metric tons of $CO_2e$ (indirect)** | | | | |
| **Anticipated start year of accounting** | | | | |
| **Duration of accounting** | | | | |

**Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)**

| Total Target Benefit | Energy (MJ) (At PIF) | Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement) | Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR) | Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Target Energy Saved (MJ)** | | | | |

**Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)**

| Technology | Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF) | Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR) | Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

**Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments**

| | Number (Expected at PIF) | Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Number (Achieved at MTR) | Number (Achieved at TE) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Female** | | 60 | 145 | 648 |
| **Male** | | 60 | 128 | 366 |
| **Total** | **0** | **120** | 273 | **1014** |

## IV: Co Financing

| Sources of Co-financing | Name of Co-financier | Type of Co-financing | Investment Mobilized | Anticipated at CEO($) | Materialized at MTR($) | Materialized at TE($) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recipient Country Government | EM (Ministry of Environment) | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 848,900.00 | 509,340.00 | 1,264,885.36 |
| Recipient Country Government | EM (Ministry of Environment) | Grant | Investment mobilized | 6,654,000.00 | 3,992,400.00 | 6,238,015.05 |
| Recipient Country Government | MINVU (Ministry of Housing and Urbanization) | Grant | Investment mobilized | 583,333.00 | 350,000.00 | 583,333.00 |
| Recipient Country Government | MOP-DGA (General Water Department) | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 12,500.00 | 7,500.00 | 6,442.28 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recipient Country Government | MOP-DGA (General Water Department) | Grant | Investment mobilized | 48,333.00 | 29,000.00 | 194,712.58 |
| Recipient Country Government | MOP-DOP (Port Works Department) | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 40,000.00 | 534,000.00 | 40,000.00 |
| Recipient Country Government | MOP-DOP (Port Works Department) | Grant | Investment mobilized | 9,016,667.00 | 4,900,000.00 | 6,070,014.96 |
| Recipient Country Government | MBN (Ministry of Public Property) | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 512,567.00 | 307,540.00 | 498,274.74 |
| Recipient Country Government | MBN (Ministry of Public Property) | Grant | Investment mobilized | 99,289.00 | 59,573.00 | 113,580.04 |
| Recipient Country Government | MINAGRI (Ministry of Agriculture) | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 45,833.00 | 27,500.00 | 47,243.11 |
| Recipient Country Government | MINAGRI (Ministry of Agriculture) | Grant | Investment mobilized | 880,416.00 | 528,250.00 | 3,417,152.95 |
| Recipient Country Government | Under ministry for regional development | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 116,667.00 | 70,000.00 | 61,502.66 |
| Recipient Country Government | Under ministry for regional development | Grant | Investment mobilized | 102,667.00 | 61,600.00 | 357,553.22 |
| Private Sector | Arauco Forest Company | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 11,667.00 | 7,000.00 | 53,782.28 |
| Private Sector | Arauco Forest Company | Grant | Investment mobilized | 63,333.00 | 38,000.00 | 89,678.96 |
| Other | Audubon International | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 295,000.00 | 295,000.00 | 295,000.00 |
| Other | Audubon International | Grant | Investment mobilized | 205,000.00 | 205,000.00 | 205,000.13 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Other | Centro Neotropical de Entrenamiento en Humedales | In-kind | Recurrent expenditures | 143,136.00 | 85,882.00 | 237,720.47 |
| Other | Centro Neotropical de Entrenamineto en Humedales | Grant | Investment mobilized | 312,682.00 | 187,609.00 | 218,098.54 |
| Other | Other Sources | In-kind | | | | |
| **Total Co-financing** | | | | **19,991,990.00** | **12,195,194.00** | **19,991,990.33** |

Comments

Co-financing figures reported in the mid-term review and in this terminal evaluation are based on broad estimations rather than on verified data. Specifically, the reported amounts were calculated using a pro-rata formula (i.e. total committed co-financing / project duration) × years of implementation). While the use of estimations, particularly for in-kind co-financing, may be understandable to some extent, minimum evidence would still be expected to clarify what was considered as co-financing and to explain how committed co-financing was mobilized.

## V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

**Overall Project/Program Risk Classification**

| PIF | CEO Endorsement/Approval | MTR | TE |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Low |

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Although no formal Safeguards Plan was developed at CEO approval, risks identified in the Environmental and Social Safeguards Checklist were generally addressed, with corrective measures effectively resolving early gaps in Indigenous Peoples engagement. However, an unanticipated impact in the Cahuil pilot affecting oyster producers was not captured through safeguard monitoring, revealing limitations in proactive risk management. Low risk rating in the latest PIR is justified, with some adaptive management weaknesses.

## VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

| Document Category | Prefix | Title |
| --- | --- | --- |
| M and E Document | Terminal Evaluation (TE) | Terminal Evaluation Report |