Promoting the conservation and sustainable management of southern peatlands in Chile

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12152
Countries
Chile
Project Name
Promoting the conservation and sustainable management of southern peatlands in Chile
Agencies
UNEP
Date received by PM
12/9/2025
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Ulrich Apel
Focal Area
Multi Focal Area
Project Type
MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

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

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?
b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

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

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

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

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

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

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

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

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

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

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

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

01/12/2026: Not fully.

Please include relevant information in section "Coordination and Cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects".

03/16/2026: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments
03/11/2026

Information on coordination and cooperation with other projects and initiatives has been included.

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

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

Secretariat's Comments
01/12/2026: Not fully.

- Please calculate carbon benefits (CI 6.1) with the usual 20 years accounting timeframe. Currently, the accounting period indicates 3 years.

03/16/2026: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments
03/11/2026

The basis for carbon estimates has been adjusted to 20 years as requested.

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

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments
5.6 RISKs

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

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 screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments
01/12/2026: Not fully.

Key risk: The rating under the Environmental and Social risk category (currently low) must be the same as the rating under the Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) risk (currently Moderate), as per the GEF risk appetite GEF/C.66/13.

Please make entries consistent.

Please clarify whether consultations with Indigenous Peoples and Local communities were taken place preparing the PIF and how the results of the consultations were integrated into the project design.

ii. Please carefully consider potential social risks related to loss of livelihoods for local communities particularly related to harvesting moss. Please also include appropriate mitigation measures to address this risk in the project design including provision of alternative livelihoods particularly for the most vulnerable and informal groups.

iii. SRIF is not completed and does not include Safeguard review summary and recommendations by the safeguard team. Please provide complete SRIF including Safeguard review summary and recommendation by the safeguard team. These recommendations should be integrated into PIF.

iv. The environmental and social risk of the Key Risk table said Low risk. Please make the Key risk table consistent with SRIF and provide a summary of environmental and social risks and potential mitigation measures from SRIF in the table. Please also make it clear actions will take place to mitigate potential impacts of the project, such as development of ESMP, during PPG.

03/16/2026: Not fully.

1) The entries are still not consistent. The rating under the Environmental and Social risk category (currently low) must be the same as the rating under the Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) risk (currently Moderate), as per the GEF risk appetite GEF/C.66/13.

04/23/2026: Addressed

Agency's Comments
03/11/2026

The risk assessment has been revised and is now consistent between the PIF and the Safeguards Assessment tool (SRIF).

04/01/2026

Apologies for missing this. During the previous review we had updated the explanation of risk and mitigation measures but overlooked updating the risk rating to moderate in the portal?s dropdown menu. This has now been corrected in the portal and a summary of concrete mitigation measures for potential risks and impacts has been included in the Key Risk table.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments
01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments
01/12/2026: Not fully.

- Please clarify if Indigenous peoples and local were consulted. This field is currently blank. If not, explain why.

03/16/2026: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments
03/11/2026

Clarification regarding consultations with IPLC has been included in the PIF and further detail provided in the Safeguards document (SRIF).

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

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

Secretariat's Comments
01/12/2026: Yes. However:

i. Please clarify whether consultations with Indigenous Peoples and Local communities were taken place preparing the PIF and how the results of the consultations were integrated into the project design.

ii. Please carefully consider potential social risks related to loss of livelihoods for local communities particularly related to harvesting moss. Please also include appropriate mitigation measures to address this risk in the project design including provision of alternative livelihoods particularly for the most vulnerable and informal groups.

iii. SRIF is not completed and does not include Safeguard review summary and recommendations by the safeguard team. Please provide complete SRIF including Safeguard review summary and recommendation by the safeguard team. These recommendations should be integrated into PIF.

iv. The environmental and social risk of the Key Risk table said Low risk. Please make the Key risk table consistent with SRIF and provide a summary of environmental and social risks and potential mitigation measures from SRIF in the table. Please also make it clear actions will take place to mitigate potential impacts of the project, such as development of ESMP, during PPG.

03/16/2026: Not fully addressed. Below is additional clarification about the revision and request during the PPG.

Please ensure assessing and engaging wide range of stakeholders using target project areas including seasonal and temporary users of the areas during PPG. Please also ensure integrating results of consultations with Indigenous Peoples and vulnerable populations into project design during PPG.

- Please ensure obtaining Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) from Indigenous Peoples about the project design during PPG and throughout project implementation and monitoring.
- The environmental and social risk of the Key Risk table indicate Low risk. Please make the Key risk table consistent with SRIF and provide a summary of environmental and social risks and potential mitigation measures from SRIF in the table. Please also make it clear actions will take place to mitigate potential impacts of the project, such as development of ESMP, during PPG. Please also ensure integrating mitigation measures identified in the ESMP into the project design during PPG.

04/23/2026: Addressed.

Agency's Comments
03/11/2026

i. See response to 7.2.

ii. Risk mitigation has been elaborated. Refer also to 5.6.

iii. SRIF has been reviewed, edited and cleared by UNEP Safeguards unit.

iv. Risk assessment in PIF and SRIF are consistent.

04/01/206

Thank you for the comment and recommendations. This guidance will be certainly considered during PPG and implementation.

In addition, at this stage we have done the following:

Updated the level of the environmental and social risk in the Key Risk table to moderate, consistent with the SRIF (also see 5.6 above on Risks).

Included a summary of concrete mitigation measures from the SRIF for potential environmental and social risks in the Key Risk table.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments01/12/2026: Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to

assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Commentsn/a

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments
01/12/2026: Requesting OP sequential review before returning the review sheet to the agency.

01/27/2026: No. Please address comments made in this review.

03/16/2026: No. Two comments were not fully addressed. Please refer to above comments in the review sheet.

04/23/2026: PM is requesting final check by OP before recommending the project.

Agency's Comments
03/11/2026

Comments addressed individually.

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

Secretariat's Comments
01/27/2026: Please note and acknowledge:

Please ensure that in the development of the results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting. In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please indicate measures to facilitate and support its implementation (e.g., budgets, staff support, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.). Under M&E, please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

Agency's Comments
03/11/2026

Comments under 9.2 are acknowledged and will be addressed during PPG for the time of CEO Approval.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	**1/12/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**1/27/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**3/16/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**4/23/2026**	
Additional Review (as necessary)		