



Strengthening inter-institutional coordination for the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in national, regional and local public policies in Chile

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11208

Countries

Chile

Project Name

Strengthening inter-institutional coordination for the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in national, regional and local public policies in Chile

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

6/28/2024

Review completed by PM

7/10/2024

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/6/2024

Cleared.

7/9/2024

1. As FAO is providing some execution support services for the project, please add FAO as one Executing Entity in the Information section of the Portal entry:

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION



Project Information

Project Title:	Strengthening inter-institutional coordination for the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation i national, regional and local public policies in Chile		
Region:	Chile	GEF Project ID:	11208
Country(ies):	Chile	Type of Project:	FSP
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	744545
Project Executing Entity(s):	Ministry of Environment (MMA)	Project Executing Type:	Government
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Submission Date :	6/28/2024
Type of Trust Fund:	GET	Project Duration (Months):	60

Agency Response

08/05/2024

Thank you for the comment which is duly noted. FAO has been added in the portal as requested.

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

- Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?
- Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

- 5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?
- b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?
- c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Ensure that the Results 1.1 and 1.2 from the Gender Action Plan are reflected in the Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and 1.2.1 in the project document.

Ensure capacity building in economic and financial resources for women and women's organization are articulated in Outputs 1.2.2, 3.1.3.

In addition, please ensure that the pilot plans in Output 3.1.2 integrate women's active role in the new management model and that this is adequately reflected in the project document.

Please ensure during project implementation, that the PIRs, the MTE and the FE include an analysis and review of all dimensions of the Gender Action Plan and relevant gender dimensions of the project.

8/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

08/05/2024

Thank you very much for the comments. We have reviewed the CEO endorsement request to ensure a better and explicit integration of the gender approach into the description of outcomes and outputs, also including adequate mention to indigenous peoples where relevant.

Regarding project implementation, a person specialized in social matters including gender equality and indigenous peoples will be hired as part of the project team and provide constant advice and orientation to the PMU and to relevant counterparts, in order to ensure adequate inclusion of the relevant gender dimensions identified for the project. Likewise, FAO in its role as GEF implementing agency will supervise that an adequate analysis and review of the gender dimensions are included into the PIRs, MTE and FE.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

OFP for Chile has requested FAO to provide execution support and FAO has agreed to provide this support at no cost to the project and the execution support activities are appropriate, thus, this is cleared also.

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

NA

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities
6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Please ensure during project implementation, that the PIRs, the MTE and the FE include an analysis and review of all dimensions of the Gender Action Plan and relevant gender dimensions of the project.

8/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

08/05/2024

During project implementation, a person specialized in social matters including gender equality and indigenous peoples will be hired as part of the project team and provide constant advice and orientation to the PMU and to relevant counterparts, in order to ensure adequate inclusion of the relevant gender dimensions identified for the project. Likewise, FAO in its role as GEF implementing agency will supervise that an adequate analysis and review of the gender dimensions are included into the PIRs, MTE and FE.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

NA

Agency Response
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

NA

Agency Response
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

NA

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

NA

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

The letter of co-financing support from Ministry of Public Works (\$10,765,012) and Pew Charitable Fund (\$1,000,000) do not have a date. Given that these letters have no date, please

provide an updated estimation of the actual amount that the Agency (with the help of the co-financier if possible) will go to the project considering the timeframe of the co-finance and the GEF project. Please make all necessary budget revisions accordingly.

8/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

08/05/2024

Thank you for the comment. Kindly note that in the co-financing letter from the Ministry of Public Works, the digital signature contains the date: April 16th 2024. In the case of the letter from Pew Charitable Fund, after reaching out to the partner, they have provided an updated letter with the date when it was provided, which has been uploaded into the portal.

Please also note that in both cases, the co-financing has already been analyzed and distributed in the different components reflecting the timeframes of the contribution.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

Budget table: miscellaneous (printing, publications, office supplies) should be charged to PMC only not to project component. Please revise.

8/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response
08/05/2024

Noted, the budget table has been revised accordingly.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

NA

Agency Response
Additional Annexes
9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation
Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/22/2024

Please revise document per comments above and resubmit.

8/6/2024

Project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/22/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/6/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		