

MID-TERM REVIEW

Project ID:	10718
Project Name:	Restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services at the landscape scale on productive agroforestry areas and their natural environment
Countr(ies):	Chile
Implementing Agency:	FAO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW3

A. Description3

B. Key Dates3

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES3

A. Main MTR Findings3

B. Stakeholder Engagement13

C. Gender Equality14

D. Knowledge Management15

III. CORE INDICATORS16

IV: CO FINANCING18

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS19

VI. ANNEX19

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name

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

Country

Chile

GEF ID
10718

Implementing Agency
FAO

Executing Entity

Ministry of Environment (MMA) and National Forestry Corporation (CONAF)

Trust Fund
GET

Project Type
FSP

Objective

Restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services at the landscape scale on productive agroforestry areas and their natural environment improving the livelihoods of local communities

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval
5/6/2022

Agency Approval
3/15/2022

Implementation Start
11/7/2022

First Disbursement
12/31/2023

Expected MTR
11/6/2025

MTR Submission
4/29/2026

Actual MTR
9/23/2025

Expected Completion
11/6/2027

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main MTR Findings

Executive summary

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

Main findings

Relevance

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

Effectiveness

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

Efficiency

- RE11. The project has executed 36% of the budget planned for the mid-term and has a significant margin of resources still available (76% of the total for the five years). While this situation represents a weakness in time management, it is also an opportunity to strengthen investment in pending outputs and to adjust actions in the second phase of implementation.

RE12. While the MTR recognizes recent efforts to accelerate execution and strengthen technical and administrative management, it estimates that, even with increased spending, the remaining implementation time will not be sufficient to execute the entire budget, consolidate the expected results, and ensure the sustainability of ongoing actions. In this regard, it considers it necessary to assess the possibility of requesting an extension of the implementation period in order to guarantee the fulfillment of key outputs, the consolidation of the processes initiated, and the achievement of expected results and impacts.

Performance factors

Design

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

Implementation

RE14. FAO has complied with the basic functions and quality standards required by the GEF in its guidelines and fiduciary standards.

RE15. In its role as implementing agency, it has satisfactorily accompanied the process of identification, preparation, formulation, and implementation of the project, ensuring technical and administrative quality in each phase of the cycle.

Execution

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

Co-financing

RE17. As of June 2025, the institutions that committed to co-financing have reported and documented a contribution equivalent to 78% of the total assumed, i.e., \$29,148.92 of \$37,402.84 USD.

RE18. It is noteworthy that, although the project has a high level of reported co-financing, this volume of resources has not yet translated into greater programmatic effectiveness or proportional progress in some of the outcome indicators.

RE19. This is explained by the fact that a significant part of the co-financing comes from existing institutional programs and budgets, mainly aimed at strengthening environmental governance (an area in which the Project shows significant progress), as well as regional restoration actions that, in some cases, intersect with the landscapes of intervention but, nevertheless, these contributions are not being systematically accounted for as effective contributions to the achievement of the project's goals.

Monitoring and evaluation

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

Cross-cutting perspectives

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

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

Safeguards

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

Sustainability

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

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

Conclusions

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

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

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

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

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

RE31. From an efficiency perspective, the project shows a financial under-execution of 64% compared to the medium-term plan. While this situation reflects weaknesses in time management and in the synchronization between technical and administrative programming, it also represents a strategic opportunity to redirect efforts, prioritize key products, and introduce corrections that will accelerate implementation during the second phase.

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

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

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

Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- **Suggestion 1.** Promote the plans as foundational milestones that define the municipality as a territory 'under restoration.'
- **Suggestion 2.** Consider the portion of the landscape corresponding to the municipality as a priority territory, without ruling out the possibility of implementing actions outside the delimited area. Not only small landowners, but also medium and large producers, as well as companies with a presence in the territory.
- **Suggestion 3.** In addition to the technical standards specific to this type of planning, consider the following aspects in its design and implementation:
 - Establishment of mechanisms for inter-institutional, multi-level, and multi-stakeholder participation and coordination. Including forestry companies and civil society organizations, in addition to government and community actors.
 - Ensuring consistency with current national, regional, and local public policy instruments.
 - Align its implementation with the annual work plans of institutional programs (e.g., INDAP).
 - Providing them with a clear roadmap and a realistic financing plan.
 - Define institutional and community responsibilities for implementation.
 - Include a capacity-building program.
- **Suggestion 4.** To strengthen its legitimacy and sustainability, the Project could contribute to the deployment of communication strategies that highlight and raise the profile of local actors, with demonstration projects, the promotion of synergistic business models, and the development of restoration capacities (e.g., through the diploma course).

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

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

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

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

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

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

- **Suggestion 1.** In line with lesson learned 6, it is important to strike a balance between the scope and level of innovation of the business models to be developed and the actual operational and financial possibilities of the project. A good calibration could be achieved by:
 - Supporting innovative businesses that are in the early stages of development (e.g., fog catchers).
 - Prioritizing the most realistic and viable alternatives, even beyond the examples mentioned.
 - Supporting cross-cutting models applicable in different pilot landscapes, establishing one or two 'flagship' initiatives that concentrate learning, generate visibility, and facilitate scalability and/or replicability. and/or
 - Reducing the target number of business models to be developed.
- **Suggestion 2.** Use an analysis that establishes the link between the benefits and co-benefits of the business models to be promoted as input for their selection and feasibility.

- **Suggestion 3.** Assess the possibility of programmatically linking the development of business models with other projects under implementation, and of leveraging additional resources from, for example, the GEF small grants program, CORFO funds, regional governments, business programs, among others.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix 4. GEF rating table

GEF - FAO Criteria / subcriteria	Ranking ⁽¹⁾ 1 y ⁽²⁾ 2	Comentarios breves
A. STRATEGIC RELEVANCE		
A1. Overall strategic relevance	AS	The project is highly relevant. It responds decisively to the needs and interests of the local beneficiary populations, the priorities of GEF-7, FAO strategies, and the Chilean government's restoration priorities.
A1.1. Alignment with GEF and FAO strategic priorities	AS	
A1.2. Relevance to national, regional, and global priorities and to the needs of beneficiaries	AS	
A1.3. Complementarity with other ongoing interventions	AS	
B. EFFECTIVENESS		
B1. Overall assessment of project results	MI The level of results achieved is lower than expected and/or there have	The project is behind schedule. Only one result indicator has fully achieved its midterm target.

	been significant shortcomings.	
B.1.1. Delivery of project outputs	MS MS The level of results achieved is more or less as expected and/or there were moderate deficiencies.	The project is behind schedule. However, some of the outputs committed to in the Prodoc have been achieved, others are in progress, and others have not yet begun to be developed.
B1.2. Progress toward project results and objectives:		
Outcome 1.1. Institutional arrangements, public policy objectives, instruments, and restoration plans aligned for the comprehensive restoration of degraded landscapes.	MS The level of results achieved is more or less as expected and/or there were moderate deficiencies.	Progress has been made in developing public policy instruments and establishing governance bodies.
Outcome 1.2. Monitoring and prioritization system for landscape restoration designed and in use by relevant institutions	MU The level of results achieved is lower than expected and/or there have been significant shortcomings.	No substantive progress has been observed in the establishment of a robust monitoring system. Good progress has been made in capacity building.
Outcome 2.1. Agroforestry landscapes and their natural environments integrated into restoration for the demonstration and scaling up of nature-based solutions, instruments, financing and investment models. MS	MS The level of results achieved is more or less as expected and/or there were moderate deficiencies.	The project has been successfully implemented in the target areas, bringing together stakeholders and beginning restoration work.
Outcome 2.2. Demonstrated generation of benefits from restoration-based economies in the agroforestry sector.	MU The level of results achieved is lower than expected and/or there have been significant shortcomings.	Although the project is behind schedule, it is on track to get back on course. It has begun identifying producers and selecting projects to support.
Outcome 3.1. Knowledge Management Strategy and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System based on adaptive management and the delivery of measurable and verifiable results.	S The level of results achieved is as expected and/or there were no deficiencies or these were minor.	The project has effectively designed and implemented knowledge management, communication, and M&E plans.
Overall assessment of progress toward project results and objectives:	MS The level of results achieved is more or less as expected and/or there were moderate deficiencies.	Although the project is behind schedule, it is beginning to show signs of contributing to the results and objectives set.
C. EFFICIENCY		

C1. Efficiency	MS	The project has executed 36% of the budget planned for the mid-term and has a significant margin of resources still available (76% of the total for the five years). While this situation represents a weakness, it is also an opportunity to strengthen investment in pending products and to adjust actions in the second phase of implementation.
D. SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT RESULTS		
D1. Overall probability of sustainability	ML There are moderate risks to sustainability.	The low effectiveness observed in the delivery of key products and in the fulfillment of intermediate indicators, and the insipidity of the results being achieved by the Project, added to the fact that 76% of the total budget remains to be executed, limits the possibilities for the RMT to assess the probabilities that the effects obtained and processes promoted will be sustained once funding ceases. However, the moderation of the risks identified to date suggests that, if the project achieves its results, these risks will not affect its sustainability.
D1.1. Financial Risks	ML There are moderate risks to sustainability.	No substantial associated risks are observed. Although there are delays in implementation, the project will present a series of alternative climate finance instruments and promote business models in the pilot landscapes.
D1.2. Sociopolitical risks	L There are few or no risks to sustainability	No substantial risks are observed. The project seeks to ensure adequate representation of women, youth, indigenous peoples, and local communities, disadvantaged and vulnerable people, as well as the private sector, civil society, and government actors whose support is essential to achieving these results.
D1.3. Institutional and governance risks	ML There are moderate risks to sustainability	The change of administration in the State, which will take place in March 2026, is an obvious political risk. The project is preparing an advocacy plan aimed at successfully transferring the initiative to the new administration.
D1.4. Environmental risks	L There are few or no risks to sustainability	No significant environmental risks that could jeopardize sustainability have been identified.
E. FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE		
E1. Project design and maturity	S	The results matrix has some deficiencies in the formulation of goals, sources of verification, and minor inconsistencies in vertical logic.

E2. Quality of project implementation	S There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies, and the quality of implementation or execution meets expectations.	The FAO, in its role as implementing agency, has satisfactorily accompanied the process of identification, preparation, formulation, and implementation of the Project, ensuring technical and administrative quality in each phase of the cycle.
E2.1. Quality of project implementation by FAO (BH, LTO, etc.)	S There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies, and the quality of implementation or execution meets expectations.	The programmatic and administrative areas of the FAO Representation in Chile have maintained close and coordinated monitoring, providing technical guidance, operational support, and continuous supervision.
E2.2. Project supervision (CDP, PTF, etc.)	S	FAO has proven mechanisms for technical and financial monitoring and supervision.
E3. Quality of project implementation	S There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies, and the quality of implementation or execution meets expectations.	The MMA and CONAF, as executing and co-executing entities, respectively, have performed as planned. Both institutions have integrated and contributed strategic and operational guidance to the steering committee.
E3.1. Project execution and management (performance of the PMU and partners in execution, administration, contracting, etc.)	S There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies, and the quality of implementation or execution meets expectations.	Overall project management is satisfactory. It is desirable to shorten the time required for contracting services and purchasing goods.
E4. Financial management and co-financing	S	As of June 2025, the institutions that committed to co-financing have reported a contribution equivalent to 78% of the total assumed, i.e., \$29,148.92 of \$37,402.84 USD.
E5. Project partnerships and stakeholder participation	S	The various stakeholders have been kept informed. In addition, the Project has established consultation and community participation mechanisms to ensure that the voices of local communities and interest groups are heard and considered.
E6. Communication, knowledge management, and knowledge products	S	The Project has effectively designed and implemented its communications and knowledge management plan.
E7. Overall quality of M&E	S There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies, and the quality of the M&E design or implementation meets expectations.	The project has a standardized monitoring and evaluation system tailored to the initiative's monitoring and accountability needs. In addition, it has a professional dedicated exclusively to monitoring the GEF project portfolio. This minimizes the learning curve for monitoring new projects and improves the efficiency of information flow to FAO's institutional counterparts or "internal clients."

E7.1. M&E Design	S There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies, and the quality of the M&E design or implementation meets expectations.	
E7.2. M&E implementation plan (including human and financial resources)	S There were no deficiencies or only minor deficiencies, and the quality of the M&E design or implementation meets expectations.	
E8. Overall assessment of factors affecting performance	S	Although there is room for improvement, these factors do not appear to have had a negative impact on the performance of the Project.
F. CROSS-CUTTING DIMENSIONS		
F1. Gender and other dimensions of equality	HS	The project has consistently integrated gender and indigenous peoples' perspectives into the intervention cycle.
F3. Environmental and social safeguards	S	In accordance with its moderate risk classification and GEF guidelines, the project has taken the necessary measures to avoid harmful effects on the communities and habitats where it operates.
Overall project rating	MS	The project is highly relevant, and its execution and implementation are satisfactory, as are its monitoring and evaluation. Cross-cutting dimensions have been successfully integrated, and factors have not significantly affected the project. In terms of effectiveness, there are opportunities for improvement and interesting challenges. For the RMT, with adjustments, it is very likely that the project will be able to meet its programmatic and budgetary goals and make decisive progress in the theory of change that it has proposed to pursue.

^[1] Highly Satisfactory (HS); Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU); Could not be evaluated (CE)

^[2] Some criteria, in addition to their rating, have specific descriptors. These are included in the table and are also detailed at the end of the appendix.

B. Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement

The Project has promoted a series of strategic linkages with public, private, academic, and community institutions, expanding the base for inter-institutional collaboration and the multiplier potential of its actions. Good examples include:

- The incorporation of **INDAP** into the **Steering Committee** and the joint work and planning with **PRODESAL** and **PDTI** teams based in the municipalities. This has facilitated access to beneficiary groups and strengthened the Project's connection with public programmes operating in rural areas.

- The involvement of **forestry companies** and the **Forestry Dialogue Roundtable** in carrying out joint restoration actions (**biological corridors**) together with the Project and CONAF.
- Outreach, beyond letters of agreement and consultancies, to universities interested in contributing through research, theses, and technical support.
- The invitation to **Regional Governments (GORE)** to join governance bodies. This strengthens territorial relevance and legitimacy, maximizes the options and possibilities for institutional anchoring of the committees, and broadens the range of funding sources that can help ensure sustainability.

All the actors mentioned, particularly the **GORE**, **INDAP**, and the **municipalities**, in addition to the Project partners, are regarded by the **MTR** as strategic institutions for advancing the institutionalization of restoration in territorial public policy and for strengthening the Project's sustainability.

The Project shows, albeit still incipiently, signs of contributing to institutional and community strengthening, laying a sound foundation for the second half of its implementation. The project established and supports governance bodies at the national, regional, and local levels. A total of 18 governance committees have been established and supported at the national (1), regional (6), and local (11) levels. Although they still need to be strengthened and alternatives for institutional anchoring will need to be identified, key stakeholders indicate that these spaces are beginning to yield results. The MTR concurs and considers them well positioned to become a key element both for the future of the Project and for its sustainability.

Shared planning and joint action with public programmes operating in the territory constitute a key strategy for the Project; they broaden its reach, strengthen the efficiency and effectiveness of implementation, and at the same time enhance the prospects for the financial and institutional sustainability of the interventions in the medium and long term.

For government stakeholders, MMA and CONAF, as executing entities, have provided strategic and operational guidance through the Project Steering Committee, while broader collaboration with INDAP, municipalities, regional governments (GORE) and other public institutions has strengthened territorial legitimacy, policy alignment and prospects for institutionalization.

Engagement of final beneficiaries is closely linked to local rural needs, especially water security and soil productivity, and is characterized by a more integrated and participatory approach than is usually experienced in these territories (see Finding 1.). Gender diagnostics and action plans were prepared, sex-disaggregated data were maintained, gender-sensitive indicators and budgets were incorporated, and FPIC/CLPI processes were carried out in Mapuche territories in Cañete and Contulmo. Participation figures reinforce this pattern: women represent around 45% of Regional Committees and 61% of Local Committees, while 26% of Local Committee members belong to Indigenous Peoples.

C. Gender Equality

Gender

Finding 10. The Project has consistently integrated gender and Indigenous Peoples' perspectives throughout the intervention cycle.

103. In line with GEF guidelines and FAO's 2020–2030 Gender Equality Policy, the Project has systematically incorporated the cross-cutting perspectives of gender and interculturality.

104. In accordance with these instruments, specific assessments and action plans were carried out from the beginning of the Project cycle to ensure the participation of women and Indigenous Peoples, including consultation processes and the signing of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) in the Mapuche territories of the municipalities of Cañete and Contulmo.

105. The Project has also maintained a database with sex-disaggregated information; designed and integrated gender-sensitive results and indicators into its results matrix; developed capacities within the team, institutional partners, and beneficiaries; allocated a specific budget; and included in its reports a description of the progress made in these areas. These and other actions demonstrate the Project's full alignment with the various standards required by FAO's Gender Policy.

106. One of the most notable results is the high level of participation. On average, in the six Regional Committees, women account for 45% of representation, and 61% in the Local Committees, where, in addition, 26% of members belong to Indigenous Peoples, showing a strong Project response in terms of parity and inclusion in the intervention.

107. Another positive aspect is the establishment of partnerships with public institutions such as SERNAMEG, INDAP's Rural Women's Board, and PRODEMU, to jointly conduct workshops, exchange spaces, and/or technical sessions on gender, Indigenous Peoples, and economic empowerment in the landscapes of Valparaíso, Maule, Ñuble, and Biobío. Particularly noteworthy is the gender training provided to INDAP extension workers in Concepción.

108. For the MTR, the gender approach and the inclusion of Indigenous Peoples constitute one of the strongest areas and one with the greatest potential for replication and scaling up. The conditions are in place so that, in one municipality or across the entire Lanalhue–Nahuelbuta landscape, efforts can be intensified to make this territory a national benchmark for inclusive restoration, where the role of women is explicitly highlighted, linking gender and interculturality through an intersectional lens, and clearly demonstrating how restoration can generate environmental, social, and productive benefits that recognize cultural diversity while also strengthening equity (see recommendations section).

D. Knowledge Management

• **Knowledge management.** Spaces have been created for the exchange of experiences, along with monitoring tools for the collection and organization of information (e.g., number of beneficiaries), supported through the facilitation of Project operational planning workshops. As noted earlier, the planning of a diploma course is also underway.

In terms of experience-sharing, a particularly significant achievement has been the creation of a **Community of Practice**, conceived as a collaborative space for sharing methodologies, lessons learned, and restoration experiences. Participation is not limited to individuals directly involved in the Project; the invitation has been extended to other actors who wish to contribute with their own initiatives.

The main challenge, as previously noted, lies in developing capacities among public sector officials and in documenting not only results, but also processes—and eventually the costs and benefits—of the initiatives promoted by the Project.

III. Core Indicators

Indicator 3 Area of land and ecosystems under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
9200	10000	82	

Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
Cropland	2,760.00	1,948.00	21.00	

Indicator 3.2 Area of forest and forest land under restoration

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
2,760.00	4,422.00	59.00	

Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and woodland under restoration

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
Woodlands	1,840.00	3,630.00	2.00	

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

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
1,840.00			

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)
69000	70000	300.26	

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)
41,400.00	38,890.00	295.26	

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

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

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

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

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

27,600.00

31,110.00

5.00

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

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

Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported

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

Documents (Document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

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)		154836		

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)			0	
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)		154,836	0	
Anticipated start year of accounting		2022	2022	
Duration of accounting		20	20	

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

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of 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 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	4,869	3,817	750	
Male	5,107	5,813	502	
Total	9,976	9,630	1252	0

IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO(\$)	Materialized at MTR(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment MMA	Grant	Investment mobilized	2,000,000.00	1,270,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment MMA	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	12,651,577.00	11,966,062.00
Recipient Country Government	National Forest Corporation CONAF	Grant	Investment mobilized	11,859,167.00	9,763,240.00
Recipient Country Government	National Forest Corporation CONAF	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,324,867.00	746,794.00
Recipient Country Government	National Agricultural Development Institute (INDAP)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	6,360,919.00	950,324.00
Recipient Country Government	Agricultural and Livestock Service (SAG)	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,365,266.00	3,860,660.00
Recipient Country Government	Agricultural and Livestock Service (SAG)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	521,050.00	461,840.00

GEF Agency	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	320,000.00	130,000.00
Total Co-financing				37,402,846.00	29,148,920.00

Comments

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
Medium/Moderate	Medium/Moderate	Medium/Moderate	

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Finding 11. In accordance with its moderate-risk classification and with the GEF guidelines, the Project has taken the necessary measures to avoid causing harmful effects to the communities and habitats where it intervenes.

109. The Project has maintained its initial risk rating: moderate. In line with this classification, the initiative has complied with the environmental and social safeguards established by the GEF in its updated policy on this matter.

110. These measures have been implemented through the rollout of an Environmental and Social Management Plan prepared by the Project. This instrument has guided risk identification, the application of mitigation measures, and the establishment of monitoring and evaluation criteria.

111. In this regard, the MTR confirms that the Project has established consultation and community participation mechanisms to ensure that the voices of local communities and stakeholders are heard and taken into account.

112. Likewise, it has made efforts to promote balanced representation and equitable sharing of benefits between women and men, and has carried out FPIC processes with Indigenous communities.

113. Additionally, the Project has had the capacities, procedures, and protocols needed to ensure that its implementation does not cause harmful effects in the habitats where it operates, does not contravene applicable international environmental treaties or agreements, and does not encourage the introduction of potentially invasive non-native species, among other measures.

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Prefix	Title
M and E Document	Mid-term Review (MTR)	GEFID10718 _Core Indicators at MTR_FAO_Chile
M and E Document	Mid-term Review (MTR)	GEFID10718_MTR_Executive Summary_FAO_Chile
M and E Document	Mid-term Review (MTR)	GEFID10718_MTR_FAO_Chile_Spanish
Project Supporting Document	ESS Supporting Document	GEF10718 Annex I1 Environmental and Social Risk Classification
Project Supporting Document	ESS Supporting Document	PIF Chile 683061 - ESS certification
Project Supporting Document	ESS Supporting Document	PIF Chile 683061 - Climate Risk Screening Summary