



Economic instruments and tools to support the conservation of biodiversity, the payment of ecosystem services and sustainable development

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

10213

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

CBIT/NGI

☐ CBIT

☐ NGI

Project Title

Economic instruments and tools to support the conservation of biodiversity, the payment of ecosystem services and sustainable development

Countries

Chile

Agency(ies)

UNDP

Other Executing Partner(s)

Chile Ministry of Environment

Executing Partner Type

Government

GEF Focal Area

Biodiversity

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Climate Change, Climate Change Adaptation, Private sector, Community-based adaptation, National Adaptation Plan, Ecosystem-based Adaptation, Climate Change Mitigation, Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Nationally Determined Contribution, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Ecosystem Approach, Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach, Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands, Sustainable Pasture Management, Sustainable Forest, Land Degradation Neutrality, Carbon stocks above or below ground, Land Cover and Land cover change, Forest, Forest and Landscape Restoration, REDD - REDD+, Biodiversity, Mainstreaming, Forestry - Including HCVF and REDD+, Tourism, Certification -National Standards, Financial and Accounting, Conservation Finance, Payment for Ecosystem Services, Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting, Biomes, Wetlands, Sea Grasses, Rivers, Temperate Forests, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Productive Landscapes, Productive Seascapes, Gender Equality, Gender results areas, Awareness Raising, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Capacity Development, Access to benefits and services, Participation and leadership, Gender Mainstreaming, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Beneficiaries, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Knowledge Generation, Enabling Activities, Innovation, Learning, Adaptive management, Theory of change, Indicators to measure change, Influencing models, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Deploy innovative financial instruments, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Demonstrate innovative approach, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Stakeholders, Civil Society, Non-Governmental Organization, Academia, Trade Unions and Workers Unions, Local Communities, Private Sector, Large corporations, Communications, Behavior change, Education, Indigenous Peoples, Type of Engagement, Information Dissemination, Consultation, Participation, Partnership, Fisheries

Rio Markers**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 1

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Submission Date

12/10/2020

Expected Implementation Start

4/1/2021

Expected Completion Date

4/1/2026

Duration

60In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

218,500.00

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-1-1	BD 1-1-Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors"	GET	742,111.00	3,171,518.00
BD-1-3	BD 1-3- Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting	GET	1,031,351.00	4,336,568.00
BD-1-5	BD 1-5-Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through Inclusive conservation	GET	526,538.00	2,200,646.00
Total Project Cost(\$)			2,300,000.00	9,708,732.00

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

Improve national financing of biodiversity through the design, implementation and optimization of market-based economic instruments (IECB), that reinforce public financing and facilitate the economic contribution of the private sector to maintaining Chile?s natural capital.

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co- Financing (\$)
----------------------	-------------------	----------------------	---------------------	---------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
Project Component 1 - Institutional framework, governance and tools for the application of economic instruments for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and its ecosystem services (IECB) in land, fresh water, marine and coastal ecosystems.	Technical Assistance	<p>Project Outcomes 1</p> <p>Institutional and governance system and technical capability established / strengthened for IECB development, application, monitoring and evaluation measured by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One (1) Governance model for IECB development, application, monitoring and evaluation through (1) one inter-sectorial National Biodiversity Committee and (3) three Regional Committees strengthened, and institutionalized through administrative act. - Four (4) IECB mechanisms achieved comprising eight (8) operational guides and an information system (1) - Measures to strengthen institutional capabilities as a result of IECB's application of five (5) sectors/institutions, including: Environmental Impact Assessment Framework, Green Bonds, NDCs, Potable Water Provision regulations, Sustainability in the Agro-Forestry sector. 	<p>1. Multi-sectorial coordination mechanisms with the participation of public and private stakeholders, designed and implemented to support IECB application on the national and regional scale.</p> <p>2. Technical IECB guidelines and proposals for regulations for their application, monitoring and evaluation in land, fresh water and marine-coastal environments.</p> <p>3. Multi-purpose interactive digital IECB Platform for project typologies for conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and an Information System for IECB implementation, monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>4. Project models founded in Nature-based Solutions recognized as eligible green expenditures?.</p>	GE T	705,603.00	3,114,069.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
Project Component 2 - Application of IECB mechanisms including Biodiversity Offsets for residual impacts on biodiversity and Retribution for Ecosystem Services in demonstration projects.	Technical Assistance	<p>Project Outcome 2</p> <p>Biodiversity and ecosystem services in priority productive land and marine-coastal landscapes, are maintained and improved through the development of IECB demonstration experiences (DE)s that make possible an increase in public and private financing for sustainable use and conservation. This is measured by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -100,000 ha of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity and drinking water provision in Los Ríos Region. -60 ha of seascape protected as a No Take Zone / 2,845.47 ha impact zone of seascape under improved management of the ESR-DE in ECMPO Caulón and of the ESR-DE in AMERB Chepu -89,890 metric tons of CO2e in Los Ríos Region -Eight IECB DEs in land and continental aquatic ecosystems with validation of IECB mechanism guidelines, intervention model, governance model and information system, with an impact on 1,333 direct beneficiaries (400 women and 933 men) -Six Financing Strategies (6) 	<p>Project Output 2</p> <p>1. Demonstration experiences (DE) for IECB mechanisms accompanied by a sub-national governance model.</p> <p>2. Proposal for a Strategy to increase financing for conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services through IECB application.</p>	GE T	994,843.00	4,109,717.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing (\$)
Project Component 3 - Knowledge management, learning, monitoring and evaluation for effective IECB implementation.	Technical Assistance	<p>Project Outcome 3</p> <p>Technical capabilities established and knowledge increased for IECB application, M&E and effective and efficient administrative Project management, supported with an outcomes-based M&E system. This is measured by:</p> <p>-70% of participants in activities for strengthening capabilities confirm an increase in knowledge equal to or greater than 70% in the training material. (30% are women).</p> <p>-A Strategic Communication Plan (1) focused on knowledge management implemented.</p> <p>-An Action Plan for strengthening capabilities implemented (1).</p> <p>-One training course under a self-teaching method implemented (1).</p> <p>-Communication measures for strengthening capabilities designed and implemented. (7 land / 7 marine); training activities (1 IECB course implemented); development and publication of IECB documents (1); bulletin (9) and systematization</p>	<p>Project Output 3</p> <p>7. Strategic Communication Plan focused on knowledge management and strengthening capabilities.</p> <p>8. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) Strategy, stakeholder plan, and gender plan implemented for efficient, effective and sustainable achievement of outcomes.</p>	GE T	490,030.00	2,007,072.00

Project Compone nt	Financi ng Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Tru st Fu nd	GEF Project Financing (\$)	Confirme d Co- Financing (\$)
				Sub Total (\$)	2,190,476. 00	9,230,858. 00
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
GET		109,524.00		477,874.00		
Sub Total(\$)		109,524.00		477,874.00		
Total Project Cost(\$)		2,300,000.00		9,708,732.00		

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Environment Ministry	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	7,309,600.00
Recipient Country Government	Sanitary Services Superintendency (SISS)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	26,150.00
Recipient Country Government	Service for Environmental Evaluation (SEA)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	43,885.00
Recipient Country Government	Agriculture and Livestock Service (SAG)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	4,194.00
Recipient Country Government	Institute for the Development of Agriculture and Livestock (INDAP)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	200,000.00
Recipient Country Government	National Corporation for Indigenous Development (CONADI)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	15,657.00
Recipient Country Government	Ancud Municipality	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	5,856.00
Recipient Country Government	National Fisheries and Aquiculture Service (SERNAPESCA)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	35,653.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry for Social and Family Development (MDSF)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	10,400.00
Recipient Country Government	Bureau of Agrarian Studies and Policies (ODEPA)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	279,576.00
Civil Society Organization	Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	45,750.00

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Environment Superintendency (ES)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,207,720.00
Recipient Country Government	Puchuncavi Municipality	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	3,183.00
Recipient Country Government	La Unión Municipality	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	22,386.00
Private Sector	CMPC - Mininco Forestry Company SpA	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	43,125.00
Private Sector	CMPC - Mininco Forestry Company SpA	Grant	Investment mobilized	28,750.00
Private Sector	AngloAmerican	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	18,750.00
Private Sector	AngloAmerican	Grant	Investment mobilized	103,750.00
Recipient Country Government	Department of Water Works (DOH)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	18,720.00
Recipient Country Government	Association of Municipalities, Corral-La Unión Coastal Mountain Range	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	7,887.00
Private Sector	Arauco Forestry Company	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	63,422.00
Recipient Country Government	National Forestry Corporation (CONAF)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	27,843.00
Recipient Country Government	National Assets Ministry (MBN)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	64,075.00

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Civil Society Organization	Artisanal Fishermen's Union Caleta Maitencillo	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	50,417.00
Civil Society Organization	Artisanal Fishermen's Union Caleta Las Ventanas	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	50,417.00
Recipient Country Government	Panguipulli Municipality	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	12,125.00
Recipient Country Government	National Tourism Service (SERNATUR)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	9,441.00
Total Co-Financing(\$)				9,708,732.00

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

At the beginning of the PPG phase (November, 2019) the initial workshop was held to present the Project, define next steps and to establish partnerships to secure participation commitments. Prior to this activity, information was shared and possible pilot sites were visited for the purpose of assessing enabling conditions, meeting with possible key partners and with the communities. Halfway through the PPG period (January 27 and February 4, 2020) two workshops were carried out, one with the institutions linked to the marine sector and the other with the institutions associated with land ecosystems (agriculture, public works, sanitary services, public property, social development, indigenous matters, NGO's, etc). During these activities, progress in the development of the PRODOC was shared, as well as the activities plan and progress toward defining the demonstration experiences. In these participative instances we applied the Project's governance and management arrangement model for the implementation phase (Section VIII Governance and Management Arrangements / PRODOC); the lines of participation were presented and progress was made identifying sources of in-kind and grants co-financing. Because of sanitary measures in response to the Covid 19 pandemic (beginning at the end of February), remote bilateral meetings were held with all the institutions -NGO's, private companies, municipalities, representatives of the communities participating in the demonstration experiences- to agree on common objectives and activities, and negotiate co-financing through grants and in-kind contributions. Between April and June, at least 3 meetings were held with each of the partners (totalling more than 150 meetings), in addition to carrying out follow-up actions via e-mail and other remote means of communication. The Project components, outcomes and activities in which these partners were invited to participate were organized by sector (Section IX Financial Planning and Annex 7 Stakeholder Engagement Plan). The roles and functions identified for each partner were shared and agreed upon based on the intersection of the Project outcomes, targets and outputs and their sectorial policies, plans, strategies and instruments, for the purpose of emphasizing common work

goals and related benefits (Section V Outcomes and Associations and Section VI Project Results Framework). These negotiations and consensus building resulted in obtaining letters of commitment and co-financing (Section IX Budget and Annex 12 Cofinancing Agreement Letters). In-kind contributions totalling US\$ 9,576,232 (98.6 %) and grants for US\$ 132,500 (1.4%) were the types of cofinancing that the Project secured for its implementation. Most of the in-kind contributions were secured from government institutions (99.4%) and grants were all secured from private companies.

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	GET	Chile	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	2,300,000	218,500
Total Grant Resources(\$)					2,300,000.00	218,500.00

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required

☐

PPG Amount (\$)

100,000

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

9,500

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programmin g of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	GET	Chile	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	100,000	9,500
Total Project Costs(\$)					100,000.00	9,500.00

Core Indicators

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)
100000.00	100000.00	0.00	0.00

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)
100,000.00	100,000.00		

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)

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)

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided

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

Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title

Submitted

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)
700.00			

Indicator 5.1 Number of fisheries that meet national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
	2,845		

Type/name of the third-party certification

Third party certification(s): management plans AMERB y ECMPO AMERB + ECMPO (ha)

Indicator 5.2 Number of Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollutions and hypoxia

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (achieved at MTR)	Number (achieved at TE)
0	0	0	0

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

Indicator 5.3 Amount of Marine Litter Avoided

Metric Tons (expected at PIF)	Metric Tons (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)	Metric Tons (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 ₂ e (direct)	89890	89890	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)	0	0	0	0

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 CO₂e (direct)	89890	89,890		
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting	2021	2023		
Duration of accounting	10	5		

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 CO₂e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (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 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	500	401		
Male	500	933		

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Total	1000	1334	0	0

Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided

Core indicator 4 "Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas)(Hectares)" is the aggregate of four subindicators capturing the improved practices in productive sectors such as agriculture, rangeland, forestry or tourism. The subindicator that applies to the activities of this Project is "Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (qualitative assessment, non-certified)". This will be understood as the area of landscapes where management measures are implemented to benefit biodiversity (and ecosystem services in the case of this Project) as a result of a change in management. The target of this indicator will consider the the following areas: 1) microwatersheds that provide water for the Rural Drinking Water Systems of Mashue and Liqui?e (Regi?n de Los R?os) where management, conservation and restoration actions will be implemented as part of the ESR scheme (Component 2, Output 5; Activity 5.2); 2) influence areas of these watersheds, understood as the subsubwatershed units where these are located; 3) areas of other microwatersheds that provide water to the rest of the Rural Drinking Water Systems across the Los R?os Region, where studies will be conducted to assess the status of native forests and baselines for carbon sequestration and water provision (Component 1; Output 4; Activity 4.3) and where capacities will be transferred to other Committees for Rural Drinking Water (CAPR) (Component 3, Output 7; Activities 7.1 and 7.2) to implement improved management measures and establish the basis for future ESR schemes replication. Core indicator 5 "Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (hectares; excluding protected areas)" is the aggregate of three subindicators capturing the area of marine habitat under improved management to benefit biodiversity and/or for which management plans have been prepared and endorsed and are under implementation. The three subindicators refer to: 1) number of fisheries that meet third party certification incorporates biodiversity considerations; 2) number of large marine ecosystems with reduced pollution and hypoxia; and 3) amount of marine litter avoided. Given that the Project will not work on any of the topics approached by the subindicators, a new subindicator was established to report on the benefits to marine biodiversity that will result as an outcome from this Project. This is "Area of seascape under improved management to benefit biodiversity and small-scale fisheries". The target of this indicator will consider the no-take zones and impact areas within the boundaries of AMERBs in Chepu, Ventanas and Maitencillo and ECMPO Caul?n, where the Project will implement ESR schemes. Core indicator 6 "Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated (metric tons of CO₂e)" is the aggregate of two subindicators capturing the total reduction of GHG emissions and enhancement of

sinks and reservoirs reported in tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e). The subindicator that applies to the activities of this Project is "Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the sector of Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use", which will be understood as the process of increasing the carbon content of a reservoir/pool other than the atmosphere. Avoided emissions refers to reduced emissions due to avoided deforestation or forest degradation, sustainable forest management, and improved practices on other land uses such as in agriculture. To report the target of this indicator the project will apply the Ex-Ante Carbon-balance Tool (EX-ACT) of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the GEF's Carbon Benefits Project tools for estimating benefits, or other justified equivalent tool based on IPCC guidelines. To define the targets of carbon sequestration by native forests in the areas where demonstration experiences will be implemented, the reference value of -238 ± 31 g C/m² estimated by Pérez-Quezada et al. (2017) was used. This sequestration rate was applied to the area of Los Rios Region where there is dominance of native vegetation based on the National Cadaster of Vegetation Resources (CONAF, 2017), in the same areas of landscapes expected to improve management (Core indicator 4). Core indicator 11 "Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment" captures the total number of direct beneficiaries including the proportion of women beneficiaries. The Project considered as direct beneficiaries: 1) all the members of fishing associations that have use rights over the AMERBs that the Project will use as platforms to implement ESR schemes (Ventanas, Maitencillo and Chepu); 2) members of the indigenous and non-indigenous communities that have use rights over the ECMPO Caulín as recognized on its Administration Plan; 3) members of the CAPR Mashue and CAPR Liquiñe whom will benefit from the ESR scheme to be implemented to protect the watersheds of their localities.

Part II. Project Justification

1a. Project Description

describe any changes in alignment with the project design with the original pif

1a. Project Description.

1) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed:

The global environmental problem, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed are in alignment with the PIF. Changes to be noted include (specific paragraphs within Section III. Development Challenges of the UNDP-PRODOC are specified): i) relationships of the productive sector with the natural capital were described in detail (paragraphs 3 to 6); ii) links between biodiversity and ecosystem services with human wellbeing were described in more detail (paragraphs 10 to 12); iii) description of enabling conditions for the implementation of Economic Instruments for Biodiversity Conservaiton (IECB) was incorporated (paragraph 18); iv) Chile's vulnerability to climate change and current policy instruments for climate change mitigation and adaptation were detailed (paragraph 22).

2) The baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects:

The baseline was updated, incorporating the most recent laws, policies, instruments and initiatives promoted by Chile which currently relate or will relate to the Project objectives during its implementation phase.

3) The proposed alternative scenario with a description of the Project Outcome and Component.

The original components of the Project remain practically the same, with just some phrasing modifications in Component 1.

Regarding the scope of each Component:

Component 1: The PRODOC details more precisely the governance model that is expected to be implemented (National Technical Committee and Regional Technical Comittes). The PRODOC also outlines in detail the digital tools to be developed to promote the exchange of information, the use of IECBs by different stakeholders and IECBs' monitoring. This will strengthen the institutional frameworks and the economic instruments to manage and conserve biodiversity.

Component 2: This component keeps the focus on developing pilot demonstration experiences of IECB with a focus on Ecosystem Services Retribution (ESR) and Biodiversity Offset, and adds two instruments that were not consider before: the *Derecho Real de Conservaci?n (DRC)* and a Public Certification System of activities, practices or sites, for their contribution to biodiversity conservation and to maintaining or recovering ecosystem services. A more detailed description is incorporated to explain how IECB relate to other instruments, policies and approaches (e.g. Nature-based Solutions -SbN-, Nationally Determined Contributions -NdC-). Thorough descriptions are provided about ecosystem services subject to the ESR schemes in terrestrial ecosystems (focused on rural potable water systems -APR-) and coastal-marine ecosystems (focused on AMERB/ECMPO area based units). Biodiversity offsets demonstration experiences are described in more detail, including their implementation in the same sites where the ESR pilots in terrestrial and marine ecosystems will be implemented. This approach strengthens both demonstration experiences.

Component 3: Changes to this component improve the original descriptions presented in the PIF, which provide more clarity to the scope of the communications strategy, its objectives, target audiences and relation with the other Project components.

4) Alignment with GEF focal area and /or impact program strategies.

Regarding the alignment of the Project with the GEF focal areas and program strategies, the programme directives that the Project contributes to, remain the same. All programme directives (1-1, 1-3, 1-5), have been updated in their descriptions regarding how the Project contributes to each, consistent to other changes in the Components narrative.

5) Incremental/Additional Cost Reasoning And Expected Contributions From The Baseline, The GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, And Co-Financing

The PRODOC describes in more detail the direct contributions from the Project to support the implementation of the Service of Biodiversity and Protected Areas (SBAP). Chile is advancing towards approving the Proposed Legislation for establishing the SBAP, to safeguard biodiversity in the National System of Protected Areas and outside protected areas. The proposed legislation includes a section about IECBs which will be then legally recognized as conservation tools by the SBAP once it is created. To contribute to the future implementation of the SBAP, the Project will create guidelines to implement IECBs (Component 1) and will pilot them in demonstration experiences in terrestrial and coastal marine ecosystems (Component 2). Thus, the Project will financially contribute with an investment of US\$ 705,603 to establish the enabling conditions to effectively implement the law in those aspects related to IECB (including technical guidelines for implementation, implementing regulations and capacity building of decision makers) leveraging sources for US\$2,962,819 as cofunding for the same objectives.

6) Global Environmental Benefits (GEFTF) And/Or Adaptation Benefits (LDCF/SCCF)

The coastal-marine areas that will be subject to an improvement of management practices increased their scope from 700 hectares (PIF) to 2,485.47 ha in the PRODOC. The subindicator that will be assessed to comply with the target of core indicator 4 (subindicator 4.4. Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided to the subindicator) was replaced by subindicator 4.1. Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity.

7) Innovativeness, sustentabilities and potencial for scaling up:

The content of this section was updated in paragraphs 138-145 of the PRODOC. It provides thorough descriptions of actions of innovation, sustainability and scaling up. Six additional elements were described: i) the development of digital information systems to facilitate access and encounters between different stakeholders in IECB application; ii) development of standardized methodologies for ecosystem services evaluation with pilot applications, including studies of return on investment in biodiversity and ecosystem services, to establish precedents for their inclusion in sectorial and private sector management; iii) development of territorial intervention models to conserve and restore ecosystem services as part of IECB implementation and designed as bankable green projects that contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation (NbS models); iv) complementarity of IECBs and how they can be applied together in the same territory (e.g. ESR scheme can be applied with DRC mechanisms, biodiversity offsets and certification) in different ecosystems (terrestrial, coastal, marine); v) contributions from IECB implementation to sectorial policies, plans and strategies (i.e. forestry-agriculture-livestock, environment, public works, sanitary services, tourism) which will support replication; vi) implementation of IECB in demonstration experiences will be made in partnership with diverse local and regional stakeholders (e.g. Rural Drinking Water Committees -CAPR-, fishermen associations, indigenous communities) covering different natural resources governance structures to generate meaningful learnings for scaling-up.


1b. Project Map and Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

The geographic location, represented in the map of the sites for development of the demonstration experiences, is presented by ecosystem and by instrument.

1. IECB demonstration experiences in Ecosystem Services Retribution /ESR) in a land ecosystem:


Figure 2. Map of the Los Ríos Region (Map of Chile, upper left), with the position of the ESR Mashue and the ESR Liquiñe demonstration experiences and distribution of watersheds for soil and native forest state of conservation studies.



1.1. i. ESR IECB Demonstration experiences in land ecosystems, site at Mashue, Region of Los Ríos, Province of Ranco, La Unión Township, locality of Mashue.


ii. IECB experience in Derecho Real de Conservación in land ecosystem in the Region of Los Ríos, Province of Ranco, La Unión Township, locality of Mashue.

Figure 3. Mashue watershed



1.1. ESR IECB demonstration experiences in land ecosystems, site at Liqui?e, Region Los R?os, Province of Valdivia, Panguipulli Township, locality of Liqui?e.


Figure 4. Liqui?e watershed



2. IECB demonstration experiences with feasibility for development of Derecho Real de Conservaci?n in continental aquatic ecosystem (wetlands):

2.1. Metropolitan Region, Alto Maipo Wetlands

Figure 5. El Yeso watershed



2.2. Region of Concepci?n, Urban Wetlands at Rocuant Andalien (Urban wetlands)


Figure 6. Location of the Rocuant Andalien wetland





2.3. Region of La Araucan?a, Queule Wetlands (Rural Wetlands/indigenous communities)

Figure 7. Location of Queule River W



3. IECB demonstration experiences in Ecosystem Services Retribution, marine and coastal ecosystem.


3.1. **Figure 8.** ESR IECB demonstration experiences in marine and coastal ecosystem located in the Areas for Management and Exploitation of Benthic Resources (AMERB) in the Region of Valparaíso, Puchuncavi Township, in the Maitencillo AMERB's. This DE focuses on supporting the creation of no-take zones to protect biodiversity




3.2. **Figure 9.** ESR IECB demonstration experiences in marine and coastal ecosystem located in the Areas for Management and Exploitation of Benthic Resources (AMERB) in the Region of Valparaíso, Puchuncavi Township, Ventanas AMERB. This DE focuses on supporting the creation of no-take zones to protect biodiversity



3.3. **Figure 10.** ESR IECB demonstration experiences in marine and coastal ecosystem located in the Indigenous Peoples Coastal Marine Areas (ECMPO) in the Region of Los Lagos, Ancud Township, ECMPO Caulín. This DE focuses on supporting the creation of no-take zones to protect biodiversity.



3.4. **Figure 11.** ESR IECB demonstration experiences in marine and coastal ecosystem located in the Areas for Management and Exploitation of Benthic Resources (AMERB) in the Region of Los Lagos, Ancud Township, AMERB of Chepu. This DE focuses on supporting the creation of no-take zones to protect biodiversity.



1c. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

2. Stakeholders

Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase:

Civil Society Organizations Yes

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Yes

Private Sector Entities Yes

If none of the above, please explain why:

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Annex 7 of the PRODOC) identifies and describes the participative process that each stakeholder went through during the Project PPG Phase (inception and midterm PPG workshops, bilateral meetings for reaching participation agreements and resolving queries; as well as the validation workshop (Activity Report)). In addition, it explains the objective, the participation mechanism, the stakeholders map, and the role and function expected of each partner during Project implementation. Furthermore, a gender participation plan (Annex 8 of the PRODOC) is included in order to safeguard the participation of women and an indigenous peoples plan framework will be developed before project implementation to safeguard cultural pertinence throughout the Project, especially in the demonstration experiences and training activities. In the section on Financial Planning and Management (IX) of the PRODOC the activity is explained in detail as well as the outcomes to which the stakeholders will contribute.

Participation during the PPG phase contributed to identifying lines of action for the different stakeholders within the Project framework; it also made it possible to obtain participation commitments defined in agreement letters that specify co-financing (Section X Total Budget and Workplan and Annex 12 of the PRODOC). Furthermore, the Stakeholders Engagement Plan incorporates the Project inception activities for involving its partners and contributes to the implementation of several risk management measures considered in the SESP (Annex 4 of the PRODOC) including a consultation to indigenous peoples for some demonstration experiences (ESR scheme in ECMPO Caulin, Mashue and Liqui?e). The Stakeholders Engagement Plan presents a participation timeline, and the monitoring and evaluation mechanism (Annex 3 of the PRODOC) will allow an oversight of the Stakeholders Engagement Plan (Annex 7 of the PRODOC) and the Gender Action Plan (Annex 8 of the PRODOC).

The Project applies a multi-stakeholder, multi-sector and multi-level (national, regional and local) governance and participation focus. It establishes a governance model and management arrangements

(section VIII for details) through a National Technical Committee and Regional Committees in the Regions where demonstration experiences are carried out; in the NTC and the RTC's public institutions participate and this is a consultation entity. Both committees have broad operational instances, where the communities, civil society (NGO's, Foundations and others), private enterprise, academia and other stakeholders may participate. Frequency of meetings is determined in the Multi Year Work Plan (Annex 2 of the PRODOC), with a minimum of 4 meetings per year; however, depending on activities, the output and progress toward outcomes, frequency could vary depending on strategic management measures.

The Project includes a communication strategy and capacity building (Component 3 / Section VI Project Results Framework) through dialogue and reaching agreements, as well as knowledge management for strengthening capabilities, in direct support of appropriate functioning and operation of the stakeholders participation arrangements.

Participation of the private sector has been ensured through activities carried out during the design phase; as well as governance and management arrangements for Project implementation (Section VIII and Annex 7 of the PRODOC); regarding participation of public institutions, we defined the outcome, output and activity in which private enterprise would participate. Other details are described in point 4 of this document.

The Project Management Unit includes a Macro-regional Technical Coordinator (Los Ríos and Los Lagos Regions) who among other functions will safeguard the appropriate participation and commitment of the institutions and other stakeholders. The Project has established the function of Conservation Guarantors, who in the case of the land demonstration experiences will be the Rural Potable Water Committees, and in the case of the marine experiences, will be the Capital Azul and Costa Humbolt Foundations. The Guarantors will fulfill the role and carry out the functions defined during efforts carried out with the beneficiary communities and the fishermen's associations in order to ensure appropriate participation, commitment, and activities development (see Annex 6 of the PRODOC for more details). During the PPG phase, the beneficiary communities established an explicit participation commitment. In the case of Caulin because it has an ECMPO, a consultation process will be carried out to ensure proper participation (for more detail, see Annex 7 Stakeholders Engagement Plan, Annex 4 Social and Environmental Screening Procedure, Annex 5 UNDP Risks Register).

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only;

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor; Yes

Co-financier; Yes

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body; Yes

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain) Yes

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Provide the gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assesment.

The Project has a gender assessment and gender plan with a budget allocated for its implementation (USD\$39,000) (Annex 8 of the PRODOC). This was achieved through field visits to sites where demonstration experiences are to be developed; through interviews with women and men members of the participating organizations; with male and female employees of related public bodies; through reviewing bibliographic sources related to gender, biodiversity conservation and economic and financial instruments and the situation of women in the marine resources administration regimes incorporated in the Project. In addition, the consultant participated in the workshops implemented during the PPG phase[1]¹.

A description of the gender situation in Chile begins with a women's population of 8,972,014 (51% of the total population) and a femininity index[2]² of 104.3[3]³, concentrated mainly in the age range of 15 to 59 years (63%), with a life expectancy for women of 82.8 years and an overall fertility rate in women of 1.3 offspring. A total of 2.4% of women are below the line of extreme poverty, and 6.6% below the poverty line[4]⁴. According to CEPAL[5]⁵, the participation rate of Chilean women in economic activity is 49% (for men it is 71.6%). The National Institute of Statistics' (INE)[6]⁶ 'Gender and Employment Report' indicates that in the year 2016, 37% of all the women who declared themselves to be outside the labor force indicated that their reason for this was permanent family circumstances, such as child care and/or caring for other dependents, whereas the reason given by most of the unemployed men was studies. According to the 2017 Census, those jobs most frequently held by women were associated with child care, care and services to others, such as the areas of activity involved with lodging and food services, teaching and human health activities. The World Economic Forum's Global Gender Gap Index places Chile in 57th place among 153 countries, with an overall index of 0.723[7]⁷. The greatest gap is to be found in political participation, followed by economic participation and opportunities. The Gender Inequality Index shows that the gender gap in Chile is 2.3 times the average observed in those countries with a very high level of human development, placing it in 72nd place in terms of gender inequality among 189 countries. The challenge is to overcome gaps both in women's political participation and their access to economic resources, since women in Chile participate less in the labor force and also receive less income for the same work as men. Power relations and inequality are manifest, with gender differences in regards to access to, use and control of natural resources, because of economic, social, institutional and legal limitations, such as for example access to land.

The bibliography also indicates that women are assuming more responsibility in protecting biodiversity but without participating equitably in access to and control of the resources. The Convention on Biological Diversity (1993) recognizes the decisive function that women play in the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, and affirms the need for their full participation at all levels of formulation and execution of policies whose aim is conservation of biodiversity, underlining relevant challenges in the actions to be defined, considering their traditional participation from within their role of overseeing family nutrition.

As for the water resource, the lack of attention to gender issues has led to women not being recognized as interested parties and stakeholders regarding rights over water and its management, as well as

undervaluing their abilities, knowledge and contributions in managing this resource[8]⁸. Regarding the marine-coastal sector resources, women's participation in fishing is minor and basically invisible, although for the year 2014 it is estimated that nearly half of the 120 million people worldwide who work in the fishing sector, in capture or in the value chain, were women[9]⁹, enduring working conditions that did not resemble what could be considered decent; at the same time, available statistics help to hide women's participation in these activities. This has led to the fact that in fishery policies, little attention is given to women and the gender dimension. The FAO study carried out in Chile, Colombia, Paraguay and Peru[10]¹⁰ draws similar conclusions. They point out that women associated with the fishing and aquaculture sectors fulfill most significant roles in the value chain, since they are involved in preparing fishing tackle, capture, receiving the catch, processing and sale. Therefore, they in fact constitute a significant part of the work force, and their number and qualitative importance is vastly superior to what the available data suggests. Furthermore, the sources indicate that for the most part, women who labor in fishing and aquaculture must face working conditions inferior to what could be considered decent. Both activities present high levels of informality, affecting especially women, mostly heads of family, and this can be seen in the predominance of part-time work, limited access to safety and social protections, a low level of associativity and limited access to goods and services for developing their activity.

Regarding natural resource management by women in Chile, the revision that was carried out did not uncover data indicating women's participation in conservation experiences. However, the information available regarding the Environment Ministry, both at its legal representation and in its coordination of Environmental Protection Fund (FPA) initiatives[11]¹¹, indicates that on the national level there is a larger proportion of women to men between the years 2016 and 2019.

Regarding gender, ecosystem services and economic instruments for biodiversity conservation (IECB), no information was found. For this reason, a gender analysis was carried out on resource or territorial organizations and/or administrative regimes that will participate in the Project's demonstration experiences, including the following: Areas for Management and Exploitation of Benthic Resources (AMERB), Rural Potable Water Committees (CAPR), Benthic Resource Management Committee (Management Committee as beneficiary of capabilities transfer), and Indigenous Peoples' Coastal-Marine Space (ECMPO).

In Chile, of the 89,577 people registered as small-scale fishermen in 2018, 23.7% were women, working as seaweed harvesters (19,204) or in fishing itself (4,868). In the Valparaíso and Los Lagos Regions where the Project is being implemented, the presence of women seaweed harvesters is notable, reaching 9.1% and 35.3% respectively[12]¹². In the year 2018, there were 1,543 organizations registered in the Small-Scale Fisheries Listing (RPA)[13]¹³, 42 of which were made up exclusively of women, 1,081 mixed, and 420 with only male members. However, out of a total of 10,748 women members of some organization, only 1,094 hold a directorship position. Of these, 290 are presidents, 376 treasurers and 428 secretaries. This clearly shows the low level of participation of women in leadership positions and decision-making in this sector.

As for activities connected with or in support of small-scale fishing, such as preparation of fishing tasks (repairing tackle and gear), equipment maintenance, bait preparation, filleting, hauling and shelling, SERNAPESCA[14]¹⁴ indicates that, for the year 2011, of the total people participating in these

activities (13,813), around 23.1% (3,197) were women and 76.9% were men. Although men continue to make up the majority in these activities, in some areas women constitute a high percentage, such as in preparing bait and shelling, reaching 19.6% (529) and 39.7% (1,389) respectively. In addition, support activities such as repairing fishing tackle and hauling are the main tasks that women perform, with 185 and 293 women for each of these.

Between the years 2014-2018, a total of 550 AMERB were recorded as functioning, and they are responsible for 370 small-scale fishing organizations. Of these, 336 are mixed organizations, 208 have only men members, and 5 are made up of only women. In the Regions of Project intervention, there are 11 mixed AMERB's in the Region of Valparaíso and 159 in the Los Lagos Region, there being no AMERB's registered with only women members. According to the reports issued by SUBPESCA, SERNAPESCA and the DOP since 2010, women's participation in traditionally male activities has increased. For example, in the category of fisherman, there was an increase of 27.5% of women between the years 2010 and 2018. Despite this, the AMERB's and Management Committees have still mostly male members.

A gender assessment carried out in the year 2004 by the Water Works Department (DOH) determined that, in the Rural Potable Water Programs (CAPR), organized in Committees and Cooperatives, men have historically been in charge of leadership tasks and women of administrative work, and only 32.5% of the total of leaders were women^[15]¹⁵. Through training and other measures, such as modifying CAPR and Cooperatives' Statutes, between the years 2008 and 2016 the percentage of women's participation in leadership roles grew from 38.6% to 45.6%. In the Los Ríos Region, where some of the Project's demonstration experiences are located, the percentage of men in CAPR directorships was 54.6%, and women 45.4% in 2016.

In 2008, Law 20,249, known as the Lafkenche Law, was ratified for establishing the Indigenous Peoples' Coastal-Marine Space (ECMPO). Up to December 2019, there were 93 applications for ECMPO status in Chile, nine of which include an approved use agreement and administration plan, one in the Araucanía Region, and eight in Los Lagos^[16]¹⁶. Up until May 2019, there were 255 indigenous communities applying for ECMPO status, of which 42.7% had women presidents (109) and 57.3% were presided by men (146)^[17]¹⁷.

Regarding the situation of women in the sites where Project demonstration experiences will be developed, this varies largely depending upon the particular circumstances, according to the type of organization under consideration as well as the characteristics of the organizations' intervention environment and the context in which they find themselves. In the marine-coastal sector, conditions are the same as in the fishing activity itself, which is predominantly male, despite a significant participation of women in complementary or related activities. In the land and continental aquatic sector, which by definition involves rural spaces, they have their own forms of peasant family agriculture, where women are mainly occupied with activities inside the home, with minor sales of excedents from their domestic production. Finally, in the ECMPO, specific cultural conditions will be found regarding the gender construct, in this case associated with the mapuche-williche tradition.

As for the specific situation in each site, the following is of interest:

Maitencillo Small-Scale Fishing Port AMERB: This is a seaside resort in the Puchuncaví Township, Valparaíso Region. Its total population is 2,228 (1,167 men and 1,061 women)^[18]¹⁸. The main activities in this location are tourism and fishing. The Maitencillo Small-Scale Fishermen's Union is located here, with 36 members, none of whom are women. Since the year 1999 they have AMERB

status. In 2013 a marine reserve was established within their management area, for the purpose of improving protection of and increasing its main natural resources, such as abalone, limpets and a variety of rock fish. This initiative operates through payment of an ESR via philanthropy with the intermediation of the Capital Azul Foundation and support from the Chilean Catholic University (PUC). The Fishermen's Union has demonstrated a strong organizational trajectory and strong leadership, as well as a strategic vision for projecting their activity. Within this scenario, women have a secondary role that is not directly related to the organization, although they do participate in some of the Union's activities. For example, they have an area for direct sales of products they extract from the sea, where the fishermen themselves and their families can sell these products, and women are involved in this activity. In addition, for the last 25 years they have maintained the same administrative secretary, a woman, and this has made it possible to maintain constant support in management and capabilities transfers that go beyond the temporality of directorships.

Las Ventanas Small-Scale Fishermen's Port AMERB: This locality has a total population of 8,314, of whom 4,202 are men and 4,112 are women (Ibid). The Caleta Ventanas Small-Scale Fishermen's Union is located here, and is in charge of an AMERB, established in 1987 with 65 members, two of whom are women, although they have no significant participation nor is their participation obvious in tasks related or complementary to AMERB resource extraction work. In 2017 a marine reserve was established within their management area for the purpose of strengthening the area's biodiversity; this initiative operates in the same manner as the Maitencillo AMERB described above.

Mashue CAPR: According to the Mashue CAPR, the local population is around 700 persons (50% would be women). Around 24% of this population are under the poverty line^[19]; there are two indigenous organizations, one Neighborhood Board and an association of small-scale entrepreneurs. Both women and men participate in all of these organizations. In general they are peasant family farmers, with minor sales of excedents. In summer, women work as seasonal farm laborers. The Mashue CAPR has 176 members. Of these, 67% identify with the mapuche-williche indigenous group and 40% are women. Both women and men participate in Assemblies, the directorship is all men, and they have a woman secretary for administrative support. Women do participate in some CAPR activities (managing the nursery, teaching environmental education). This CAPR has pioneered in the implementation of an ESR model since the year 2013. At the present time, they have a nursery of native species for the purpose of creating plant resources for reforestation of the watershed. The first landholding where this initiative was implemented belongs to a woman. In addition, through an agreement with an educational establishment, they have designed an environmental education program directed by a female teacher who is a member of the CAPR. At present (2019) they are involved in the UN REDD+ Project implemented by CONAF. Their directorship has 6 members, one of whom is a woman.

Liqui'e CAPR: This locality has a population of 875 inhabitants, 445 men and 430 women. It is located in a pre-Andean tourism zone with hot springs of volcanic origin, generating significant economic activities in which both men and women participate, organized into a Rural Tourism Network called Siete Lagos (Seven Lakes). The CAPR has around 600 members, some of whom are women. Their directorship consists of six members, one of whom is a woman. They have two female administrative secretaries. At present (2019) they participate in the UN REDD+ Project implemented by CONAF.

Caul'n ECMPO: They have a total population of approximately 833, where nearly 50% are probably women. About 32% of its inhabitants identify with an indigenous people. Both men and women carry out economic and subsistence activities such as beach gathering, agriculture and livestock, which sometimes constitute sources of income for their families, in which women and men participate. Among the most important are harvesting pelillo seaweed, where women participate. The Huenque Caul'n and Wente Kaulin Indigenous Communities, who have applied for ECMPO status, belong to the mapuche-williche cultural tradition. The first has 25 members (13 women), and represent 25

families. The Wente Kaulin Community has 27 members (20 women), representing 16 families. The culturally determined uses proposed for the ECMPO include the following: beach clamming; exploitation and gathering of seaweed; small-scale fishing; commercial diving; tourism, and local cultural festivities and practices, some of which involve women. Furthermore, women participate in the communities' directorships and participate equally in their assemblies.

Chepu AMERB: They have a total population of approximately 476 [20]²⁰, and according to the Fisheries Census[21]²¹, there are a total of about 75 small-scale fishermen at the Chepu fishermen's port. Chepu's Small-Scale Fishermen's Union called Mar Adentro, beneficiaries of the Chepu AMERB administration, has a total of 35 members, 34 men and 1 woman. Among their members are people of indigenous descent. In this respect, and considering the fact that each small-scale fisherman has a family of about 4 members, we are dealing with approximately 140 people, all direct beneficiaries of the Chepu Pilot Project. Although the locality's most significant activity is small-scale fishing, it is true that its inhabitants are also farmers, forestry workers and gatherers, being part of the broad peasant family farming sector in which both women and men participate; and for several years they have been carrying out small-scale tourism initiatives.

Summary of the gender analysis and evaluation: (i) Maitencillo and Ventanas AMERB's: Although there is generalized and growing recognition of women's role, it can be felt that this is not completely recognized and accepted, both from a gender point of view and a sectorial perspective. In the case of the organizations that have implemented IECB's, since these organizations are under the leadership of men, it has been their voice and experience that has taken precedent, leaving women, who fulfill a support role in union tasks, excluded from preservation and appreciation of this experience. (ii) Mashue and Liqui'e CAPR's: Even when women's participation in these organizations (assemblies) is recognized, they do not occupy directorship positions, and rarely administrative positions. In the case of the organizations that have implemented IECB's, since it is the men who lead the organizations, it is their voice and experience that is heard, leaving women, who fulfill a support role or have been pioneers in associated activities, relegated to a secondary position in the preservation and appreciation of this experience. (iii) Caul'n ECMPO and Chepu AMERB: more direct knowledge is required of this situation and the participation of women, in order to appreciate specifically how, within the cultural definitions of gender, they might participate in the ECMPO and the AMERB.

Identified gender constraints: (i) Barrier 1: The participation of women in the IECB, their role, experience and knowledge are not visible and are not perceived as a contribution in the application of these instruments. Neither the gender role nor the participation of women is known as an habilitating factor for IECB development and the benefits these might bring to them. (ii) Barrier 2: The role, contribution and knowledge of women in the organizations and/or regimens for the administration of resources or territories are not known nor have they been made visible, the same can be said for the benefits they obtain from them. No data is available for projecting the role of women from these organizations in IECB implementation nor how these could benefit and/or harm them. No data is available for determining how the participation of women in these organizations might constitute an IECB habilitating factor. (iii) Barrier 3: domestic responsibilities and care are an important part of women's work load, and could constitute a constraint if the initiatives to be carried out do not take this factor into consideration and adapt to it.

The Project has a gender monitoring and evaluation plan that will allow to oversee fulfillment of the gender plan (See details in Annex 3 of the PRODOC); identification of gender-based risks (Annex 5 of the PRODOC) and the SESP (Annex 4 of the PRODOC) that describes management measures for the risks identified included in the PRODOC. Implementation of the gender plan (Annex 8 of the PRODOC) and the Indigenous Peoples Plan Framework (to be developed before Project implementation) will be supported by a consultancy and the terms of reference of project personnel and technical consultancies (Annex 6 of the PRODOC).

-
- [1] Reports of the consultancy on gender and social and environmental issues, Design Phase of GEF Project on economic instruments, Gloria Ochoa, 2019 -2020.
- [2] Number of women for each 100 men.
- [3] Chile's Population and Household Census, National Institute of Statistics, 2017.
- [4] Ministry for Social Development (MIDESO) 2018a. Poverty and Income Distribution. Presentation of results. CASEN 2017.
- [5] CEPAL, 2018. Annual Statistics on Latin America and the Caribbean. UN. CEPAL. Statistics Department.
- [6] INE, 2017. Gender and Employment. Statistical Focus. National Institute of Statistics, May 2017. At: <http://historico.ine.cl/genero/files/estadisticas/pdf/documentos/enfoque-estadistico-genero-y-empleo.pdf>
- [7] World Economic Forum, 2019. The Global Gender Gap Report 2020.
- [8] Gender and Water Alliance, et al. 2006. Effective Transversalization of the gender focus in water management to ensure sustainable means of life: from guidelines to practice
- [9] FAO, 2016b. Worldwide state of fishing and aquiculture. Contribution to food security and nutrition for all. Rome. On line at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3720s.pdf>
- [10] FAO, 2016. Women's role in fishing and aquiculture in Chile, Colombia, Paraguay and Peru. Integration, systematization. And national analysis of studies. Final Report. FAO RLC. Santiago, Chile. On line at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5774s.pdf>
- [11] Environment Ministry (EM). 2019. Environmental Protection Fund.
- [12] SERNAPESCA, SUBPESCA and DOP, 2018. Women and Men in the Fisheries and Aquiculture Sector in Chile 2018. On line at: http://www.subpesca.cl/portal/618/articles-102848_recurso_1.pdf
- [13] SERNAPESCA, 2019. Small-Scale Fishermen's Listing.
- [14] SERNAPESCA, 2011. Report on Assessment of men and women participating in auxiliary activities in the country's small-scale fishing ports. Chile. National Fisheries Department (SERNAPESCA), Chile.
- [15] DOH. 2016. Systematization Report. Results of the PMG Commitment on Gender Focus. Rural Potable Water Program.
- [16] SUBPESCA, 2019. Response to application AH002T0003196.

[17] SUBPESCA, 2019b. Status of ECMPO applications being processed (Dicember 2019), at: <http://www.subpesca.cl/portal/616/w3-propertyvalue-50834.html>

[18] INE, 2019. Map services, 2017 Census. At: <http://ine-chile.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=bc3cfbd4feec49699c11e813ae9a629f>

[19] According to the Water Works Department data base, included in the ?List of Rural Potable Water Systems in Chile?, the Mashue Rural Potable Water Committee was inaugurated in 2013 and the number of beneficiaries is estimated at 524 for the year 2014 (DOH, 2014)

[20] National Institute of Statistics of Chile, Population and Household Census 2002. https://redatam-ine.ine.cl/redbin/RpWebEngine.exe/Portal?BASE=CENSO_2002&lang=esp

[21] First National Fishing and Aquiculture Census 2008- 2009, National Institute of Statistics of Chile.

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Yes

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; Yes

Improving women's participation and decision making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women Yes

Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

4. Private sector engagement

Elaborate on the private sector's engagement in the project, if any.

The private sector participates in the Broad NTC and the Broad RTC's (Section VIII Governance and Management Arrangements); the private sector is included in the development of guidelines and other tools; it will be beneficiary of strengthening capabilities; and it will participate in the development of the demonstration experiences contributing experience from its sector's point of view. The role and functions of the private sector in this Project are described in detail in Annex 7 (Stakeholders Engagement Plan) and in the case of those companies that presented letters of agreement, their commitments are described in Section IX (Financial Planning and Management), in Section X (Total Budget and Workplan) and in Annex 12 (Cofinancing Agreement Letters).

The Project expects to develop IECB experiences of *Derecho Real de Conservación* (DRC) where the private sector would participate directly, where these are feasible. Participation in the development of the remaining IECB mechanisms is key because of the role that the private sector fulfills in the development of investment projects, within the SEIA framework, and appropriate offsets, as well as their experience regarding best practices certifications and the application of standards. Furthermore, it is expected that companies from the mining and port sectors will participate in the development and application of the methodological guidelines for offsets in the marine sector. As for the development of

the ESR mechanisms, participation of the forestry companies and others that impact natural resource management is key; in order to accompany these efforts and be beneficiaries in the development of ecosystem services assessment studies and return on investment studies for management of water resources, as part of the forestry, public works and sanitary services sectors.

Development of the financing strategy includes articulating IECB's with Corporate Social Responsibility actions and with the actions of private entities in key sectors that affect biodiversity and ecosystem services, or that seek to contribute to conservation, and other secondary benefits from IECB application.

During the PPG phase, the Project established a participation agreement letter with some companies and expects to develop additional agreements moving forward and during the Project implementation phase.

5. Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

During the PPG phase, some possible risks were identified (see details in Annex 5 of the PRODOC), as well as others remaining from the application of the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) (Annex 4 of the PRODOC). In the following table, details of the risks and management measures are given for the implementation phase:

#	Description	Risk Category	Impact & Probability	Risk Treatment / Management Measures	Risk Owner
---	-------------	---------------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	------------

#	Description	Risk Category	Impact & Probability	Risk Treatment / Management Measures	Risk Owner
1	Change in the national government (2022); in regional and municipal governments (2021) could generate changes in policy priorities and reassessing the allocation of institutional human and budgetary resources, affecting participation and governance, implementation, and the level of achievement of Project targets and objective.	<p>Risk category: Political</p> <p>Subcategory: Political will</p> <p>Commitment by the Government</p> <p>Change/ rotation in the government</p>	<p>Potential effect: Changes in the national, regional and local governments could affect the level of interest and the institutional commitment achieved during the Project's design phase. It could generate changes in stakeholders and focal points. In general, this fact might hamper institutional participation in the identification and strengthening of capabilities for the purpose of closing gaps, in accompaniment, and in the development and validation of tools and of the IECB demonstration experiences; in establishing the IECB governance model and in making it efficient; in providing sectorial technical support; in the appropriation and impact of the outputs and results in sectorial policies, strategies, plans and instruments; limiting the fulfillment of outputs and targets; the achievement of administrative measures for safeguarding institutionalization, sustainability, and IECB replicability and scalability.</p> <p>It could limit access by private</p>	<p>Implementation of agreements for institutional participation through the implementation of the stakeholders participation plan and of the agreed-upon institutional and governance arrangement (NTC ? RTC?s) .</p> <p>Highest level of public inter-institutional management.</p> <p>Implementation of the Project's communications strategy with focus on partners and results; efficient implementation and M&E of the work plan and progress toward outcomes achievement.</p> <p>Establishment and operation of the national and regional technical committees, focused on safeguarding participation, the governance model and the functions and targets defined with the institutions.</p> <p>Application of the monitoring and evaluation mechanism focused on participation; on continuous improvement of management; on the development and achievement of outputs and</p>	<p>EM / Department for Biodiversity and Natural Resources / Biodiversity Policies and Planning Department.</p> <p>Project National Director.</p> <p>Project Technical Focal Point</p> <p>National Project Coordinator.</p> <p>Regional Technical Coordinator</p>

#	Description	Risk Category	Impact & Probability	Risk Treatment / Management Measures	Risk Owner
2	The social movement in Chile and the process of constitutional change could weaken the Project's organization, governance, participation, implementation of actions on the regional and local levels and the development of the demonstration experiences, affecting proper continuity in the development of outputs and progress toward fulfillment of targets.	<p>Risk category: Political</p> <p>Subcategories of political risk: Political commitment Political instability</p> <hr/> <p>Risk category: Organizational</p> <p>Subcategories of organizational risk: Governance Knowledge management Innovation, piloting and research.</p>	<p>A new social upheaval that might affect political stability could weaken the Project's organizational capacity. This could limit appropriate participation and operation of the Project's institutional and governance arrangements, as well as the participative development of the demonstration experiences; and it could limit institutional technical support, knowledge management and strengthening of capabilities.</p> <p>Probability: 2 Impact: 3 Risk: Moderate</p>	<p>The Project through direct communications actions with the institutional and private strategic partners, the communities and others, will apply actions for monitoring the state of the situation; it will implement measures for strengthening management, governance, participation in developing the demonstration experiences and activities for strengthening capabilities; it will implement measures pertinent to the state of the situation that favor progress toward achievement of outcomes.</p> <p>The Project will strengthen actions conducive to conflict prevention and management.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>EM / Department of Biodiversity and Natural Resources / Biodiversity Policies and Planning Department.</p> <p>Technical Focal Point</p> <p>National Coordinator</p> <p>Consultant for administrative support, monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>Regional Coordinator.</p> <p>Conservation Guarantors</p> <hr/> <p>UNDP</p> <p>RTA UNDP Chile M&E Official</p>

#	Description	Risk Category	Impact & Probability	Risk Treatment / Management Measures	Risk Owner
3	Presence of health or natural threats that could affect Project execution and progress toward achievement of outcomes.	<p>Risk category: Security and protection</p> <p>Subcategory: Natural dangers</p> <p>Risk category: Social and environmental</p> <p>Subcategory: Community health and safety</p>	<p>The presence of the COVID 19 pandemic, if there should be a resurgence when the Project is being executed, or other health risk or natural disaster, would affect all activities that involve stakeholder participation and the development of the demonstration experiences.</p> <p>This situation if it were to be repeated could eventually affect in some measure the achievement of outcomes, knowledge management and strengthening of capabilities.</p> <p>Probability: 2 Impact: 3 Risk: Moderate S</p>	<p>If necessary, measures will be implemented for participation and agreements, such as: remote working system; institutional articulation management; compensatory measures for strengthening the achievement of outcomes.</p> <p>The Project will apply the norms and measures imposed by the national health authority, by the EM and by the UNDP. The budget includes costs for materials to limit the spread of the virus. The Project will not promote activities that put people's health at risk.</p> <p>Protocols will be drafted for remote activities; implementation of remote communication measures / communication on line (Zoom, teams, Skype, WhatsApp, etc.); as well as biosecurity protocols for in office work, among others.</p> <p>Health protection supplies will be available in a timely manner.</p> <p>All Project personnel and strategic partners will be trained in</p>	<p>EM / Department of Biodiversity and Natural Resources / Biodiversity Policies and Planning Department.</p> <p>Project National Director</p> <p>Technical Focal Point</p> <p>National Coordinator</p> <p>Regional Coordinators.</p> <p>Conservation Guarantor.</p> <p>Direct Project beneficiaries, communities and other strategic partners.</p>

#	Description	Risk Category	Impact & Probability	Risk Treatment / Management Measures	Risk Owner
	SESP / Risk category: Social and environmental				
#	Description	Risk Category	Impact & Probability	Risk Treatment / Management Measures	Risk Owner

#	Description	Risk Category	Impact & Probability	Risk Treatment / Management Measures	Risk Owner
4	Risk 1 /SESP. Within Component 2 (IECBs demonstration experiences), there is a risk that as a result of IECBs implementation, marginalized indigenous and non-indigenous people are affected indirectly and/or involuntarily by restrictions of access to certain natural resources, potentially causing economic displacement and impacts on their livelihoods.	<p>Risk category: Social and environmental</p> <p>Subcategories: Commitment of the interested parties</p>	<p>Probability is low because IECB are voluntary measures therefore their implementation has to be carried out through a totally participative process that includes consulting all stakeholders in order to reach agreement on how the implementation of these instruments will be designed and executed. Negative impacts on livelihoods are not anticipated - neither in the local communities nor among indigenous people- because the management actions under the umbrella of IECBs are designed to improve biodiversity and ecosystems services that communities depend on. IECBs include the execution of sustainable management practices for nature-based income-producing activities, as well as conservation and restoration activities. For example, creation and management of no-take zones for certain marine resources within AMERBs (Areas for Management and Exploitation of Benthonic Resources) or within ECMPOs (Coastal-Marine</p>	<p>A Stakeholders Engagement Plan (PRODOC Annex 7) was drafted during PPG phase, as well as governance and management arrangements through a participative process (PRODOC Section VIII Governance and Management Arrangements). The previously mentioned plans will ensure that all interested parties are adequately consulted regarding the Project activities, including IECB implementation design and application. During the PPG phase, possible sites were visited where the demonstration experiences could be developed; contact was made with the organizations? representatives and an evaluation of site eligibility was made through compliance with criteria regarding enabling conditions for Project implementation (PRODOC Annex 11 Profile of Target Landscape and Viability Studies), following UNDP's Social And Environmental Standards and</p>	<p>EM Technical Focal Point</p> <p>National Coordinator</p> <p>Regional Coordinators.</p> <p>Conservation Guarantor.</p> <hr/> <p>UNDP RTA UNDP Chile</p>

#	Description	Risk Category	Impact & Probability	Risk Treatment / Management Measures	Risk Owner
5	<p>Risk 2 /SESP. There is a risk that promoting sustainable production practices and conservation and restoration activities as part of the IECB?s, could generate some restrictions regarding the exploitation of natural resources (for example, through reserved zones in marine and coastal ecosystems), which could affect both women and men. Furthermore, there could be restraints on participation of women during Project implementation.</p>	<p>Risk category: Social and environmental</p> <p>Subcategories: Biodiversity and use of natural resources</p> <p>Gender</p>	<p>As part of Component 2, the Project will engage with rural communities, many of which have gaps in gender equity. For example, the marine demonstration activities in which artisanal fisheries are mostly dominated by men. The probability of this risk has been categorized as Moderately likely and the impact as Moderate because it is limited in scale (site-specific) and can be avoided or managed with the proposed measures.</p> <p>Probability: 3 Impact: 3 Risk: Moderate</p>	<p>The Project has identified the key barriers to women?s participation and empowerment in the correspondent Gender Analysis, and has prepared a Gender Action Plan (PRODOC Annex 8).</p> <p>The Gender Plan will be implemented and will be overseen through the Monitoring Plan (Section VII and Annex 3 of the PRODOC) for compliance with the actions in this plan and the gender-sensitive indicators, as well as the budget allocated for this. The monitoring plan includes carrying out a consultancy that will ensure inclusion and monitoring of the gender issues.</p> <p>Women?s participation will be promoted in all Project actions (for example, personnel selection, interventions, training, multi-level dialogue ? see details on Question 1 of this document) for the purpose of coping with the constraints to their participation because of cultural factors: for example, in the artisanal fisheries</p>	<p>Technical Focal Point</p> <p>National Coordinator</p> <p>Regional Coordinators.</p> <p>Conservation Guarantor.</p> <hr/> <p>UNDP RTA UNDP Chile</p>

#	Description	Risk Category	Impact & Probability	Risk Treatment / Management Measures	Risk Owner
6	Risk 3 / SESP. All activities of the Project's Component 2 (demonstration experiences of IECBs implementation) will be carried out within or adjacent to areas of high conservation value (i.e reforestation with native species), that could be negatively affected if the Project were to be poorly designed or implemented.	<p>Risk category: Social and environmental</p> <p>Subcategories: Biodiversity and use of natural resources</p>	<p>The terrestrial and marine demonstration experiences aim at implementing conservation and restoration activities to safeguard ecosystem services. All the pilot sites have been selected because they have high value for biodiversity and ecosystem services. The probability of these measures not working as intended is considered slight because they will be designed with the guidance of experts in the field (e.g. consultants, CONAF) based on the best available science and approval of local communities. See more details in PRODOC Section IX Budget Notes and Annex 6 Overview of Technical Consultancies.</p> <p>Probability: 1 Impact: 3 Risk: low</p>	-	<p>Technical Focal Point</p> <p>National Coordinator</p> <p>Regional Coordinators.</p> <p>Conservation Guarantor.</p> <hr/> <p>UNDP RTA UNDP Chile</p>

#	Description	Risk Category	Impact & Probability	Risk Treatment / Management Measures	Risk Owner
7	Risk 4 /SESP. The Ecosystem Services Retribution (ESR) scheme in the marine demonstration experiences are expected to result in increased biodiversity and biomass within the defined non-extraction zones; this may increase vulnerability to thefts and poaching.	<p>Risk category: Social and environmental</p> <p>Subcategories: Biodiversity and use of natural resources</p>	<p>By establishing non-resource-extraction areas as part of the ESR scheme in the marine demonstration experiences, it is expected that biodiversity and biomass will increase, to be confirmed by scientific studies. This may bring adverse effects, such as increased thefts of resources by illegal users of the marine areas. Based on previous experiences the probability of this to happen is moderately likely and the impact is moderate because is limited in scale (site-specific) and can be managed with locally accepted measures.</p> <p>Probability: 3 Impact: 3 Risk: Moderate</p>	<p>As a management measure to address this risk, the ESR scheme in the marine demonstration experiences includes the design, establishment, monitoring and reporting of a Surveillance System of remote cameras and a Community Surveillance System led by the local communities with use-rights on marine resources (indigenous and non-indigenous) to minimize and prevent thefts (See details in the PRODOC Section V Outcomes and associations and Annex 6 Overview of technical consultancies /Section X Total Budget and Workplan, Budget Note 13). A Plan for capacity building will be drafted and implemented (PRODOC Component 3 / Section VI) for sustainable management and compliance with rules in the extraction of marine resources. The experience and lessons learned from surveillance will be systematized and will serve as input for capacity building.</p>	<p>Technical Focal Point</p> <p>National Coordinator</p> <p>Regional Coordinators.</p> <p>Conservation Guarantor.</p> <hr/> <p>UNDP RTA UNDP Chile</p>

#	Description	Risk Category	Impact & Probability	Risk Treatment / Management Measures	Risk Owner
8	Risk 5 / SESP. Project outcomes regarding enhancing biodiversity and ecosystem services in the demonstration experiences are vulnerable to possible impacts from climate change (e.g. increases in ocean's temperature; exposure to prolonged droughts, among other impacts).	<p>Risk category: Social and environmental</p> <p>Subcategories: climate change and disasters</p>	<p>Climate change is a global phenomenon that also affects the Project's intervention zones, and that could affect its outcomes in the future. However, it is not as yet possible to comprehend the extent of its impacts. Concern over climatic variability and climate change is inherent in this Project.</p> <p>Probability: 3 Impact: 3 Risk: moderate</p>	<p>The development of IECB demonstration experiences in terrestrial and marine ecosystems includes the design and implementation of sustainable management measures that will consider climate change criteria. The Project will also develop policy tools and a governance that contribute to conservation and to increase resiliency of biodiversity and ecosystem services. The results of these measures will contribute to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change (PRODOC Section V Outcomes and Associations / Section VI Project Results Framework and Multi Year Work Plan - Annex 2). The outputs and targets defined in Components 1 and 2 aim at reinforcing institutional management of biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation (water and marine resources) and climate change mitigation and adaptation. Specific indicators for sustainable management</p>	<p>Technical Focal Point</p> <p>National Coordinator</p> <p>Regional Coordinators.</p> <p>Conservation Guarantor.</p> <hr/> <p>UNDP RTA UNDP Chile</p>

#	Description	Risk Category	Impact & Probability	Risk Treatment / Management Measures	Risk Owner
9	Risk 6 /SESP. Child labour could be used in small-scale agriculture /forestry in properties part of the ESR scheme in terrestrial ecosystems or in fishing activities associated to the ESR scheme in marine ecosystems (Component 2)	<p>Risk category: Social and environmental</p> <p>Subcategories: Human Rights</p>	<p>In Chile, child labour is absolutely prohibited and the country has ratified all international conventions about it. Thus, the probability was categorized as slight. Nevertheless, there is still child labour in some places of the country and in certain economic activities. Impact is severe because it entails adverse consequences to people but these are predictable and reversible.</p> <p>Probability: 1 Impact: 4 Risk: moderate</p>	<p>Demonstration experiences mostly target small landholders and fishermen associations that are not the major sources of child labour in Chile. Particular attention will be given to ensure that no child labor is involved in activities associated with Project implementation, through the following measures: The UNDP Country Office and the PMU will promote strict compliance with the national legislation that prohibits child labor , through awareness raising about the issue in the sites and communities of demonstration experiences, and training to Project staff, partners and consultants. Communication of the child labor prohibition will be included in the Terms of Reference for consultancies and services and included in all contracts and donation agreements.. The PMU will ensure that all actions and service contracts impose the prohibition of child labor. The UNDP will ensure</p>	<p>EM</p> <p>Technical Focal Point</p> <p>National Coordinator</p> <p>Regional Coordinators.</p> <p>Conservation Guarantor.</p> <hr/> <p>UNDP RTA UNDP Chile</p>

#	Description	Risk Category	Impact & Probability	Risk Treatment / Management Measures	Risk Owner
10	Risk 7 /SESP. Project's area of influence includes indigenous peoples. There is a risk that these communities may be excluded from the decisions that will affect them (directly or indirectly), that they will not benefit equally from the Project, and/or that there will be restrictions in their access to resources associated with the implementation of IECB's. In addition, there could be some ideological resistance to IECB's because they are market-based solutions.	<p>Risk category: Social and environmental</p> <p>Subcategories: Human Rights of Indigenous Peoples.</p>	<p>IECB's constitute a market-based solution for conservation in which there could be (or not) monetary transactions.</p> <p>Probability of this risk has been categorized as Not Likely because to implement the demonstration experiences the Project will use community-based governance structures that already exist in each pilot site, and that give voice to indigenous peoples (i.e CAPRs in the terrestrial DEs), or are the voice of indigenous communities (i.e. ECMPO in the Caul'n's marine DE).</p> <p>If indigenous peoples are left out of the Project decision making and short and long-term benefits, then the impact will be at least Severe because the ultimate goal of the Project is to enhance to contributions of nature to people.</p> <p>Probability: 2 Impact: 4 Risk: Moderate</p>	<p>Particular attention will be given to ensure that indigenous peoples participate of decision making and benefit from the Project outcomes, through the following measures:</p> <p>Implementation of the IECB's will be carried out within a framework of sensibilization, generating capacities and support. Each Project activity will be carried out through a process of critical reflection and feed-back with both men and women indigenous participants, which will allow a detailed understanding of the scope of these instruments and to take the necessary safeguards to avoid negative impacts in their participation and in their territories.</p> <p>An Indigenous Peoples Plan Framework will be developed whose compliance will be monitored during Project implementation as part of the M&E plan (PRODOC Section VII Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan / Annex 3 Monitoring Plan). The mentioned Plan for Indigenous Peoples describes</p>	<p>EM / MIDES / CONADI</p> <p>Technical Focal Point</p> <p>National Coordinator</p> <p>Regional Coordinators.</p> <p>Conservation Guarantor.</p> <hr/> <p>UNDP RTA UNDP Chile</p>

#	Description	Risk Category	Impact & Probability	Risk Treatment / Management Measures	Risk Owner
11	Risk 8 / SESP. A culturally appropriate FPIC process has not been developed during PPG phase in the demonstration experiences where there are indigenous peoples, therefore indigenous peoples might still decide not to confirm their participation in the project	Risk category: Social and environmental Subcategories: Human Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	Probability of this risk is Slight because local partners and their represented indigenous peoples are aware of the project and preliminarily are eager to participate in a project that will help them to safeguard biodiversity and ecosystem services through different mechanisms. Impact is Severe because if indigenous communities decide not to participate, the Project will lose the opportunity to test IECB tools in an indigenous people - oriented scenario, which is critical to improve IECB related policy. Probability: 2 Impact: 4 Risk: Moderate	A culturally appropriate FPIC process will be developed with the indigenous peoples once the Project starts its implementation, being the first priority, and in partnership with the NGO Costa Humboldt for the marine demonstration experience in Caul?n and with the CAPRs Mashue and Liqui?e in the terrestrial demonstration experiences (additional details will be provided in the IPPF to be developed before project implementation). The FPIC process will be included in the scope of work of the donation agreement with the NGO Costa Humboldt and the CAPRs Mashue and Liqui?e, and in the technical consultancy for gender and cultural pertinence (PRODOC Annex 6 Overview of Technical Consultancies).	EM / MIDES / CONADI Technical Focal Point National Coordinator Regional Coordinators. Conservation Guarantor. <hr/> UNDP RTA UNDP Chile

6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

The Project's Implementation Agency is the UNDP; the executing institution is the Environment Ministry. The Project has a Steering Committee consisting of a UNDP representative, the Project Director who represents the EM and a representative of each institutional beneficiary. The Project's governance and participation arrangement is a multi-sectorial and inter-institutional coordination body called the "National Technical Committee" and the respective subnational bodies called the "Regional Technical Committees", in those Regions where the land and marine and coastal IECB demonstration experiences will be carried out. Both Committees have a broad version, where communities, civil society (NGOs, Foundations and others), private enterprise, academia and other relevant stakeholders participate.

Development of demonstration experience implementation will be led by the Project Management Unit which has a National Project Coordinator and an Assistant for technical, administrative and monitoring and evaluation support. On the subnational level, the PMU is represented by the Macroregional Technical Coordinator; at this level they will have the support of the EM's Regional Ministerial Secretariats, who will reinforce inter-institutional management and governance on the regional and local levels in coordination with the RTC's and their broader instances.

The partners responsible for development of the ESR demonstration experiences are the Guarantors of Biodiversity Conservation (GBC): in the marine experiences these will be the Costa Humbolt Foundation and the Capital Azul Foundation. In the case of the land experiences, the GBC's will be the Rural Potable Water Committee (CAPR) of Mashue and the CAPR of Liqui?e. The small-scale fishermen's organizations will be beneficiaries and will participate in the implementation of the marine ESR DE; in the land cases, these will be the CAPR's themselves and their beneficiaries. The pertinent sectorial institutions will accompany development of the demonstration experiences and will be beneficiaries of capacity building along with the local organizations.

For its part, the GEF Coastal Wetlands Project will be a key partner in the development of the Derecho Real de Conservaci?n IECB DE in two wetlands (Rocuant Andalien and Queule, Annex 1). That Project will provide the local governance arrangement and operational support, and will contribute the methodology and evaluation of wetlands biodiversity and ecosystems, based on the results of their efforts. Some private entities will participate, taking on the responsibility for developing some of the IECB's, as in the case of Derecho Real de Conservaci?n. The Mashue CAPR will lend support for the development of a DE for a CE in its respective sub-basin.


The regional and local governments where the demonstration experiences are implemented, in consideration of their role in territorial governance and administration, will participate in the governance arrangement and will be responsible for contributing to institutionalizing the focus of biodiversity and ecosystems services protection in territorial planning instruments.

The Small-Scale Fishermen's Organizations and the Rural Potable Water Committees and their beneficiaries have active responsibility in development of the IECB demonstration experiences for Ecosystem Services Retribution. The Project counterparts, their role and functions are described in detail in the Stakeholders Participation Plan in the PRODOC, Annex 7.

The NTC will consist initially of representatives of the EM, the Under-Secretariat for Fishing and Aquiculture (SUBPESCA), the National Service for Fisheries and Aquiculture (SERNAPESCA), the Department of Overseas Territory and the Merchant Marine (DIRECTEMAR), the Institute for Fisheries Development (IFOP), the National Institute for the Sustainable Development of Small-Scale Fishing and Aquiculture (INDESPA), the National Corporation for Indigenous Development (CONADI), the National Forestry Corporation (CONAF), the Forestry Institute (INFOR), the Superintendency of Sanitary Services (SISS), the Water Works Department (DOH), the Highway Department, the Institute for the Development of Agriculture and Livestock (INDAP), the Bureau of Agrarian Studies and Policies (ODEPA), the Agriculture and Livestock Service (SAG), the Finance Ministry, the Under-Secretariat for Tourism, the National Tourism Service (SERNATUR), the Service for Environmental Evaluation (SEA) and the Environment Superintendency (SMA). In addition, the Implementation Agency (UNDP) and the GEF FPO will be part of the NTC. The RTC's will consist of representatives of those public bodies with competencies in the areas of intervention in the ecosystem included in each Region, as well as the corresponding Regional Government (GORE) and Local Government (Municipality). For the Broad instances, representatives of the communities, private companies, NGO's, civil society, academia and other relevant stakeholders will be invited to participate in order to achieve the desired results.

The EM will preside over both the NTC and the RTC's; they can call for an internal Technical Round Table for advisement purposes. This Round Table will include EM divisions, departments and areas that contribute to the design, implementation and sustainability of IECB's, providing technical and operational assistance as well as articulation with other EM initiatives (See details in section VIII Governance and Management Arrangements in the PRODOC). The Project organization structure is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Project Organization structure



Diagrams about the governance structures of the National and Regional Technical Committees are presented in Annex H.

7. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions from below:

NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

- National Action Plan for Adaptation (NAPA) under LDCF/UNFCCC
- National Action Program (NAP) under UNCCD
- ASGM NAP (Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining) under Mercury
- Minamata Initial Assessment (MIA) under Minamata Convention
- National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP) under UNCBD
- National Communications (NC) under UNFCCC
- Technology Needs Assessment (TNA) under UNFCCC
- National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) under UNCBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD
- National Implementation Plan (NIP) under POPs
- Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)
- National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE) under GEFSEC
- Biennial Update Report (BUR) under UNFCCC

- Others

- National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP) under UNCBD
- National Action Plan for Adaptation (NAPA) under LDCF/UNFCCC
- Biannual Update Report (BUR) under UNFCCC
- Intended Nationally Determined Contribution ? INDC under UNFCCC.
- Plan for Adaptation to Climate Change in Biodiversity
- National Strategy for Conservation and Rational Use of Wetlands in Chile
- National Strategy for Marine Conservation
- Chile's Forestry Policy 2015 - 2035
- National Strategy for Climate Change and Vegetational Resources - ENCCRV
- National Rural Development Policy
- Law 20.930 on Derecho Real de Conservaci?n

8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, including a budget, key deliverables and a timeline, and explain how it will contribute to the project's overall impact.

Knowledge management is part of the Project's Component 3 (Section V Outcomes and Section VI Project Results Framework). It is based on development of a Strategic Communications Plan focused on knowledge management and strengthening capabilities of key stakeholders regarding IECB's, which will be drafted during the Q3 and Q4 periods of the Project's 1st year and carried out in the course of Project implementation. Budget money has been allocated for development and implementation of the Strategic Communications Plan, including different communication media: (i) web platforms and development of self-teaching training courses; (ii) publication of documents, bulletins and systematization of experiences; (iii) exchange activities and distribution; and (iv) promotion of citizen science platforms (I-naturalist or others).

Knowledge generated as specific outputs and outcomes in components 1 and 2, such as the development of tools and of the demonstration experiences for each IECB in land and marine environments, will become inputs for raising awareness and strengthening national capabilities, in institutions, communities, in the private sector and with other key stakeholders. The knowledge management thus generated will contribute to achieving the Project's objective through raising awareness among stakeholders, strengthening capabilities and the institutionalization of the IECB mechanisms and other outputs, mainstreaming the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation in institutional routine activities; this will ensure improved institutional management and the participation of the private sector, increasing financing for sustainable conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Development of the IECB information system and its implementation through an internet platform will constitute a mechanism for permanent knowledge management for all stakeholders (components 1 and 3, Section V Outcomes and Associations and VI Project Results Framework).

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

Describe the budgeted M and E plan

Project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) will be implemented in accordance with the UNDP and GEF Monitoring Policies and Procedures. Monitoring and evaluation will be carried out on all of the following: fulfillment of the indicators defined in the work plan (Section VII M&E and Annex 3 M&E indicators); all the potential risks listed for Project development (Annex 5/PRODOC); the social and environmental safeguards and risks identified and registered through application of the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (Annex 4 of the PRODOC); the strategic partners commitment plan (Section IX Financial Planning and Management; Annex 12 of the PRODOC); the gender action plan (Annex 8 of the PRODOC); the GEF core indicators (Annex 13 of the PRODOC); as well as application of other tools for the evaluation of indicators that may be required.

Furthermore, planned activities will be carried out that are a part of the monitoring and evaluation plan, such as the following: the inception workshop with its respective report; the Project implementation report (PIR) on an annual basis; the independent midterm evaluation and the independent final evaluation, plus the corresponding reports, and the prior revision of the level of fulfillment of the GEF core indicators. The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan budget is for USD \$115,000. Implementation of the Plan will be accompanied by the UNDP's Technical Regional Advisor, Monitoring Officials, Gender Officials and the UNDP Country Office.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget is showed below

Table 2. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget

GEF M&E requirements	Responsible Parties	Indicative costs (US\$)	Time frame
Inception Workshop	Implementing Partner PM/Coordinator	13,000	Within 60 days of CEO endorsement of this project.
Inception Report	PM/Coordinator	None	Within 90 days of CEO endorsement of this project.
Monitoring of indicators in project results framework	PM/Coordinator	None	Annually prior to GEF PIR. This will include GEF core indicators.
GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	RTA UNDP Country Office[1] PMU/Coordinator/ CTA	Add14 18,000	Annually typically between June-August
Monitoring all risks (UNDP risk register)	UNDP Country Office PMU/Coordinator/ CTA	Add 0	On-going.
Monitoring of [list safeguards management frameworks and/or plans here; delete row if none]	<i>Project Safeguards Officer</i>	<i>Add as per plan</i>	On-going.
Supervision missions	UNDP Country Office	None[2]	Annually

Table 2. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget

GEF M&E requirements	Responsible Parties	Indicative costs (US\$)	Time frame
Oversight missions	RTA and BPPS/GEF	None ¹⁴	Troubleshooting as needed
Mid-term GEF and/or LDCF/SCCF Core indicators and METT or other required Tracking Tools	INFOR ? CONAF ? DOH ? TNC - Garantes de conservaci?n Terrestre y marino - PMU	6,000	Before mid-term review mission takes place.
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR)	Independent evaluators	36,000	Add date included on cover page of Project Document
Terminal GEF and/or LDCF/SCCF Core indicators and METT or other required Tracking Tools	INFOR ? CONAF ? DOH ? TNC - Garantes de conservaci?n Terrestre y marino - PMU	6,000	Before terminal evaluation mission takes place
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE)	Independent evaluators	36,000	Add date included on cover page of Project Document
TOTAL indicative COST		115,000*	Add to TBWP component 3

10. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels, as appropriate. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

Regarding socioeconomic benefits, by the end of the project there will be a direct positive influence on 1,334 people (401 women and 933 men) who will benefit from the mechanisms put in place to safeguard biodiversity and ecosystem services that they depend on (mostly marine resources and fresh water supply). These direct beneficiaries are the members of each of the organizations that will co-execute the project IECB demonstration experiences: the Rural Drinking Water Committees of Mashue and Liqui?e, the Fishermen Association of AMERBs Chepu, Ventanas and Maitencillo, and the indigenous communities of ECMPO Caul?n.

As a result of Project implementation, this initiative will deliver various global environment benefits (GEB?s) in sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity, as described in the GEF-7 Programme Directives. The demonstration experiences in land ecosystems will contribute to the protection of ecosystems of high global significance, making available around 100,000 ha of high value (HCV) native forests for conservation and sustainably managed biodiversity in the Los R?os Region, and 2,845.47 ha of surface area in marine-coastal ecosystems, distributed between the Valpara?so and Los Lagos Regions, sustainably managed to reduce pressure on productive species threatened with collapse or even extinction (bentonic resources). Furthermore, carbon emissions will be mitigated, measured as carbon sequester, as a result of the application of sustainable management measures, amounting to 89,890 metric tons of CO₂.

Having available IECB mechanisms and guidelines as well as other institutionalized outputs (green project models; intervention models based on sustainable practices; information and monitoring and evaluation systems and an internet platform; studies on biometrics and return on investment in ecosystem services, etc.) generates benefits on the national level, strengthens institutions? management capabilities, as well as

public policies, strategies, plans and instruments. At the same time, access by the private sector and their participation is ensured, thereby improving the development of conservation projects and appropriate offsets through IECB application, increasing both public and private financing and favorably impacting biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation. Furthermore, it will contribute to the implementation and up-dating of the NDC's and Chile's other international commitments such as the CDB and Climate Change. It contributes directly to EM and SEIA capabilities; to the Environmental Superintendency's information system; as well as to the component of the National System of Public Investment consistent with the objectives of IECB implementation under the Social Development Ministry's responsibility.

Development of the land and marine demonstration experiences (DE's) will make it possible to validate the methodological guidelines for the instruments and generate knowledge for strengthening local and national capabilities. The land ESR experience will reinforce the management capabilities of the Rural Potable Water Committees impacting other CAPR's, through replication and up-scaling; as well as directly to their beneficiary members. This experience will benefit the Public Works Ministry's Water Works Department regarding improving management of the CAPR's under their responsibility as well as achieving more sustainable management of water resources for human consumption. This initiative will contribute to DE sustainability, replicability and scalability in other CAPR's. Studies on biometrics and return on investment will contribute to Sanitary Services Superintendency management and its inclusion of biodiversity and ecosystem services in determining tariffs for potable water services. Development of NbS project models contributes to the Finance Ministry's Green Bonds initiative regarding climate change. The IECB mechanisms with green project models and sustainable management measures, together with the territorial governance framework, contribute to improving management in the Agriculture Ministry's institutions (INDAP, CONAF, INFOR, SAG and ODEPA). As for the results of IECB application regarding the ecosystem services of scenic beauty, human well-being and tourism, this will contribute to the targets of the National Tourism Service.

Implementation of sustainable management measures in native forests will make it possible to improve in the middle and long term the ecosystem services of water for rural human consumption and productive systems, carbon sinking, and other ecosystem services, such as: scenic beauty, tourism, cultural objectives, medicinal applications and social well-being. If it should be feasible to develop the ESR DE's in the Alto Maipo Wetlands, this will be an example of supporting the ecosystem service of water for human consumption in an urban area. If it should be feasible to develop CE experiences in coastal wetlands, the surface area under conservation measures will be increased as well as financing for biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation in this type of ecosystem.

The outputs and outcomes will foster transfer of capabilities and financing through IECB application; the outputs taken together will be an incentive for project development; the ESR demonstration experiences could also serve as offset sites, attracting financing to the territory; this same benefit will generate the development of the certification system. The land and marine ESR demonstration experiences will contribute to regional and local governance and to territorial planning within the IECB framework as well as planning of sustainable measures founded in NbS's.

The implementation of demonstration experiences in marine and coastal ecosystems will help strengthen capabilities of Fishermen's Union members in the AMERB's and the ECMPO. In this last case, indigenous issues will be safeguarded. Developing this IECB experience will lead directly to an increase in biodiversity, in quantity, size and number of species; will transfer methodologies for natural resources conservation and management, demonstrating an increase in benthic resources and seaweed, that can be incorporated as a model in the management plans of these marine management systems (replication, sustainability and up-scaling). Furthermore, the Unions will be strengthened in their organizational capabilities, in reaching agreements through the development of activities for the application of surveillance system models and biodiversity management models. As in the case of the land experiences, this will attract financing for the management and conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and through the system for managing and increasing natural resources, we will even be contributing to incomes, the feasibility of project development and broadening out to include other ecosystem services such as tourism.

The IECB demonstration experiences in the AMERB and ECMPO will generate, like in the land experiences, an ESR mechanism (green project model, sustainable management measures, information system and financing strategy); these will become offset sites and will have a Biodiversity Conservation Certification System. The tools generated will contribute to strengthening the sectorial institutions: SERNAPESCA, SUBPESCA, INDESPA and DIRECTEMAR. Furthermore, the results of the demonstration experience in the ECMPO where indigenous issues are addressed, will contribute to the CONADI targets and to strengthening ECMPO management plans through IECB application.

Safeguarding application of the gender focus throughout the IECB DE's, in all capacity building actions, including indigenous issues and cultural pertinence, will provide lessons that will reveal the role of women in biodiversity and ecosystem conservation; it will foster IECB application and provide knowledge for replicability and up-scaling actions.

Implementation of the ESR IECB and other instruments will provide social benefits recognized on the local, regional and national levels; as well as the contribution of models on the international level.

11. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks

Provide information on the identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project/program based on your organization's ESS systems and procedures

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification *

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
Medium/Moderate			

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Elaborate on the types and risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and impacts (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and any measures undertaken as well as planned management measures to address these risks during implementation.

ANNEX 4. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING PROCEDURE (SESP)

Project Information

<i>Project Information</i>	
1. Project Title	Economic instruments and tools to support the conservation of biodiversity, the payment of ecosystem services and sustainable development
2. Project Number	5794
3. Location (Global/Region/Country)	Chile

Part A. Integrating Overarching Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability

QUESTIONS: How Does the Project Integrate the Overarching Principles in order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams the human-rights based approach

The project objective is to improve national financing of biodiversity through the design, implementation and optimization of market-based economic instruments for biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation (IECB, its acronym in Spanish). The instruments to be developed are: Ecosystem Services Retribution (ESR; also known as Payment for Ecosystem Services or PES schemes); Biodiversity Offsets in the context of the Chilean Environmental Impact Assessment Framework; *Derecho Real de Conservación* (a Chilean mechanism similar to internationally used Conservation Easements and Covenants); and a Public Certification System for activities, practices or sites, that contribute to biodiversity conservation and to maintain or restore ecosystem services. These instruments will be institutionalized through implementing guides and procedures, and will be piloted in terrestrial and marine demonstration experiences in partnership with local partners and communities. Thus, IECBs are expected to strengthen public financing and to facilitate economic contributions by the private sector to maintaining Chile's natural capital.

The Project mainstreams the human rights-based approach, as follows:

Participation and inclusion: the Project will seek to assure the commitment and participation of all stakeholders in the different stages of the Project cycle and its activities. Governmental bodies, local communities, civil society and the private sector have all been consulted during the PPG phase. An analysis was carried out of the stakeholders, which served as a basis for drawing up the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Annex 7 of PRODOC) and for the development of an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) before project implementation. In the Stakeholders Engagement Plan, key Project stakeholders are identified (see stakeholder map in PRODOC Annex 7), the participation process, consultations carried out during Project formulation and the mechanisms of participation are summarized. Furthermore, the role of each stakeholder is described, including government institutions on the national, regional and local levels, the academic and research institutions, the private sector, organizations of civil society and local communities, including those in which women and indigenous communities participate. The interventions in the demonstration experiences will be carried out with the full participation and inclusion of the relevant stakeholders. During implementation, the Project will ensure that potentially marginalized individuals and groups have a voice in the decision-making processes and in the activities that may affect them. The human rights principle of participation and inclusion will be respected throughout the Project. When appropriate, free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) will be sought. Finally, the conflict resolution mechanisms that will be applied during Project implementation can be found in the Stakeholders Engagement Plan (Annexes 7 of the PRODOC). The Project strategy includes actions for information management and distribution.

The Project is aligned with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development contributing to the following goals: 1) Goal 6 Water and sanitation, through the development of an ESR model applicable to safeguard drinking water sources for rural communities of IECB to protect biodiversity and ecosystem services; 2) Goal 13 Climate Action, through the development of models of nature-based solutions (NbS) that can be implemented in the context of IECBs implementation to achieve climate mitigation and adaptation goals while protecting biodiversity; 3) Goal 14 Life Below Water, through testing ESR schemes to protect relevant marine resources in partnership with fishermen and indigenous peoples; and 4) Goal 15 Life On Land, through testing different IECBs to protect biodiversity and ecosystem services outside official protected areas, in partnership with landowners and local communities. The principle of rendering accounts and the state of law will be maintained, adhering to all standard UNDP policies regarding monitoring, evaluation, audits and transparency in Project implementation. The UNDP has established account rendering mechanisms that have two main components: 1) A review of compliance in responding to any possible complaint that the UNDP did not comply with the applicable social and environmental policies; and 2) a Stakeholder Response Mechanism (SRM) which ensures that individuals, peoples and communities affected by the Projects have access to appropriate procedures for resolving complaints, for hearing and addressing complaints and conflicts related to the Project.

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women's empowerment

During the PPG phase, a gender analysis was carried out for the purpose of understanding the different impacts, needs and concerns of women and men regarding the Project and its outcomes. A Gender Action Plan was drawn up and budgeted (see Annex 8), and it was assigned a UNDP gender marker: GEN2. The Project includes indicators broken down by gender in the Project Results Framework (Section VI of the PRODOC). The annual reports will include details of the outcomes achieved in terms of promoting gender equality and improving women's empowerment. In the Project design, human and financial resources were earmarked for incorporating a gender perspective during Project implementation and for monitoring the effectiveness of this. Gender balance will be taken into consideration in hiring Project staff and in nominating the Steering Committee, as well as in activities for developing capabilities, among others.

According to the gender analysis carried out, women's role in biodiversity conservation and participation in IECB implementation has not been sufficiently valued or appreciated, nor is it clear that the benefits of these are reaching women. For this reason, women will be beneficiaries of actions for capacity building and for promoting opportunities to develop nature-based income-generating activities, including the implementation of economic instruments for biodiversity conservation (IECB in Spanish) and complementary actions such as tourism. Along these same lines, the Project seeks to reveal and value women's knowledge about nature, generated through their traditions and way of life, currently under threat by environmental degradation, especially in the case of indigenous women. The Gender Action Plan (Annex 8) establishes measures so indigenous women's knowledge is appropriately considered during the Project development. These measures will also be considered in the development of an IPPF before Project implementation.

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability

This Project promotes environmental sustainability through the development of economic instruments for biodiversity conservation so that economic/productive activities and conservation efforts may converge in an integrated development strategy with a territorial focus. In order to achieve this, the Project will promote the incorporation of IECB's into the institutional framework, both in the marine and coastal ecosystems and the land and continental aquatic ecosystems (component 1). The IECB's will be tested through demonstration experiences in areas of high conservation value and in different administrative and resource management systems (component 2). In the same manner, the Project will promote the increase of knowledge and comprehension of the IECB's in Chile among stakeholders and other interested parties (component 3), with the objective of promoting their application throughout the national territory as a contribution to environmental sustainability.

Furthermore, the Project incorporates environmental sustainability through the implementation of a governance framework that makes it possible for institutional and private stakeholders as well as local communities within a territory to act in a coordinated manner, which will lead to lesser impacts on the environment and will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of actions that are currently being carried out in a disarticulated manner, leading in many cases to increased pressures on the same territory generating a process of degradation.

The Project reflects the priorities identified in the United Nations Framework Convention on Biodiversity, ratified by Chile in 1994, as well as Chile's National Biodiversity Strategy 2017-2030, especially Strategic Objective 3: Develop a solid institutional structure, good governance and just and equitable distribution of the benefits of biodiversity. This objective specifically includes as one of its strategic lines of action, to develop, increase and refine economic instruments and mechanisms for biodiversity conservation.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?
<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Impact and Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</i>

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?
<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Impact and Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</i>
<p>Risk 1. Within Component 2 (IECBs demonstration experiences), there is a risk that as a result of IECBs implementation, marginalized indigenous and non-indigenous people are affected indirectly and/or involuntarily by restrictions of access to certain natural resources, potentially causing economic displacement and impacts on their livelihoods.</p> <p>Principle 1 (q3); Principle 3 Standard 5:5.2; and Standard 6: 6.3, 6.6.</p>	<p>I:4</p> <p>P:2</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Probability is low because IECB are voluntary measures therefore their implementation has to be carried out through a totally participative process that includes consulting all stakeholders in order to reach agreement on how the implementation of these instruments will be designed and executed. Negative impacts on livelihoods are not anticipated - neither in the local communities nor among indigenous people- because the management actions under the umbrella of IECBs are designed to improve biodiversity and ecosystems services that communities depend on.</p>	<p>A Stakeholders Engagement Plan (PRODOC Annex 7) and governance and management arrangements through a participative process (PRODOC Section VIII Governance and Management Arrangements) were developed during PPG phase. The previously mentioned plan, as well as the Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) / Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) to be developed before Project implementation, will ensure that all interested parties are adequately consulted (via FPIC where required) regarding the Project activities -including IECB implementation design and application-, to prevent or mitigate risks. During the PPG phase, possible sites were visited where the demonstration experiences could be developed; contact was made with the organizations? representatives and an evaluation of site eligibility was made through compliance with criteria regarding enabling conditions for Project implementation (PRODOC Annex 11 Profile of Target Landscape and Viability Studies), following UNDP's Social And Environmental Standards and ensuring participation of activities? beneficiaries in the Regional Technical Committee in their Broad instances (PRODOC</p>

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?
Risk Description	Impact and Probability (1-5)	Significance (Low, Moderate, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
<p>Risk 2. There is a risk that promoting sustainable production practices and conservation and restoration activities as part of the IECB's, could generate some restrictions regarding the exploitation of natural resources (for example, through reserved zones in marine and coastal ecosystems), which could affect both women and men. Furthermore, there could be restraints on participation of women during Project implementation.</p> <p>Principle 2 (q2, q4)</p>	<p>I = 3</p> <p>P = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>As part of Component 2, the Project will engage with rural communities, many of which have gaps in gender equity. For example, the marine demonstration activities in which artisanal fisheries are mostly dominated by men. The probability of this risk has been categorized as Moderately likely and the impact as Moderate because it is limited in scale (site-specific) and can be avoided or managed with the proposed measures.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>The Project has identified the key barriers to women's participation and empowerment in the correspondent Gender Analysis, and has prepared a Gender Action Plan (PRODOC Annex 8).</p> <p>The Gender Plan will be implemented and will be overseen through the Monitoring Plan (Section VII and Annex 3 of the PRODOC) for compliance with the actions in this plan and the gender-sensitive indicators, as well as the budget allocated for this. The monitoring plan includes carrying out a consultancy that will ensure inclusion and monitoring of the gender issues.</p> <p>Women's participation will be promoted in all Project actions (for example, personnel selection, interventions, training, multi-level dialogue ? see details on Question 1 of this document) for the purpose of coping with the constraints to their participation because of cultural factors: for example, in the artisanal fisheries reality, which has traditionally been a men's do. The Project will also promote recognition of women's role in nature conservation, which in the past has not been adequately recognized or valued.</p> <p>In addition, the Project has</p>

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?
<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Impact and Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</i>
<p>Risk 3. All activities of the Project's Component 2 (demonstration experiences of IECBs implementation) will be carried out within or adjacent to areas of high conservation value (i.e reforestation with native species), that could be negatively affected if the Project were to be poorly designed or implemented.</p> <p>Principle 3, Standard 1: 1.2; 1.6</p>	<p>I = 3 P = 1</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>The terrestrial and marine demonstration experiences aim at implementing conservation and restoration activities to safeguard ecosystem services. All the pilot sites have been selected because they have high value for biodiversity and ecosystem services. The probability of these measures not working as intended is considered slight because they will be designed with the guidance of experts in the field (e.g. consultants, CONAF) based on the best available science and approval of local communities. See more details in PRODOC Section IX Budget Notes and Annex 6 Overview of Technical Consultancies.</p>	<p>-</p>

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?
<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Impact and Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</i>
<p>Risk 4. The Ecosystem Services Retribution (ESR) scheme in the marine demonstration experiences are expected to result in increased biodiversity and biomass within the defined non-extraction zones; this may increase vulnerability to thefts and poaching.</p> <p>Principle 3, Standard 1: 1.7; 1.11</p>	<p>I: 3 P: 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>By establishing non-resource-extraction areas as part of the ESR scheme in the marine demonstration experiences, it is expected that biodiversity and biomass will increase, to be confirmed by scientific studies. This may bring adverse effects, such as increased thefts of resources by illegal users of the marine areas.</p> <p>Based on previous experiences the probability of this to happen is moderately likely and the impact is moderate because is limited in scale (site-specific) and can be managed with locally accepted measures.</p>	<p>As a management measure to address this risk, the ESR scheme in the marine demonstration experiences includes the design, establishment, monitoring and reporting of a Surveillance System of remote cameras and a Community Surveillance System led by the local communities with use-rights on marine resources (indigenous and non-indigenous) to minimize and prevent thefts (See details in the PRODOC Section V Outcomes and associations and Annex 6 Overview of technical consultancies /Section X Total Budget and Workplan, Budget Note 13).</p> <p>A Plan for capacity building will be drafted and implemented (PRODOC Component 3 / Section VI) for sustainable management and compliance with rules in the extraction of marine resources. The experience and lessons learned from surveillance will be systematized and will serve as input for capacity building.</p>

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?
<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Impact and Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</i>
<p>Risk 5: Project outcomes regarding enhancing biodiversity and ecosystem services in the demonstration experiences are vulnerable to possible impacts from climate change (e.g. increases in ocean's temperature; exposure to prolonged droughts, among other impacts).</p> <p>Principle 3, Standard 2: 2.2</p>	<p>I: 3</p> <p>P: 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Climate change is a global phenomenon that also affects the Project's intervention zones, and that could affect its outcomes in the future. However, it is not as yet possible to comprehend the extent of its impacts. Concern over climatic variability and climate change is inherent in this Project.</p>	<p>The development of IECB demonstration experiences in terrestrial and marine ecosystems includes the design and implementation of sustainable management measures that will consider climate change criteria. The Project will also develop policy tools and a governance that contribute to conservation and to increase resiliency of biodiversity and ecosystem services. The results of these measures will contribute to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change (PRODOC Section V Outcomes and Associations / Section VI Project Results Framework and Multi Year Work Plan - Annex 2).</p> <p>The outputs and targets defined in Components 1 and 2 aim at reinforcing institutional management of biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation (water and marine resources) and climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p> <p>Specific indicators for sustainable management measures were established to underline carbon sequestration by native forests under improved management in the terrestrial demonstration experiences. And, regarding the marine demonstration experiences, indicators of sustainable management measures were developed to</p>

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?
<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Impact and Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</i>
<p>Risk 6. Child labour could be used in small-scale agriculture /forestry in properties part of the ESR scheme in terrestrial ecosystems or in fishing activities associated to the ESR scheme in marine ecosystems (Component 2)</p> <p>Principle3, Standard 3: 3.8</p>	<p><i>I:4</i></p> <p><i>P:1</i></p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>In Chile, child labour is absolutely prohibited and the country has ratified all international conventions about it. Thus, the probability was categorized as slight. Nevertheless, there is still child labour in some places of the country and in certain economic activities.</p> <p>Impact is severe because it entails adverse consequences to people but these are predictable and reversible.</p>	<p>Particular attention will be given to ensure that no child labor is involved in activities associated with Project implementation, through the following measures:</p> <p>The UNDP Country Office and the PMU will promote strict compliance with the UNDP SES, and national legislation that prohibits child labor, through awareness raising about this issue in the sites and communities of demonstration experiences, and training to Project staff, partners and consultants.</p> <p>Communication of the child labor prohibition will be included in the Terms of Reference for consultancies and services and included in all contracts and donation agreements.</p> <p>The PMU will ensure that all actions and service contracts impose the prohibition of child labor. The UNDP will ensure adequate compliance. Implementation of the monitoring plan will ensure oversight and reporting on adequate compliance with these measures.</p> <p>Instructions will be given and follow-up carried out with the stakeholders involved, especially the Project team, the conservation guarantors and the local organizations involved.</p>

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?
Risk Description	Impact and Probability (1-5)	Significance (Low, Moderate, High)	Comments	Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.
<p>Risk 7. Project's area of influence includes indigenous peoples. There is a risk that these communities may be excluded from the decisions that will affect them (directly or indirectly), that they will not benefit equally from the Project, and/or that there will be restrictions in their access to resources associated with the implementation of IECB's. In addition, there could be some ideological resistance to IECB's because they are market - based solutions.</p> <p>Principle 3, Standard 6: 6.1; 6.3; 6.6</p>	<p>I: 4 P:2</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>IECB's constitute a market-based solution for conservation in which there could be (or not) monetary transactions.</p> <p>Probability of this risk has been categorized as Not Likely because to implement the demonstration experiences the Project will use community-based governance structures that already exist in each pilot site, and that give voice to indigenous peoples (i.e. CAPRs in the terrestrial DEs), or are the voice of indigenous communities (i.e. ECMPO in the Caul'n's marine DE).</p> <p>If indigenous peoples are left out of the Project decision making and short and long-term benefits,</p>	<p>Particular attention will be given to ensure that indigenous peoples participate of decision making and benefit from the Project outcomes, through the following measures:</p> <p>Implementation of the IECB's will be carried out within a framework of sensibilization, generating capacities and support. Each Project activity will be carried out through a process of critical reflection and feed-back with both men and women indigenous participants, which will allow a detailed understanding of the scope of these instruments and to take the necessary safeguards to avoid negative impacts in their participation and in their territories.</p> <p>An ESMF and IPPF will be developed, and their implementation will be monitored during Project implementation as part of the M&E plan (PRODOC Section VII Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan / Annex 3 Monitoring Plan). In addition, both Frameworks will each contain a chapter on monitoring, as will the subsequent management plans (if any).</p> <p>This framework to be developed before Project implementation will describe the measures that the Government of Chile has already implemented to</p>

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?
<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Impact and Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</i>
Risk 8. A culturally appropriate FPIC process has not been developed during PPG phase in the demonstration experiences where there are indigenous peoples, therefore indigenous peoples might still decide not to confirm their participation in the project or activities might proceed without their consent. Principle 3, Standard 6: 6.4	<i>I: 4</i> <i>P:1</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	Probability of this risk is Slight because local partners and their represented indigenous peoples are aware of the project and preliminarily are eager to participate in a project that will help them to safeguard biodiversity and ecosystem services through different mechanisms. Impact is Severe because of the importance of FPIC.	A culturally appropriate FPIC process will be developed with the indigenous peoples once the Project starts its implementation, being the first priority, and in partnership with the NGO Costa Humboldt for the marine demonstration experience in Caul?n and with the CAPRs Mashue and Liqui?e in the terrestrial demonstration experiences (additional details will be provided in the IPPF to be developed before Project implementation). The FPIC process will be included in the scope of work of the donation agreement with the NGO Costa Humboldt and the CAPRs Mashue and Liqui?e, and in the technical consultancy for gender and cultural pertinence (PRODOC Annex 6 Overview of Technical Consultancies).
	QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?			
	Select one (see SESP for guidance)			Comments
	<i>Low Risk</i>			?

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?
<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Impact and Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</i>
	<i>Moderate Risk</i>			X The implementation of economic instruments for the conservation of biodiversity could be associated with restrictions on current practices of the stakeholders involved, and with a differentiated impact on women and indigenous peoples. For this reason, the measures for mitigating risks include a Stakeholders Engagement Plan and a Gender Action Plan developed during Project design, and an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF)/Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) to be developed before Project implementation. Those Frameworks will confirm the additional management plans necessary for SES compliance, which will also be developed during implementation.
				?
	QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?			

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?	
<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Impact and Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</i>	
	Check all that apply			Comments	
	<i>Principle 1: Human Rights</i>			X	See comments under risk 1 and 6
	<i>Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</i>			X	See comments under risk 2
	<i>1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management</i>			X	See comments under risk 3 and 4
	<i>2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation</i>			X	See comments under risk 5
	<i>3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions</i>			X	
	<i>4. Cultural Heritage</i>			?	
	<i>5. Displacement and Resettlement</i>			X	See comments under risk 1
	<i>6. Indigenous Peoples</i>			X	See comments under risks 1, 7 and 8
	<i>7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</i>			?	
Checklist Potential Social and Environmental <u>Risks</u>					
Principles 1: Human Rights					Answer (Yes/No)

1. Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	No
2. Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? [1]	No
3. Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?	Yes
4. Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	No
5. Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?	No
6. Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	No
7. Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process?	No
8. Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	No
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	
1. Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	No
2. Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	Yes
3. Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process and has this been included in the overall Project proposal and in the risk assessment?	No
4. Would the Project potentially limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? <i>For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being</i>	Yes
Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability: Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below	

Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management	
<p>1.1 Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i></p>	No
<p>1.2 Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities?</p>	Yes
<p>1.3 Does the Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5)</p>	No
<p>1.4 Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?</p>	No
<p>1.5 Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?</p>	No
<p>1.6 Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?</p>	Yes
<p>1.7 Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?</p>	No
<p>1.8 Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i></p>	No
<p>1.9 Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)</p>	No
<p>1.10 Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?</p>	No
<p>1.11 Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area? <i>For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g. felling of trees, earthworks, potential relocation of inhabitants). The new road may also facilitate encroachment on lands by illegal settlers or generate unplanned commercial development along the route, potentially in sensitive areas. These are indirect, secondary, or induced impacts that need to be considered. Also, if similar developments in the same forested area are planned, then cumulative impacts of multiple activities (even if not part of the same Project) need to be considered.</i></p>	Yes

Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation	
2.1 Will the proposed Project result in significant[2] greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change?	No
2.2 Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?	Yes
2.3 Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental vulnerability to climate change now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)? <i>For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding</i>	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions	
3.1 Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities?	No
3.2 Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	No
3.3 Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)?	No
3.4 Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)	No
3.5 Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions?	No
3.6 Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)?	No
3.7 Does the Project pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, and radiological hazards during Project construction, operation, or decommissioning?	No
3.8 Does the Project involve support for employment or livelihoods that may fail to comply with national and international labor standards (i.e. principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions)?	Yes
3.9 Does the Project engage security personnel that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals (e.g. due to a lack of adequate training or accountability)?	No
Standard 4: Cultural Heritage	

4.1 Will the proposed Project result in interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	No
4.2 Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement	
5.1 Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?	No
5.2 Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions ? even in the absence of physical relocation)?	Yes
5.3 Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions?[3]	No
5.4 Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	No
Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples	
6.1 Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?	Yes
6.2 Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.3 Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)? <i>If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is ?yes? the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.</i>	Yes
6.4 Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?	Yes
6.5 Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No

6.6 Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?	Yes
6.7 Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	No
6.8 Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.9 Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?	No
Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	
7.1 Would the Project potentially result in the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts?	No
7.2 Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	No
7.3 Will the proposed Project potentially involve the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials? Does the Project propose use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs? For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol	No
7.4 Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	No
7.5 Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	No

[1] Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to ?women and men? or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexuals.

[2] In regards to CO₂, ?significant emissions? corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.]

[3] Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that

were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections.

Supporting Documents

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title	Module	Submitted
PIMS 5794 Chile Economic Instruments SESP	CEO Endorsement ESS	

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

<p>This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s): The IECB Project relates to Chile's commitment to Sustainable Development Objectives (SDO) and specifically contributes the following: SDO 6, Guarantee the availability of water and its sustainable management and its sanitation; SDO 13 Actions in the realm of climate; SDO 14, Undersea life; and SDO 15, Life in land ecosystems.</p>				
<p>This project will contribute to the following country outcome (UNDAF/CPD, RPD, GPD): In 2022, State institutional capacity on the national, regional and local levels will be reinforced for mitigating and adapting to climate change, sustainable management and preservation of the natural resources, ecosystems and biodiversity, as well as management of socio-environmental risks and conflicts (CPD/UNDAF 2019-2022).</p>				
<p>Outcome 2.4.1: Legal and regulatory systems sensitive to the gender dimension (gender-responsive), policies and institutions strengthened and solutions adopted for addressing conservation, sustainable use and equitable distribution of the benefits of natural resources, in accordance with the international conventions and national legislation.</p>				
	Objective and Outcome Indicators (no more than a total of 21 indicators)	Baseline[1]	Mid-term Target[2]	End of Project Target
<p>Project Objective: Improve national financing of biodiversity through the design, implementation</p>	<p>Mandatory Indicator 1: # direct project beneficiaries disaggregated by gender (individual people)</p>	<p>279, including: 72 women 207 men</p>	<p>534 direct beneficiaries, including: 161 women 373 men</p>	<p>1,334 direct beneficiaries, including: 401 women 933 men</p>

<p>and optimization of market-based economic instruments, that reinforce public financing and facilitate the economic contribution of the private sector to maintaining Chile's natural capital.</p>	<p>Core indicator 4. Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)</p> <p>Indicator 4.1:</p> <p>? Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (qualitative assessment, non-certified)</p>	<p><i>0 ha of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity and drinking water provision in Los R?os Region</i></p>	<p><i>12,228 ha of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity and drinking water provision in Los R?os Region</i></p>	<p><i>100,000 ha of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity and drinking water provision in Los R?os Region.</i></p>
	<p>Core indicator 5. Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity</p> <p>? Area of seascape under protection and under improved management benefiting biodiversity and small-scale fishing (no take zones / impact zones)</p>	<p><i>30 ha No take zones /207 ha impact zone of AMERB?s in ESR-DE Ventanas and Maitencillo</i></p>	<p><i>45 ha No take zones / 2,642.49 ha impact zone in ESR-DE ECMPO Caul?n</i></p>	<p><i>60 ha of seascape protected as a no take zone / 2,845.47 ha impact zone of seascape under improved management of the ESR-DE in ECMPO Caul?n and of the ESR-DE in AMERB Chepu</i></p>

	Core indicator 6. Greenhouse gas emission mitigated Indicator 6.1. Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in sector of Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use	0 metric tons of CO ₂ e	-----	89,890 metric tons of CO ₂ e in Los Ríos Region[3]
Project component 1	<i>Institutional framework, governance and tools for the application of economic instruments for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and its ecosystem services (IECB) in land, fresh water, marine and coastal ecosystems.</i>			
Project Outcome 1 Institutional and governance system and technical capability established / strengthened for IECB development, application, monitoring and evaluation.	Indicator 6 Number of intersectoral biodiversity work committees institutionalized and functioning in IECB development, application, monitoring and evaluation at the national and regional levels.	0	One (1) Project National Technical Committee (NTC) (1) and (3) three Project Regional Technical Committees (RTC), with broad instances, multi-sectorial, established and working to support IECB design, development, application and optimization, monitoring and evaluation.	One (1) Governance model for IECB development, application, monitoring and evaluation through (1) one inter-sectorial National Biodiversity Committee and (3) three Regional Committees strengthened, and institutionalized through administrative act.

	<p>Indicator 7</p> <p>Number and type of regulation procedures and tools, defined in administrative acts that materialize public policy decisions regarding the application and diversification of Economic Instruments for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Conservation (IECB).</p>	<p>Law 19.300 on General Environment Bases, Law 20.930 Derecho Real de Conservación; SEIA Regulations.</p> <p>Standard for appropriate implementation of the CE mechanism, pending validation and institutionalization.</p> <p>Preliminary guidelines for the implementation of the mechanism for appropriate Biodiversity Offsets for loss of land biodiversity within the SEIA framework, in the process of validation and institutionalization.</p> <p>Information System for monitoring of Biodiversity (SIMBIO) administrated by the EM.</p>	<p>Total of (8) eight Guidelines drafted for the implementation of IECB mechanisms: preliminary ESR guidelines for land and continental aquatic environments (1) and marine and coastal environments (1); guidelines for Biodiversity Offsets in land and continental aquatic environments (1) and preliminary marine-coastal Biodiversity Offset guidelines (1); preliminary guidelines for monitoring of Biodiversity Offsets in land environments (1) and continental aquatic and marine-coastal environments (1), within the framework of environmental follow-up of the Environmental Qualification Resolutions (EQR); preliminary CE guidelines in land and continental aquatic environments (1); and preliminary guidelines for biodiversity and ecosystem services certification (1).</p>	<p>Total of four (4) IECB mechanisms achieved comprising eight (8) operational guides and an information system (1):</p> <p>? Process of environmental evaluation of investment projects strengthened through incorporating (1) one marine and land Biodiversity Offsets Mechanism via administrative act that institutionalizes the validated Guidelines for: i) Biodiversity Offsets procedure (SEA) (2); ii) Technical guidelines for Biodiversity Offsets oversight (2) and electronic register of offset measures (EMS) (1); and iii) Biodiversity Offsets repository regulations (EM) (1).</p> <p>? A Retribution Mechanism (1) for Ecosystem services (ESR) in land and marine environments (implementation guidelines and contract model(s)) institutionalized through administrative acts (EM) (2).</p> <p>? A Mechanism for Derecho Real de Conservación (DRC) (1) strengthened via</p>
--	---	---	---	---

	<p>Indicator 8.</p> <p>Number of measures for strengthening institutional capabilities as a result of the application of IECB's for biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation.</p>	<p>National Information System for Environmental Oversight (SNIFA) administered by the EMS.</p> <p>National Environmental information System (SINIA) administered by the EM.</p> <p>National Rural Development Policy that incorporates a focus on environmental sustainability/ ODEPA.</p> <p>Green Bonds Initiative led by the Finance Ministry.</p> <p>Recent approval of the Green Fund for supporting implementation of the National Strategy for Climate Change and Vegetational Resources / CONAF.</p>	0	<p>Information System (1) of the Environment Superintendency (EMS) strengthened for monitoring offset measures committed to in the Environmental Qualification Resolutions (EQR) of the System for Evaluation of Environmental Impact.</p> <p>Contribution to the Green Bonds Framework initiative (Finance Ministry), with an IECB project model (1) for land environments and one for marine environments (1), recognized as ?electable green expenditures? and NbS?s, that reinforce financing for biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>Contribution with land demonstration experiences (2) and marine experiences (4) and green project models and NbS?s (2), to be included in compliance with and updating the National Determined Contribution (NDC) (2021 ? 2025).</p> <p>Recognition through Administrative acts (1)</p>
--	--	---	---	---

Outputs to achieve Outcome 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1. Multi-sectorial coordination mechanisms with the participation of public and private stakeholders, designed and implemented to support IECB application on the national and regional scale. 2. 2. Technical IECB guidelines and proposals for regulations for their application, monitoring and evaluation in land, fresh water and marine-coastal environments. 3. 3. Multi-purpose interactive digital IECB Platform for project typologies for conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and an Information System for IECB implementation, monitoring and evaluation. 4. 4. Project models founded in Nature -based Solutions recognized as ?electable green expenditures?.
Project component 2	<i>Application of IECB mechanisms including Biodiversity Offsets for residual impacts on biodiversity and for Ecosystem Services Retribution in demonstration projects.</i>

Outcome 2	Indicator 9			
<p>Biodiversity and ecosystem services in priority productive land and marine-coastal landscapes, are maintained and improved through the development of IECB demonstration experiences (DE?s) that make possible an increase in public and private financing for sustainable use and conservation.</p>	<p>Number of Demonstration Experiences (DE?s) for IECB application executed in productive landscapes belonging to land, continental aquatic and marine and coastal ecosystems.</p>	<p>ESR DE in Marine and Coastal ecosystem in AMERB Ventanas and AMERB in Maitencillo (Valpara?so Region)</p> <p>ESR DE in land ecosystem in the community of Mashue, La Uni?n Township, Los R?os Region.</p>	<p>Total of (8) IECB DE?s in land and continental aquatic ecosystems:</p> <p>? ESR application DE in Mashue (1) and ESR DE in Liqui?e (1)</p> <p>? DE for possible application of CE (4): one in a land ecosystem in Mashue (1) and in a continental aquatic ecosystem in wetlands (3)</p> <p>? DE for Biodiversity Offsets (1) (application of level one of methodological guidelines) in land ecosystem in Mashue and Liqui?e for preparing landholdings to be receptors of offset measures.</p> <p>? DE for application of preliminary guidelines with criteria for a proposal for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Certification (1) in sites where conservation actions are being implemented in land ecosystems in Mashue and Liqui?e.</p>	<p>Total of (8) eight IECB DE?s in land and continental aquatic ecosystems with validation of IECB mechanism guidelines, intervention model, governance model and information system:</p> <p>? DE for ESR application in Mashue (1) and Liqui?e (1).</p> <p>? DE for possible application of DRC (4): one in a land ecosystem in Mashue (1) and in a continental aquatic ecosystem in wetlands (3).</p> <p>? DE for Biodiversity Offsets (1) (application and validation of level one of the methodological guidelines) in land ecosystems in Mashue and Liqui?e for preparing landholdings as receptors of offset measures.</p> <p>? DE for application and validation of guidelines with criteria for proposal for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Certification (1) in sites where conservation actions are being implemented in land ecosystems in Mashue and Liqui?e.</p>
			<p>Total of three IECB DE?s (3) in marine and coastal ecosystems:</p> <p>? One DE for ESR application (1) in four marine and coastal ecosystems (4): i) AMERB Ventanas (1) and ii) AMERB Maitencillo (1), iii) ECMPO Caul?n (1) and iv) AMERB Chepu (1).</p> <p>? One DE for Biodiversity Offsets (1) (application of proposal of part one of the methodological guidelines) in four DE?s in marine and coastal ecosystems (4): i) AMERB Ventanas (1) and ii) AMERB Maitencillo (1)), iii) ECMPO Caul?n (1) and iv) AMERB Chepu (1), for preparing sites as receptors of offset measures.</p> <p>? One DE for</p>	

	<p>Indicator 10</p> <p>Number of sectorial measures identified and implemented that contribute to the increase in public and private financing for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p>	<p>Financial Strategy: mobilization of resources for the National Strategy for Biodiversity / Biofin Chile.</p> <p>Environmental Policy for Sustainable Development.</p> <p>Green Bonds Framework 2018.</p>	<p>Four Financing Strategies (4) developed and being implemented for land and marine and coastal ESR IECB demonstration experiences.</p> <p>Four Sectorial Measures (4) identified that link IECB's with public and private initiatives that promote financing for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p>	<p>Six Financing Strategies (6) implemented, optimized and validated for the ESR IECB land and marine and coastal demonstration experiences.</p> <p>Six Sectorial Measures (6) implemented that link IECB application, increase financing for biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>One Financing Strategy (1) for increasing public and private financing through IECB implementation for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p>
Outputs to achieve Outcome 2.	<p>5. 5. Demonstration experiences (DE) for IECB mechanisms accompanied by a sub-national governance model.</p> <p>6. 6. Proposal for a Strategy to increase financing for conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services through IECB application.</p>			
Project component 3	<p>1 Knowledge management, learning, monitoring and evaluation for effective IECB implementation.</p> <p>2</p>			

Outcome 3 Technical capabilities established and knowledge increased for IECB application, M&E and effective and efficient administrative Project management, supported with an outcomes-based M&E system.	Indicator 11 Percentage of increase in knowledge of direct beneficiaries and strategic partners of the Project, in activities for strengthening capabilities regarding IECB's, biodiversity and ecosystem services, measured through survey.	72 women 207 men 0 men and women (partner institutions).	40% of participants in activities for strengthening capabilities confirm an increase in knowledge equal to or greater than 70% in the training material. (30% are women)	70% of participants in activities for strengthening capabilities confirm an increase in knowledge equal to or greater than 70% in the training material. (30% are women)
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Indicator 12</p> <p>Number of communication measures designed and implemented for strengthening capabilities.</p>	0	<p>A Strategic Communication Plan (1) focused on knowledge management, developed and in continuous implementation.</p> <p>A Plan for strengthening capabilities (1) developed and in continuous implementation.</p> <p>One Training Course (1) under a self-teaching method designed and beginning implementation.</p> <p>Communication measures for strengthening capabilities designed and in continuous implementation (for example: experience sharing (4 land / 4 marine); training activities (1 IECB course developed and at beginning of implementation); development and publication of documents (IECB guidelines (4)); bulletins and progress on systematization of experiences (4); promotion of citizen science platforms (DE Mashue (1) and DE Liqui?e (1)).</p>	<p>A Strategic Communication Plan (1) focused on knowledge management implemented.</p> <p>An Action Plan for strengthening capabilities implemented (1).</p> <p>One training course under a self-teaching method implemented (1).</p> <p>Communication measures for strengthening capabilities designed and implemented. (7 land / 7 marine); training activities (1 IECB course implemented); development and publication of IECB documents (1); bulletins (9) and systematization of the experiences (1); promotion of the citizen science platforms (DE Mashue (2) and DE Liqui?e (2)).</p>
<p>Outputs to achieve Outcome 3</p>	<p>7. Strategic Communication Plan focused on knowledge management and strengthening capabilities.</p> <p>8. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) Strategy, stakeholders engagement plan, indigenous peoples plan framework and gender plan implemented for efficient, effective and sustainable achievement of outcomes.</p>			

[1] Baseline, mid-term and end of project target levels must be expressed in the same neutral unit of analysis as the corresponding indicator. Baseline is the current/original status or condition and needs to be quantified. The baseline must be established before the project document is submitted to the GEF for final approval. The baseline values will be used to measure the success of the project through implementation monitoring and evaluation.

[2] Target is the change in the baseline value that will be achieved by the mid-term review and then again by the terminal evaluation.

[3] Preliminary referential data, considering estimations of C absorption ($-238 \pm 31 \text{ g C/m}^2$) for temperate forests in the Region of Los Lagos, developed by Pérez-Quezada et al, 2018.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments from STAP / Germany

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal: Germany would like to emphasize that financial resource mobilization for biodiversity conservation needs to go hand in hand with efforts to slow the drivers of conservation costs and to improve effective spending capacity. The envisioned approach should therefore go beyond the development and implementation of innovative financing mechanisms such as payments for ecosystem services (PES) and biodiversity offsets. In this context, Germany kindly asks to include a section in the final project document that details how the project contributes to track, report and reform finance flows (e.g. subsidies) that are potentially harmful to biodiversity and to reform these types of finance flows to channel them towards biodiversity-friendly activities, or at least towards activities that are not potentially environmentally harmful.

Response to comments from Germany:

The purpose of the Project is to improve national financing for biodiversity through the design, implementation and optimization of market-based economic instruments for the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services (IECB). These instruments are Ecosystem Services Retribution, Biodiversity Offsets; Derecho Real de Conservación and a Public Certification System for Biodiversity Conservation activities, that will strengthen public financing and will foster the private sector's economic contribution to maintaining the country's natural capital (PRODOC, Section IV Strategy). The Project is aware that implementing IECB and generating new monetary and non-monetary incentives for biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation is not sufficient to reduce drivers of biodiversity loss. There are still finance flows that are harmful to biodiversity and ecosystem services. Thus, the Project has established three strategies to strengthen the application of IECB while contributing to reduce negative incentives for biodiversity conservation:

1. Create and strengthen a robust institutional and governance system at the national and local scale to support IECB implementation in demonstration experiences (PRODOC, Section VI Project Results Framework). With participation of government agencies from different sectors (i.e. Public Works, Tourism, Fisheries, Indigenous Peoples matters, among others) it will be possible to mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation in their institutional targets, management, plans, strategies and programs. This will also allow the monitoring and assessment of actions aimed at counteracting the drivers of biodiversity degradation; the sustainability measures that will be implemented as part of the IECB; subsidies for nature-based income generating activities that take place in the pilot sites; institutional financing and the capacity and effective spending for biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation (see details in Section V Outcomes and Associations and in Section VI Project Results Framework). Each IECB demonstration experience has a local governance structure in which government agencies from different sectors will participate not only to monitor the IECB implementation, but to channel their own instruments and available funding for the objectives of biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation. For example, INDAP -an agency from the Ministry of Agriculture that works with small landholders who mostly live on peasant family farming- will participate in each of the terrestrial ESR demonstration experiences (see details in Annex 12 of the

PRODOC) to provide their training and funding platforms to foster sustainable practices in cattle ranching and agriculture in their beneficiaries, many of which will participate of the IECB mechanisms.

2. Design Project outputs that are part of the IECB implementation and at the same time offer opportunities to contribute to the objectives, interests and legal mandate of other government agencies. The target of Outcome 1/ indicator 8 (PRODOC, Section VI Project Results Framework) is defined as the number of measures for strengthening institutional capabilities as a result of IECB application for biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation. Achieving these targets will generate changes in institutional management to improve IECB inclusion, reinforce sustainability in public funding, counteract actions that are drivers of biodiversity degradation, and other related benefits. These targets ensure the commitment of the institutions from different sectors (Ministry of Social Development, Finance, Agriculture, Public Works, Tourism, National Assets, among others) to participate in the Project, in addition to including IECB's as one of the strategies to comply with the country's international commitments, such as the NDC (See details in Section V of the PRODOC: Outcomes and Associations). Outcome 2, in the targets related to development of the demonstration experiences (Outcome 2/ indicator 9/ Section VI Project Results Framework of the PRODOC), together with optimizing and validating IECB application, will contribute concrete sustainable management measures, green project models, an information system (M&E) and financing strategies.

3. Design financing strategies for each of the six land and marine IECB demonstration experiences through a specific consultancy (PRODOC, Section X Total Budget and Workplan and Annex 6 Overview of Technical Consultancies). These will be implemented by the conservation guarantors of each pilot site in coordination with the Macroregional Coordinator and the beneficiaries. These strategies will target different sources of funding to support and strengthen the implementation of the IECB mechanisms, including public funding for income-generating activities that could be channeled for mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation as part of other development activities.

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG).

(Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 100,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
<u>Project preparation grant to finalize the project Economic Instruments and Tools to Support the Conservation of Biodiversity, the Payment of Ecosystem Services and Sustainable Development</u>	100,000	97,425	2,575
Total	100,000	97,425	2,575


ANNEX D: Project Map(s) and Coordinates

Please attach the geographical location of the project area, if possible.

The geographic location, represented in the map of the sites for development of the demonstration experiences, is presented by ecosystem and by instrument.

1. IECB demonstration experiences in Ecosystem Services Retribution /ESR) in a land ecosystem:


Figure 2. Map of the Los Ríos Region (Map of Chile, upper left), with the position of the ESR Mashue and the ESR Liquiñe demonstration experiences and distribution of watersheds for soil and native forest state of conservation studies.



1.1. i. ESR IECB Demonstration experiences in land ecosystems, site at Mashue, Region of Los Ríos, Province of Ranco, La Unión Township, locality of Mashue.


ii. IECB experience in Derecho Real de Conservación in land ecosystem in the Region of Los Ríos, Province of Ranco, La Unión Township, locality of Mashue.

Figure 3. Mashue watershed



1.2. ESR IECB demonstration experiences in land ecosystems, site at Liquiñe, Region Los Ríos, Province of Valdivia, Panguipulli Township, locality of Liquiñe.


Figure 4. Liquiñe watershed



2. IECB demonstration experiences with feasibility for development of Derecho Real de Conservación in continental aquatic ecosystem (wetlands):

2.1. Metropolitan Region, Alto Maipo Wetlands

Figure 5. El Yeso watershed



2.2. Region of Concepción, Urban Wetlands at Rocuant Andalien (Urban wetlands)


Figure 6. Location of the Rocuant Andalien wetland





2.3. Region of La Araucanía, Queule Wetlands (Rural Wetlands/indigenous communities)

Figure 7. Location of Queule River Wetlands



3. IECB demonstration experiences in Ecosystem Services Retribution, marine and coastal ecosystem.


3.1. **Figure 8.** ESR IECB demonstration experiences in marine and coastal ecosystem located in the Areas for Management and Exploitation of Benthic Resources (AMERB) in the Region of Valparaíso, Puchuncavi Township, in the Maitencillo AMERB's. This DE focuses on supporting the creation of no-take zones to protect biodiversity.




3.2. **Figure 9.** ESR IECB demonstration experiences in marine and coastal ecosystem located in the Areas for Management and Exploitation of Benthic Resources (AMERB) in the Region of Valparaíso, Puchuncavi Township, Ventanas AMERB. This DE focuses on supporting the creation of no-take zones to protect biodiversity.



3.3. **Figure 10.** ESR IECB demonstration experiences in marine and coastal ecosystem located in the Indigenous Peoples Coastal Marine Areas (ECMPO) in the Region of Los Lagos, Ancud Township, ECMPO Caulin. This DE focuses on supporting the creation of no-take zones to protect biodiversity.



3.4. **Figure 11.** ESR IECB demonstration experiences in marine and coastal ecosystem located in the Areas for Management and Exploitation of Benthic Resources (AMERB) in the Region of Los Lagos, Ancud Township, AMERB of Chepu. This DE focuses on supporting the creation of no-take zones to protect biodiversity.



ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Goods	Account Code 73400 Rental & Maint of Other Equip. Vehicle rent for mobilizing the Macro-Regional Technical Coordinator (RTC) for Los R?os -Los Lagos (Output 5). Total cost: USD\$ 43,077 TBWP (USD\$ 5,385/Y1; \$ 10769 anual average / Y2-Y3-Y4 and \$5,385/Y4)		43,077	43,077			43,077	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Goods	Account Code 72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip. Mobile internet plan to support the management of land conservation guarantors. (Output 5). Total cost: USD\$ 1,846 for 48 months (USD \$ 231/Y1; 461 anual average /Y2-Y3-Y4 and \$232 /Y5) Cuenta 72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip. Cell phone plan for the Regional Technical Coordinator for the macro zone of Los R?os/Los Lagos (Output 5). Total cost: USD\$ 1,039 for 54 month (USD \$ 173/Y1; 231 anual average /Y2-Y3-Y4 and \$173 /Y5)		2,885	2,885			2,885	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Goods	Account Code 72800 - Information Technology Equipmt. Computer for the Regional Technical Coordinator for the Los R?os/Los Lagos Macrozone. (Output 5). Total cost: USD\$ 1,200 Account Code 72800 - Information Technology Equipmt. Computer repairs for the Regional Technical Coordinator for the Los R?os/Los Lagos Macrozone. (Output 5). Total cost: USD\$ 500		1,700	1,700			1,700	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Goods	Account Code 72800 - Information Technology Equipment. Computer for the National Technical Coordinator. Total cost: USD\$ 2,400 (USD\$ 1,200 for 2 units) Account Code 72800 - Information Technology Equipment. Computer repairs for the National Technical Coordinator. Total cost: USD\$ 1000 Account Code 72800 - Information Technology Equipment. Portable projector for presentations in workshops and meetings. Total cost: USD 1,000 (USD\$ 500 for 2 units)			-		4,400	4,400	UNDP

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Grants	Account Code 72600 ? Grants. Donation Agreement for the marine conservation guarantor Capital Azul for implementing the IECB demonstration experience in Ventanas and Maitencillo AMERB?s (Output 5) (Total USD \$ 172,732 / Y2-Y3-Y4). Grants will have to follow UNDP policy on Low Value Grants in the management arrangement Account Code 72600 ? Grants. Donation Agreement for the marine conservation guarantor Costa Humboldt for implementing the IECB demonstration experience in ECMPO Caul?n / AMERB Chepu (Output 5) (Total USD \$ 243,896 / Y2-Y3-Y4). Grants will have to follow UNDP policy on Low Value Grants in the management arrangement Account Code 72600 ? Grants. Donation Agreement for		614,628	614,628			614,628	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Contractual Services ? Individual	Account Code 71400 - Contractual services - Individuals. IECB institutionalization head. Total cost: USD 159,478 (40 months -average USD 47,832 annual average/Y1 to Y3 and 15,982 /Y4)	159,478		159,478			159,478	MMA
Contractual Services ? Individual	Account Code 71400 - Contractual Services - Individual. Macro-Regional Technical Coordinator (RTC) Los Ríos - Los Lagos for the organization, coordination and evaluation of IECB demonstration experiences in Regions of Los Lagos and Los Ríos. Total cost: USD 154,079 (54 months (\$25,679 /Y1; 34,240 annual average /Y2 to Y4; \$ 25680/ Y5) (Output 1 a 8)		154,079	154,079			154,079	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Contractual Services ? Individual	Account Code 71400 - Contractual services - Individuals. Coordinator for Administration and Monitoring & Evaluation (CAAM&E). Total cost: USD\$ 171,108 for 60 months (USD\$34,221 anual average/ Y1 to Y2 and \$34,222 anual average/ Y3 to Y5) (Output 1 a 8)			-	171,108		171,108	MMA
Contractual Services ? Individual	Account Code 71400 - Contractual services - Individuals. National Technical Coordinator (NTC). Total cost: USD 79,739 /Total 20 months; (USD\$ 47,843 /12 months and 31,896 /10 month) (Output 1 a 8)			-		79,739	79,739	UNDP
Contractual Services	Account Code 72100 -			452,06				MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
? Company	Contractual Services- Companies. Legal assistance in IECB's for supporting the following: drafting the EM's Exempt Resolution for institutionalizing the National Biodiversity Committee (Output 1); drafting a proposal for regulation to establish a Offsets repository within the SEIA framework (Output 2); creation and validation of a general contract model for ecosystem services retribution (Output 2); consultancy for drafting a proposal for regulations to create a Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Certification System, and measures for its enactment (Output 2); consultancy for drafting a proposal for statutes for Rural Potable Water Committees (CAPR) that	452,065		5			452,065	

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Contractual Services Company	Account Code 72100 - Contractual Services-Companies. Technical Assistance on marine IECB's to accompany the technical development of IECB's in marine environments, their implementation in demonstration experiences and systematization of the model conservation project on the basis of implemented IECB's. (Output 1 a 8) Total cost: USD 34,462 Account Code 72100 - Contractual Services-Companies. Technical Advisor on land IECB's to accompany the technical development of IECB's in land-based environments, their implementation in demonstration experiences and systematization of the model conservation project on the basis of the implemented IECB's. (Output		136,872	136,872			136,872	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Contractual Services ? Company	Account Code 72100- Contractual Services- Companies. Consultancy in gender and accompaniment in its transversalization in the development of technical tools and implementation of demonstration experiences. Total cost: USD\$ 24,000. (Output 1.8, 1.9, 1.10) (Output 2, 4, 5, 7 y 8) Account Code 72100- Contractual Services- Companies. Consultancy for strengthening capabilities, including identifying training needs, drawing up and implementing the capabilities strengthening plan for stakeholders involved with the Project. (Total cost USD\$ 12,475) (Output 7) Account Code 72100- Contractual Services- Companies. Consultancy for drafting and			-	142,462		142,462	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
International Consultants	Account Code 71200 - International Consultants. International consultant for carrying out Project mid-term evaluation. Total cost: USD\$ 14,000 (USD\$ 350/day for 40 days) (Output 8) Account Code71200 - International Consultants. International consultant for carrying out Project final evaluation. Total cost: USD\$ 14,000 (USD\$ 350/day for 40 days) (Output 8)			-	28,000		28,000	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Local Consultants	Account Code 71300 - Local Consultants. Local consultant for the standardization of biometrical methodologies for characterizing and monitoring ecosystem services in coordination with EM bodies and strategic partners. (Output 4). Total costs: USD\$ 8,975 / Y1. Account Code 71300 - Local Consultants. Local consultant to evaluate and project markets associated with IECB implementation (through Offsets, ESR, RCR and Certifications), including an international market analysis of ecosystem services (biodiversity credit, carbon, among others). (Output 6). Total costs: USD\$ 8,974 / Y3. Account Code 71300 - Local Consultants. Local consultant to establish methodological guidelines for estimating the social and economic benefits	62,821		62,821			62,821	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Local Consultants	Account Code 71300 - Local Consultants. Consultant for consolidating financial strategy for IECB project model on the basis of results of consultancies on social and economic benefits of ecosystem services, model of eligible eligible green expenditures and NBS model. (Output 6). Total costs: USD\$ 8,974		8,974	8,974			8,974	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Local Consultants	Account Code 71300- Local Consultants National consultant for carrying out Project mid-term evaluation. Total cost: USD\$ 12,000 (USD\$ 300/day for 40 days) (Output 8) Account Code 71300- Local Consultants National consultant for carrying out Project final evaluation. Total cost: USD\$ 12,000 (USD\$ 300/day for 40 days) (Output 8) Account Code 71300 -Local Consultants National consulting for the systematization of experiences, results and learning of the project. Total cost: USD \$ 10,000 (Output 7 - Activity 7.2 - Q4 / Y4) Account Code 71300- Local Consultants National consultant to measure compliance with GEF and / or LDCF / SCCF Basic Indicators in the medium term and METT or other			-	46,000		46,000	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Account Code 75700 -Training Workshops and Conferences. Meals for informal meetings with strategic partners and consultants (Output 2). Total cost: USD\$ 513 (USD\$ 27/meeting; total 19 meetings)	513		513			513	MMA
Trainings, Workshop	Account Code 75700 -Training,							MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
s, Meetings	Workshops and Confer. Project inception and finalization workshops in Los R?os and Los Lagos (4) . This only considers the cost for lunches and coffee breaks for 60 people. This also includes cost of meals for 50 people visiting each community for the demonstration experiences (4). Appropriate space for the event must be planned for the strategic partners. Total cost: USD\$ 8,846 (USD\$4,422 for 2 workshops and \$4,424 for 2 workshops) (Output 1-5) Account Code 75700 -Training, Workshops and Confer. Project inception and finalization workshops in Santiago (2) . This only considers the cost of lunches and coffee breaks for 60 people. Appropriate space for the event must be planned for the strategic partners. Total cost: USD\$ 4,154 (USD\$ 2,077 each, for 2 workshops) (Output 1)			-	51,230		51,230	

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Travel	Account Code 71600 - Travel. Travel that supports the development of consulting for the development of the Financing Strategy. Consider visits to marine and land demonstration experiences. Total USD 6,673 (3 trips to work on the demonstration experiences / \$2,225/Y2; 2,225/Y3; \$2,223/Y4) (Output 6, Activity 6.1) Account Code 71600 - Travel. Travel related to technical assistance, monitoring, strengthening capabilities and informing about the development process and final outcomes of guidelines regarding IECB mechanisms in Santiago and the Regions where the demonstration experiences will be carried out, for the Project's technical personnel, consultants and strategic partners (Outputs 2 - 7). Total cost: USD 24,053 (Total for	30,726		30,726			30,726	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Travel	Account Code 71600 - Travel. Travel costs for accompanying the development of the demonstration experience in Chepu and Caul?n. Includes per diem for 5 days / 4 nights for travel for continuous accompaniment in the development of demonstration experiences in Chilo?. One trip every 2 months is contemplated and this includes ferry cost. Vehicle rental and gasoline are covered elsewhere. (Output 5). Total cost: USD\$ 26,523 (USD\$ 6,630 annual average/Y1-Y2-Y3 and 6,633/Y4; total 6 trips for year/ total 24 trips)		26,523	26,523			26,523	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Travel	Account Code 71600 - Travel. Travel for mid-term and final evaluations. Includes international consultant, national consultant and national Project coordinator. Output 8. Total cost: USD\$ 20,000 (USD\$ 10,000 per trip for 2 trips) Account Code 71600 - Travel. Travel of 5 days for 4 persons (Project staff members and MMA professionals) to Project inception and finalization workshops in Los Ríos and Los Lagos (1 event in each Region). Output (1 - 5). Total cost: USD\$ 9,625 (USD\$ 4812 trip /Y1 and \$4813 trip /Y5) Account Code 71600 - Travel. Travel for one day to Project inception and finalization workshops for participants from Valparaíso Region to Santiago, from Mashue and Liquiñe to Valdivia, and from Chepu and			-	32,830		32,830	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Travel	Account Code 71600 -Travel. Travel by the PNC to CORECC workshops in Los Lagos /planning with RTC and other stakeholders. Total cost: USD\$ 2,420 (USD\$ 1,210 per trip for 2 trips) Account Code 71600 -Travel. Travel by the PNC to CORECC workshops in Los R?os/planning with RTC and other stakeholders. Total cost: USD\$ 2,318 (USD\$ 1,159 per trip for 2 trips) (Output 1) Account Code 71600 -Travel. Travel by the PNC to CORECC workshops in Valpara?so and Ventanas/Maitencillo DE?s, and monitoring of demonstration experiences and interinstitutional management. Total cost: USD\$ 11,016 (USD\$ 459 per trip for 24 trips) (Output 1)			-		15,754	15,754	UNDP

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Office Supplies	Account Code 72500 - Supplies. Gasoline and tolls per day for continuous accompaniment of the development of the demonstration experiences in Liqui?e, Mashue, Ventanas/Maitencillo, Chepu and Caul?n.(Output 5).Total cost:USD\$ 5,192 (USD\$ 1,038/years Y1 to Y3 and \$1,039 Y4 to Y5). Account Code 72500 - Supplies. Meals for informal meetings with strategic partners and consultants (Output 5). Total cost: USD\$ 513 (USD\$128 Y1 to Y3 and \$129/ Y4; total 20 meetings) Account Code 72500 - Supplies. Masks/ PPE for health safety of the Regional Technical Coordinator for the Los R?os/Los Lagos Macro-zone. (Output 5). Total cost: USD\$ 400		6,105	6,105			6,105	MMA

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Office Supplies	Account Code 72500 - Supplies. Masks/ PPE for health security of the workshop participants for strengthening capabilities. Total cost: USD\$ 400. (Output 7)			-	400		400	MMA
Office Supplies	Account Code 72500 - Supplies. Masks/ PPE for health safety of the Project's National Coordinator. Total cost: USD\$ 400 Account Code 72500 - Supplies. Meals for informal meetings with strategic partners and consultants. Total cost: USD\$ 410 (USD\$100 for Y1 to Y3 and \$110/ Y4; total 16 meetings)			-		810	810	UNDP

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1					
Other Operating Costs	Account Code 74100 - Professional Services. Translation of the mid-term evaluation and final evaluation, plus annual reports (PIR). 120 pag. For each report. Total cost: USD\$ 18,000 (USD\$ 24 per page; for 750 pages). (Output 8)			-	18,000		18,000	MMA
Other Operating Costs	Account Code 74100 - Professional Services. Annual audit of the Project carried out by the UNDP. Total cost: USD 8,821 for 5 audits (Output 8)			-		8,821	8,821	UNDP
Grand Total		705,603	994,843	1,700,446	490,030	109,524	2,300,000	

ANNEX F: Termsheet

Instructions. Please submit an finalized termsheet in this section. The NGI Program Call for Proposals provided a template in Annex A of the Call for Proposals that can be used by the Agency. Agencies can use their own termsheets but must add sections on Currency Risk, Co-financing Ratio and Financial Additionality as defined in the template provided in Annex A of the Call for proposals. Termsheets submitted at CEO endorsement stage should include final terms and conditions of the financing.

ANNEX G: Reflows

Instructions. Please submit a reflows table as provided in Annex B of the NGI Program Call for Proposals and the Trustee excel sheet for reflows (as provided by the Secretariat

or the Trustee) in the Document Section of the CEO endorsement. The Agency is required to quantify any expected financial return/gains/interests earned on non-grant instruments that will be transferred to the GEF Trust Fund as noted in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy. Partner Agencies will be required to comply with the reflows procedures established in their respective Financial Procedures Agreement with the GEF Trustee. Agencies are welcomed to provide assumptions that explain expected financial reflow schedules.

ANNEX H: Agency Capacity to generate reflows

Instructions. The GEF Agency submitting the CEO endorsement request is required to respond to any questions raised as part of the PIF review process that required clarifications on the Agency Capacity to manage reflows. This Annex seeks to demonstrate Agencies' capacity and eligibility to administer NGI resources as established in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy, GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01, June 9, 2017 (Annex 5).