Enhancing Nature-based Solutions and Green Infrastructure networks in urban and peri-urban areas in Chile

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11339
Countries
Chile
Project Name
Enhancing Nature-based Solutions and Green Infrastructure networks in urban and peri-urban areas in Chile
Agencies
FAO
Date received by PM
6/20/2025
Review completed by PM
10/3/2025
Program Manager
Aloke Barnwal
Focal Area
Multi Focal Area
Project Type
FSP

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

The project title is quite long. We suggest tightening it a bit without major change to remain broadly consistent with the OFP letters. If agreeable, please send the revised title by email and we will get it modified from the backend with help of the GEF Portal team.

We noted the OFP letter requesting for execution by FAO. However, in the project information table, FAO is not listed as one of the executing agencies. Please clarify. The implementation arrangement also doesn't indicate FAO as the executing agency.

GEFSEC September 2

Thanks. The new title looks good and will be adjusted by the GEF portal team.

Agency Response

25 August 2025

Thank you for the comment. The title has been shortened as follows: ?Enhancing Nature-based Solutions and Green Infrastructure networks in urban and peri-urban areas in Chile?

Noted. FAO as been included as Executing Entity, in terms of providing management and administration of the GEF grant, but the Ministries keep their role as executing entities in terms of being the technical leaders of the project. It is important to note this difference, as is also requested by the OFP. Please also note that in the implementation arrangements, the role of FAO providing execution support in described in the section "will de GEF implementing agency play an execution role on this project?".

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency ResponseNA

2. Project Summary.
a) 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?
b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?
c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The summary will benefit from including a paragraph of the prevailing environmental problems in Chile?s urban and peri-urban regions that the project will address.

GEFSEC September 2

Thanks for adding. No more comments.

Agency Response

25 August 2025

Thank you for the comment. The prevailing environmental problems in Chile's urban and peri-urban regions has been incorporated into the project summary.

3. Project Description Overview
a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?
c) 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?
d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
f) 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

The project objective includes promoting health and well being of people. However, in the components, outcomes and outputs, there is not explicit link with this objective. Pleas consider adding it. The project will likely support this with increased access to green spaces, improved biodiversity, improved adaptation to extremes such as flooding and heat, and improved food and nutrition security. An elaboration of this in the socio-economic benefits will be useful.

GEFSEC September 2- Thanks. No further comments.

The proposal will benefit from providing a description of potential NbS and GI solutions that the project aims to support. Often GI and NbS are defined loosely and therefore a distinction between these two with examples would strengthen the proposal.

GEFSEC September 2- Thanks. No further comments.

We recommend that the project be more ambitious especially in its outputs given a strong ownership and engagement of the two highly relevant ministries. In this context, consider replacing ?development and transfer? of guidelines, proposals, methodologies, technical standards, protocols, etc. with ?adoption? where appropriate, particularly output 1.1.1 and 1.1.2.

GEFSEC September 2- Thanks. No further comments.

The indicator *b) % women participation in the mainstreaming of NbS and GI concepts into urban and land use planning instruments* under outcome 1.1 is unclear. Please explain how this is can help measure improved policy coherence and urban and territorial planning instruments. Participation of women in project design and benefits of NBS and GI for them is an important factor to consider in this outcome, but it is difficult to comprehend their participation as an indicator.

GEFSEC September 2- Thanks.

Indicator for outcome 1.2 focuses solely on public-private agreements whereas the activities go beyond just the private sector. Please consider revising or adding another indicator relevant to the proposed outputs (e.g. for output 1.2.2).

GEFSEC September 2- Ok

Component 2 is categorized as investment even though outcome 2.1 and the associated outputs appear to be technical assistance. Consider reviewing the categorization again and separating Component 2 into two distinct rows, one for technical assistance activities and another for investment activities, for greater clarity and alignment.

The budget allocated to component 2 seem to be low given the level of technical assistance and investments planned. Please review the budget split and if feasible consider adding more resources by adjusting the resources of the other components.

GEFSEC September 2- Thanks. Ok for the above two comments.

Agency Response

25 August 2025

As suggested, the explicit link with the objective of the project of promoting the health and well being of people has been established in project Component 2. In addition, this aspect of the project has also been elaborated in the section of the socio-economic benefits of the project.

Regarding a description of NbS and GIs, this has been addressed in the project rationale by including a clear distinction between NbS and GI, along with illustrative examples of potential solutions the project aims to support.

As suggested, Outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 have been updated to indicate that the proposed instruments to be developed and regulations to be updated through the project will be adopted.

For clarification, the gender indicator under Outcome 1.1 has been replaced with the following: ?Number of land use and/or urban planning instruments approved that integrate a gender approach and/or gender sensitives measures.?

The indicator under Outcome 1.2 has been updated as follows to cover all the proposed outputs: a) ?Number of agreements with multiple stakeholders for planning, effective management, and coordination of actions for the implementation of GI and NbS in the target cities?.

Component 2 is now divided as ?Technical assistance? (Output 2.1) and ?Investment? (Outcome 2.2).

As suggested the budget allocation for component 2 has been increased from USD 2,035,365 to USD 2,234,265.

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

The proposal effectively identifies and lists the key barriers. However, it would benefit from elaboration of each barrier in Chile's context. For example, in the case of barrier (c) *"Weak institutional framework and planning instrument weaknesses for the integration of GI and NbS in city planning and development"* further clarification is needed. What specific institutional

challenges are present in Chile? Is the issue related to fragmentation among governmental bodies, lack of inter-agency coordination, outdated or rigid planning instruments, or insufficient policy guidance? Providing a more detailed explanation would strengthen the analysis and help contextualize the challenges more clearly.

In terms of stakeholders, consider including MDBs (WB, IDB) as potential stakeholders which can complement the efforts related to financing. IDB has just launched a special sub-national financing window which is a useful opportunity to factor in. In addition, the stakeholders list should also include city networks ICLEI, C40 and Regions4 https://regions4.org/ which are actively supporting cities in Chile.

Thanks. No further comments.

Agency Response

25 August 2025

Thank you for the comments. As suggested, description of the barriers identified in the project document has been updated providing more detail and context related on the challenges to be addressed through the project.

On stakeholder, thanks for the suggestion. Information regarding MDBs and city networks has been included into the Stakeholder Engagement section of the project document considering these stakeholders will have a role in the implementation phase of the project.

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) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?
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? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?
d) 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?
e) 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?
f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?
g) 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?
h) 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)?
i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?
j) 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?
k) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?
l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Incremental reasoning- please explain how this project will be incremental in terms of facilitating an integrated approach for urban transformation.

GEFSEC September 2- The new paragraph refers to multistakeholder engagement and coordination across various institutions. While this is an important aspect, please elaborate how the project will support integration across different urban sectors. At the GEF, integrated approaches for urban planning and development focuses on these aspects- i) multi-level governance (vertically and horizontally); ii) cross sectoral integration (interventions factor synergies and trade-offs across sectors e.g. NBS is integrated in urban land use planning, multiple sectoral interventions are proposed in a complementary manner to support overall urban growth and resilience, iii)multiple environmental benefits are targeted. The first paragraph has useful elements but a bit generic. A practical narrative on how the cities are currently being developed and how this project will advance an integrated approach to benefit people and the environment would be useful. Use some examples from the proposed interventions, if necessary.

Innovation and transformative change. This section needs to be strengthened as it is unclear what the innovative angles of the proposal are.

GEFSEC September 2- this is fine. It has practical examples to demonstrate innovation aspects. Please use similar style for incremental reasoning also.

Policy coherence. The proposals explains the guidelines, regulations and standards to be developed by the project and how these proposed guidelines and standards are aligned with the policy coherence principle. This is very much welcome. However, the proposal would also benefit from an identification of existing policies within other line ministries that are harmful for the urban environment, and how the proposed project would tackle them.

GEFSEC September 2- Ok. The added paragraph looks fine.

Private sector engagement: Consider strengthening private sector engagement to leverage financing especially for nature based solutions.

GEFSEC September 2- The proposed private company invests in RE which doesn't seem to be the focus of this project. Our comment referred to elaborating the output 2.1.1 which says that innovative multi-stakeholder business model for scaling up public and private investment in GI and NbS projects at the urban level, designed and piloted. Consider adding some elements from this in the private sector engagement section.

As the project integrates gender equality considerations in the project design, the Agency is requested to include under its KM, lessons learned and best practices in advancing gender equality and women's empowerment in the project, and provide for wide dissemination of such KM products. On Output 4.2.2. ?Midterm and final evaluations conducted, ensuring that results were included by gender". This output is not well-phrased. Please consider revising to reflect that MTR and TE will include gender-specific results and include reports on the implementation of the Gender Action Plan, as well as best practices and lessons learned on implementing the gender-related activities and interventions.

GEFSEC September 2- Ok. The added paragraph looks fine.

GEFSEC October 2

Comments cleared

Agency Response

23 September 2025

Incremental reasoning: Noted, this section has been updated as requested.

Private sector engagement: Thank you for your comment. We have confirmed the participation of private sector actors, and updated the list of engaged partners. In particular, the project will engage with the Chilean Chamber of Construction (CCHC), which plays a key role in investment management for urban development and is directly involved in the implementation of green infrastructure projects, and is increasingly interested in promoting Nature-based Solutions. In Antofagasta, the project will collaborate with CREO Antofagasta, which supports initiatives that contribute to the city?s sustainable development, and Kyklos, a private initiative that promotes environmental culture and community engagement. In Valdivia, the project will work with Activa Valdivia, a consortium of local private and public stakeholders whose main purpose is to foster the city?s sustainable growth.

Efforts from MINVU are also underway to establish a partnership with the company ATLAS Renewable Energy, which operates in the Antofagasta region, to participate in the project and leverage financing during project implementation. While Atlas specializes in renewable energy, their involvement is relevant in the context of Antofagasta, a city strongly linked to renewable energy development. Their contribution could be particularly valuable in Component 3, supporting training, capacity-building, and seminars on urban sustainability and green solutions.

Through these collaborations, the project will pilot innovative multi-stakeholder management models for GI and NbS projects in the four project cities (Output 2.2.1), thereby scaling up public and private investment in sustainable urban solutions.

25 August 2025

Thank you for the comments.

Incremental reasoning has been updated to explain how this project will be incremental in terms of facilitating an integrated approach for urban transformation.

Innovation: The section of innovation & transformative change was updated to highlight the innovative angles of the proposal.

Policy coherence: based on the current state of laws in force in Chile, please note that on further assessment there are no existing policies within other line ministries that are harmful for the urban environment.

Private sector: The project will engage the private sector particularly through the piloting of innovative management models for GI and NbS projects in the four project cities (Output 2.2.1). Efforts from MINVU are currently underway to establish a partnership with the company ATLAS Renewable Energy (https://ww2.atlasrenewableenergy.com/en/projects/), which operates in the Antofagasta region, to participate in the project and leverage financing during project implementation.

Activity 3.1.2.5 was updated with the following: ?This will include lessons learned and best practices in advancing gender equality and women's empowerment in the project for wide dissemination through KM products.? Output 4.1.2 (please note there was a numbering mistake) was updated as follows: ?Midterm review and final evaluation conducted to constructively inform and guide project implementation, sustainability considerations, the use of adaptive measures where necessary, and gender-specific results in line with the Gender Action Plan.? In addition, activities under this Output were updated to indicate that best practices and lessons learned on implementing gender related activities and interventions will be documented and assessed.

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.).

d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The institutional coordination diagram is vague. Please map the institutions against each groups in the governance structure. Also, given the focus on strengthening capacity and decision making of local governments, please consider including local governments in key decision making and implementation committees.

Coordination with on-going activities- There seems to be a lot of overlaps with the Green Cities Strategy (ENIV, Spanish acronym) implemented by FAO with Green Climate Funds resources. To ensure further coordination and identification of synergies, please explore the options of adding them to the project structure, for instance through the Technical Advisory Committee.

GEFSEC September 2- Ok.

Agency Response

25 August 2025

Noted. The diagram has been updated to provide more details on the project?s governance arrangements. This includes the inclusion of local governments as part of the Territorial Advisory Committee (local/city level).

We appreciate the comment. As suggested, ENIV has been included as part of the Project?s Technical Advisory Committee.

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)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?

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

Core Indicator 6. In addition to Annex O, please provide us with the EXACT Tool spreadsheet so the GEF team can track the GHG calculations.

GEFSEC September 2- Overall, the value for Core Indicator 6 seems to low for the 46,234 tCO2e for the amount of ha to be improved under Core Indicator 4, i.e., 1,551,824. Also, please provide an explanation on how the ha used in Ex-ACT for the calculation of CI6 have been estimated, and explain the correlaton with CI4.

GEFSEC October 2

The response is not clear.

1. The response on 25th August mentioned that there is an increased in the carbon benefits. As per the latest table, the CI 6 is 462345 and there is no indirect emissions estimated. This is significantly lower than the estimate at the PIF stage. i.e. 395923 (direct) and 791846 (indirect). Can the project lead to indirect emission reduction?

2. We noted that carbon sequestration is considered only for some part of the land benefits under CI4. What is the proportion? The CI4.1 which is estimated for this project pertains to Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified). Please provide a rationale for including constructed landscapes and hard surface areas under this indicator. How will they benefit biodiversity?

GEFSEC October 16, 2025

Thanks for the explanation and revisions. It's fine now.

Agency Response

16 October 2025

1. Thank you for the comment. Kindly note that the estimates of the PIF stage were done with preliminary data and gross estimates based on the best available information at that time. Actually, the first estimate was much more conservative, and then updated making extrapolations to considering indirect mitigations as per GEF comments. The updated estimate presented now at CEO endorsement stage is done with precise data and coverage obtained from baseline studies and analyses carried out during the PPG. When we referred to an increase was in relation to the first estimate done at this stage. However, the number presented was an aggregate of direct and indirect mitigations, as EX-ACT doesn?t provide differentiated modules, and we apologize for the confusion.

To clarify, we have updated the EX-ACT estimates (using V9.4.2, found as Annex O) providing direct and indirect mitigations separately. Direct mitigation, includes 41 hectares under afforestation and reforestation, and 749 hectares under management for a total of 46,234 tCO2e over 20 years. Furthermore, we have estimated indirect mitigations and added a number of replications based on the GEF interventions, which under a realistic scenario could amount to four replications in the four target cities over 20 years for a total of 739,751 tCO2e. This quantity of replications are considered as realistic given the national circumstances and characteristics of the cities and periurban areas. Thus, the total carbon benefits project for the project (direct + indirect) are 785,985 tCO2e over 20 years (5 years implementation and 15 years of capitalization). During project implementation, we will make efforts to identify new areas that can also be considered for mitigation and report in MTR and TE accordingly.

2. Urban biodiversity in the five pilot municipalities (Antofagasta, Lo Espejo, Pedro Aguirre Cerda, Valdivia, and Coyhaique) in four cities in Chile presents unique characteristics. In addition to experiencing diametrically different climatic conditions, they face the challenge of deepening ecological connectivity and improved habitat conditions in densely built-up urban areas. Unlike rural or peri-urban environments, the urban context of the pilot cities is primarily composed of built-up and hard surfaces, forming a mosaic of built-up areas, green zones, and fragmented biological corridors. Under this scenario, the Project seeks to strengthen ecological connectivity and habitats for urban biodiversity through integrated interventions involving different types of green infrastructure (GI) and nature-based solutions (NbS).

Based on the above, the target area for Core Indicator 4 (CI4): Area of landscapes under improved practices is 1,551,824 hectares. This target remains the same, as it considers all urban landscapes included within the urban and peri-urban limits of the pilot municipalities in the four selected cities. As mentioned in previous submissions, the target for CI4 was estimated based on the area of the five pilot municipalities where the project will design, implement, and monitor pilot initiatives for urban-periurban landscape planning and management considering GI and NbS. This will include integrating NbS and GI into urban parks, public spaces, green areas, and into stormwater drainage and paving projects; the development and implementation of community tree planting plans; strengthening urban ecological corridors; an urban housing project and/or the ?Quiero Mi Barrio? Program that incorporates NbS and GI through the promotion of urban agri-food systems for food security and nutrition; and piloting NbS and GI designs for disaster risk reduction including urban flooding, among others. In addition, the integration of the NbS and GI approach into Land Use Planning Instruments at the municipal and metropolitan region levels, a Master Plan for the restoration of wetlands, and two GI and biodiversity plans.

The inclusion of built-up areas or hard surfaces as part of the area under the CI4 is justified since these are part of the urban ecological system and act as transitional spaces that biodiversity use to move between natural areas in the urban matrix. The Project will promote interventions aimed at improving habitat conditions, strengthening ecological connectivity, and promoting the biodiversity that utilizes these spaces as part of urban landscapes.

23 September 2025

Kindly note that the hectares used in Ex-ACT for the calculation of CI6 are a subset of the hectares under CI4, and correspond to the sites where NbS and GI will be implemented in the four project cities including 41 hectares under afforestation and reforestation, and 749 hectares under management. Please note that the total are of 1,551,824 hectares of CI4 was not considered for the Ex-ACT analysis since it corresponds to urban landscapes with constructed and hard surface areas. On the other hand, it is expected that the project will have a replication and scale-up potential of ten times this area, which will increase the project?s GHG emission mitigation benefits to 462,345 tCO2e over 20 years.

25 August 2025

Noted. The EX-ACT Tool spreadsheet is provided (V9.4.2) so the GEF team can track the GHG calculation. Please note that the carbon GEBs were reassessed with the Excel tool and there was an increase in the revised estimation of the carbon benefits.

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 RequestYes

Agency ResponseNA
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

Agency ResponseNA
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?
b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The proposal is not required to elaborate on alignment with focal area objectives but is welcome. Please elaborate on the alignment with the GEF-8 sustainable cities program thematic areas and transformation levers.

GEFSEC September 2- Thanks.

Agency Response

25 August 2025

Duly noted. A description on the alignment with the GEF-8 sustainable cities program thematic areas and transformation levers was included.

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 RequestYes

Agency ResponseNA
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 RequestYes

Agency ResponseNA
7 D. Policy Requirements
7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency ResponseNA

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency ResponseNA

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

It is well noted that the project has carried out stakeholder analysis and consultations during project development. The attached Stakeholder engagement plan, however, is rather generic and should at this stage be able to provide more details on the specific roles of key stakeholders related to project components and outputs, including for civil society organizations, women and youth organizations as well as local communities.

Cleared.

Agency Response

25 August 2025

Kindly note that the Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be updated during the first phase of implementation based on the definition of instruments and pilot strategies for the target cities. Civil society, community organizations, women's organizations, and underrepresented groups have been identified as key stakeholders in the Plan; specific engagement strategies for this and other stakeholders will be detailed in the Plan during that stage.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

We note that FAO attached ESS document and stakeholder engagement plan. The project ESS risk is classified as Low.
- Please ensure that engagement and consultations with persons with disabilities and informal sector or vulnerable groups particularly for Component 1. Strengthened regulatory and institutional frameworks for integrated urban planning, and Output 2.2.3. Integrate NbS and GI into an urban park public space or green area project and urban road project in the four pilot cities.

Cleared.

Agency Response

25 August 2025

Noted. Output 1.1.1.2 was updated to indicate that development of gender-sensitive guidelines that include technical criteria and methodological aspects for standardizing the development and implementation of Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Plans will be done engaging and

consulting with persons with disabilities and informal sector or vulnerable groups. Similarly Activity 2.2.3.1 for integrating NbS and GI into an urban park public space or green area project and urban road project in the four pilot cities will also engage and consult with persons with disabilities and informal sector or vulnerable groups

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 RequestYes

Agency ResponseNA
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency ResponseNA
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency ResponseNA
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency ResponseNA
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency ResponseNA
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

PPG. The expenditure categories shall match those allowed by the GEF policy guidelines - See Table 1. Currently it just lists the activities and not budget items. https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf

GEFSEC September 2- Please list the activities implemented during the PPG.

Cleared.

Agency Response

23 September 2025

Noted. The status of utilization of the PPG resources has been updated by listing the activities implemented during the PPG.

25 August 2025

As indicated, the status of utilization of the PPG has been updated to match those allowed by the GEF policy guidelines.

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 RequestYes

Agency ResponseNA
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 RequestYes

Agency ResponseNA
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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency ResponseNA
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

Agency ResponseNA

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?
e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please add a column in the results framework at the end listing the indicators of the PFD against relevant KPIs of the Chile project. The column title can be ?# Indicator Program Level ? Results Framework for the GEF-8 Sustainable Cities IP?. Please refer to the SCIF PFD for indicators.

GEFSEC September 2- Thanks

Agency Response

25 August 2025

As indicated, a column label ?Indicator Program Level Results Framework for the GEF-8 Sustainable Cities IP? was added at the end of the results framework listing the indicators of the PFD against relevant KPIs of the Chile project.

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

Agency ResponseNA

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating
8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency ResponseNA

Annex G: GEF Budget template
8.9 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

Spell out the meaning of ?Local Coordinator RM?.

Consultant costs account for 39% of the project budget, which is relatively high. Please consider streamlining and scale down the budget.

Consider covering the following expense ?Mobilization - Car rental for field activities? with the co-financing resources as the proposed amount is very high. Purchase of motorized vehicles is an expense not covered by the GEF.

Office supplies should be charged 100% to PMC but not to project components. Please revise the budget.

As FAO is providing execution support services for the project, please indicate in the budget table which line items FAO will provide for such services.

Under National consultants category, please confirm ?Administrative support? is a consultant position, noting that FAO has agreed not to charge any execution support services cost to the project budget.

GEFSEC September 2-

With the changes in the budget table, there is a difference under component 1 between the budget table and Portal?s component table:

	Budget table	Portal's entry	Difference
Component 1	996,800	734,800	262,000
Component 2	2,234,265	2,234,265	0
Component 3	1,356,900	1,356,900	0
M&E	194,100	194,100	0
PMC	222,900	222,900	0
Total	**5,004,965**	**4,742,965**	**262,000**

Please correct the budget table to match with the component table in the Portal entry and resubmit.

Cleared.

Agency Response

23 September 2025

Thank you for noting this. There was a typo in one formula which has been corrected.

25 August 2025

Noted. RM stands for Metropolitan Region. Accordingly, this position in now ?Local Coordinator Metropolitan Region?

As indicated, the consultants costs account was scaled down and reduced to 33% of the project budget.

As suggested, the expense for Mobilization - Car rental for field activities was removed from the project budget and will be covered through co-financing.

The budget was revised so that office supplies are being charged 100% to PMC and not to the project components.

FAO will provide execution support by administering the GEF grant as requested by Chile OFP, but will not charge any costs to the project budget. The budget was updated to reflect that FAO will be the responsible entity, although every payment will be done against work plans and budgets validated by the project steering committee and under guidance of the ministries as technical leading executing entities.

Under the National Consultants category, this consultant position has been renamed ?Administrative Assistant? to avoid confusions, as FAO does not to charge any execution support services cost to the project budget.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes
8.10 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

Agency ResponseNA
Additional Annexes
9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation
Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not yet. The agency is requested to address the technical and policy related comments and resubmit the project.

All the comments have been addressed except for one further comment on core indicator estimation. Pasting it here again for easy reference:

GEFSEC October 2

The response is not clear.

1. The response on 25th August mentioned that there is an increased in the carbon benefits. As per the latest table, the CI 6 is 462345 and there is no indirect emissions estimated. This is significantly lower than the estimate at the PIF stage. i.e. 395923 (direct) and 791846 (indirect). Can the project lead to indirect emission reduction?

2. We noted that carbon sequestration is considered only for some part of the land benefits under CI4. What is the proportion? The CI4.1 which is estimated for this project pertains to Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified). Ideally, most of this should contribute to sequestration benefits. Please clarify and also provide a rationale for including constructed landscapes and hard surface areas under this indicator. How will they benefit biodiversity?

GEFSEC October 16, 2025

Cleared and recommended for approval.

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	**7/9/2025**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**7/28/2025**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**9/2/2025**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**10/2/2025**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**10/16/2025**	