

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

Review PIF 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**

4/12/2023

**Review completed by PM**

4/21/2023

**Program Manager**

Mark Zimsky

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

FSP

## GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

### 1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

### 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 results?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, for the most part.

However, a weakness in the presentation of the project is a general lack of detail and precision regarding the entire investment and strategy on policy coherence. It is not at all clear what policies, regulations and rules vis a vis the ?productive sector? (and which sectors) that the

project intends to work on or with. Many are mentioned as potential threats to BD: ag, fishing, mining and tourism, but the PIF has no analysis of the actual policy framework that exists, the weaknesses in that existing framework, and what the project proposes to do to improve it. Please clarify this element throughout the project design and be specific to each pilot area where the project proposes to work.

5/15/2023

Cleared.

### Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Thank you for the comment and the point is taken. A more detailed explanation on the strategy on policy coherence has been included in Section B, as well as a description of what each of the pilots will be addressing.

### 3 Indicative Project Overview

**3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**

**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?**

### Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared. But as noted above, more detail is needed with regards to the policy components of the project: which policies, regulations, and rules will be addressed and in what sectors and why are these necessary to address in order to achieve the project objective.

The PIF mentions that demonstrating the approach to improving management in the areas where the project will work will provide examples for scaling up to the rest of the country. Please clarify what the strategy for the scaling up is, who will pay for it, and how will it be executed either post project or during the project.

Please clarify why is the proposal only limiting itself to the pilot areas? Please explain why more resources are not being allocated to the project to do this at the national level?

On Knowledge management: An overall approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been provided in the Project Description. Component 2 is dedicated to capacity building. Proposal includes the use of existing platforms for knowledge sharing, south-south exchanges, KM and capacity building deliverables such as good practice and lessons learned, training events as well

as knowledge tools, guidelines, manuals and other materials. Communication strategy is mentioned as an output for Component 1; but no details are provided. Please provide a brief description of the project's Communications Strategy/Plan for outreach, awareness raising and dissemination of outputs/results.

5/15/2023

Cleared.

### Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Thank you for the comments.

Regarding policies and regulations, a more detailed explanation has been included into Section B.

In reference to scalability, more detail has been included in Section A.

On pilot areas, both components 1 and 2 are of national scale, implying that results will influence policy and decision making at country level. Component 3 will allow the testing and adjusting of the mechanisms, regulation and tools of Components 1 and 2 under different scenarios at the territorial level. Section B has been adjusted to be more clear on this logic.

About Knowledge Management, Learning and Communications, while a detailed strategy will be develop during project formulation according to the different stakeholders identified, a description of the criteria that will be followed for the elaboration of the communications strategy has been included in Section B.

We take note on the comment on the approval from GPU manager.

**3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?**

### Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

## Agency's Comments

**3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?**

**b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**

**c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

## Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

The project is very ambitious but the GEF request for support is actually quite modest. Please explain how the budget costing was arrived at and why this remains a rather modestly resourced investment particularly when considering its ambition.

5/15/2023

Cleared.

## Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Thank you for the comment. The Agency project document contains the preliminary estimated budget detailed at the output level, including the co-financing contribution. A summary can be found in the following table. Kindly note that also the country has decided to increase the STAR contribution in pilot areas, that will in turn produce the results to be applied at the national scale. An updated OFP letter of endorsement has been uploaded in the portal.

Output	Estimated GEF contribution (USD)	Estimated co-financing contribution (USD)
1.1.1 Policies, standards and other instruments that increase policy/administrative coherence for biodiversity conservation are developed or updated.	450,000	1,000,000

<p>1.1.2 Governance mechanisms created (inter-ministerial, advisory and territorial councils) to contribute to the adoption and mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation at different technical, political, and community levels.</p>	<p>150,000</p>	<p>800,000</p>
<p>1.2.1 Biodiversity conservation instruments created and/or harmonized (monitoring system, management plans, homologation of PA categories, communication strategies and community environmental education, among others).</p> <p>1.2.2 Proposals for the incorporation of environmental criteria in economic instruments and regulations of productive activities allowed in protected areas.</p>	<p>476,000</p>	<p>2,500,000</p>
<p>2.1.1 Multi-stakeholder training programme, with transversal gender and intercultural approaches, for managers of public and private protected areas.</p>	<p>250,000</p>	<p>5,000,000</p>
<p>2.1.2 National and international cooperation programme on policy coherence and an integrated and multicultural approach to marine/terrestrial ecosystems.</p>	<p>200,000</p>	<p>1,000,000</p>

2.2.1 Knowledge management and transfer strategy designed and implemented, with a gender and intercultural approach.	300,000	3,000,000
2.2.2 Guidelines and methodologies developed for efficient access to environmental information by local and indigenous communities, in accordance with the Escaz? Agreement.	181,846	1,000,000
3.1.1 Mechanisms to implement the harmonize instruments in territories with clusters of conservation areas, incorporating an integrated marine/terrestrial approach with a transversal gender approach.	500,000	5,836,348
3.1.2 Piloting the integration of harmonized conservation instruments (1.2.1) into regional and local territorial development plans and policies	573,973	2,381,614
3.1.3 Pilot projects of productive sectors applying good practices and environmental criteria in protected areas or surrounding areas.	400,000	1,000,000

#### 4 Project Outline

##### A. Project Rationale

##### 4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

**b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

For the most part yes, but as noted above the entire policy analysis is rather generic and needs revised:

" There is a general lack of detail and precision regarding the entire investment and strategy on policy coherence. It is not at all clear what policies, regulations and rules vis a vis the ?productive sector? (and which sectors) that the project intends to work on or with. Many are mentioned as potential threats to BD: ag, fishing, mining and tourism, but the PIF has no analysis of the actual policy framework that exists, the weaknesses in that existing framework, and what the project proposes to do to improve it. Please clarify this element throughout the project design and be specific to each pilot area where the project proposes to work."

5/15/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Thanks for the comment. A more detailed explanation on the project approach on policy coherence and different policies and regulations to be addressed has been included in Section B.

**4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT**

**a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**

**c) 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?**

**d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**



Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared. Please address issues related to the policy analysis and proposed solutions and the need for a granular and detailed presentation of the policy baseline and the proposed alternative.

5/15/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Thanks for the comment. A more detailed explanation on the project's proposed solutions and alternative scenario has been included in Section B.

**5 B. Project Description**

**5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE**

**a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**

**b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared but the policy analysis element of the ToC is not specific enough, please improve.

5/15/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Thank you for the comment. A more detailed explanation on the project approach to policy coherence and policies and regulations to be addressed has been included in section B and to be more specific on this element of the ToC.

## 5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

**Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

## 5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

**a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?**

**b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).**

**c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area**

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared. Executing arrangements with GEF agency acceptable.

Agency's Comments

**5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

CI 4 seems quite modest given that the project infers through the work on improving policies that landscapes outside of the protected areas will benefit, however the area

impacted is quite limited, particularly when compared to the hectares of protected areas. Please explain or revisit the target for this indicator.

CI 11 is very low, with only a beneficiary impact on only 150 people. Please explain or revisit the target for this indicator.

5/15/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Thank you and point taken. Both core indicators have been revised and updated accordingly.

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

**5.6 RISKS**

**a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?**

**b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?**

**c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

**5.7 Qualitative assessment**

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

As noted above more details need to be provided on both the strategy for scaling up and more details about the specific policies that the project will address.

5/15/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023.

Thank you. More details on scaling up and specific policies have been included in Section B.

**6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities**

**6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**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's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**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's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**8 Annexes**

**Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 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's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

NA

Agency's Comments  
**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat's Comments  
4/21/2023

NA

Agency's Comments  
**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments  
4/21/2023

NA

Agency's Comments  
**8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments  
4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments  
**8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat's Comments  
4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Kindly note that an updated letter of endorsement increasing the country STAR contribution has been uploaded to the portal.

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments



**8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

**Annex C: Project Location**

**8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Kindly note that as the project will contribute to improve the condition of biodiversity inside protected areas, the risk has been changed to moderate. An updated risk certification from the Agency has been uploaded into the Portal.

**Annex E: Rio Markers**

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

**9 GEFSEC Decision**

**9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

No. Please address issues above and resubmit.

Please also spell out all acronyms the first time that they are used in the document.

5/15/2023

PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

We are grateful for the comments, which have been addressed.

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/  
Approval**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**Review Dates**

**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>4/21/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/15/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	