



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5135		
Country/Region:	Chile		
Project Title:	Protecting Biodiversity and Multiple Ecosystem Services in Biological Mountain Corridors in Chile's Mediterranean Ecosystem		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; LD-1; LD-1; LD-2; LD-2; LD-3; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,657,201
Co-financing:	\$19,350,000	Total Project Cost:	\$25,007,201
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	Agency Contact Person:	Robert Erath

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	September 14, 2012 Yes Chile signed CBD in 1992 and ratified CCD in 1997.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	September 14, 2012 Yes a letter from X. George-Nascimento dated September 05, 2012 is available.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	September 14, 2012 UNEP has sector and country experience.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	September 14, 2012 There is no NGI.	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	September 14, 2012 Ecosystem management and environmental governance included in UNDAF. UNEP will manage from Panama regional office.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	September 14, 2012 As of September 14, 2012 allocations remaining to be programmed are: BD \$10.27, CC \$8.71 and LD \$1.77. The funds requested from the SFM/REDD envelope are within the 3:1 ratio.	
	• the focal area allocation?	September 14, 2012 Yes	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	September 14, 2012 Yes aligned with FA strategies.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	September 14, 2012 Objectives identified are BD2 LD1, LD2, LD3 SFM1 Please provide some clear justification for the additional funding through the SFM/REDD+ incentive. Please explain what are the additional activities beyond	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		the FA funded BD and LD activities that generate added value for forests and would require additional funding. February 12, 2013 Additional details provided in response matrix and in text revisions. Cleared.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	September 14, 2012 Yes aligned with NBSAP.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	September 14, 2012 Capacity building for officials and staff through Component 1 is clear. Additional detail is required on how local land user and local community capacities will be increased. February 12, 2013 Additional details of capacity building provided in text particularly for Components 2 and 3. Cleared.	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	September 14, 2012 The drivers of BD, LD and forest loss and degrade are not clearly identified which makes justification of the project response unclear, additional detail is required. What are the current rates of loss and degrade in the project area? However B1 is already a long section and it may be useful to also remove some of the less pertinent information. February 12, 2013 Additional details of drivers added.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>September 14, 2012 Please revisit the text within B.2 relating to the Components and provide a little detail on what each of the sub-components entail. For example in Component 1 the sub-components are limited to the information already provided in the Project Framework and do not explain what the sub-components will involve, and almost all of the text relates to the SCAM. Improved environmental services flows are identified in Table 2 please explain what service flows are expected through project implementation.</p> <p>February 12, 2013 Table B improved. Additional details on environmental services added. However this additional detail highlights greater overlap with the existing UNDP project than was earlier understood. Please provide some rationale as to a) how the projects are differentiated and will avoid duplication of resources and b) how the projects will work together, potentially through action planning, to maximize the synergy that the two projects</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>undoubtedly have.</p> <p>February 14 2013 Additional information included on efforts to ensure maximizing synergy and avoiding duplication to be carried out during PPG. Cleared</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>September 14, 2012 Component 2.1 please explain if the plan is to develop an implement the monitoring system. Component 2.2 please explain what is planned for the GEF funds within the improved application of existing financial resources. Component 2.3 and 2.4 please explain what is planned here. Is the intention to develop a new or use an existing certification scheme? Given there is 500k ha of FSC certified forest in Chile already how is the project using this experience. Also provide some indication of the market potential for BD/LD sensitive goods - is a market already in existence? Please remove the information on Native forest Law No 20.283 it does not fit in with the description of the project components. Component 3 please explain the incentive mechanism for land users to become involved in the Conservation Districts.</p> <p>February 12, 2013 Text revised and additional information included. Cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>September 14, 2012 Please explain how the project is mainstreaming BD in the wider landscape. Component 2 appears to be focused on smaller scale enterprises, rather than the more commercially-focused ones. There are larger scale agribusinesses operating within the project area how is the project interacting with these? Please provide an estimate of CO2 benefits arising from the SFM/REDD related activities.</p> <p>February 12, 2013 Mainstreaming. Cleared Carbon estimates are quite high for this type of activity. Please refine the figures.</p> <p>February 14, 2014 Estimates revised sufficiently for PIF. Further refined figures will be expected as part of PPG.</p>	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	<p>September 14, 2012 Socio-economic benefits are identified but are somewhat generic. What effect will the availability of a certified supply chain or involvement in the Conservation Districts have to landusers? Fuller coverage of gender issues are expected at CEO Endorsement.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>September 14, 2012 Brief details are included in the PIF of local community participation, attention to this will be expected as part of the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		PPG phase. Additionally, Component 2 seems dependent on private sector involvement, particularly the plans to utilize certification plans to enhance private sector involvement will be expected as part of the PPG stage.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	September 14, 2012 Key risks identified, fuller consideration is expected at CEO Endorsement.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	September 14, 2012 Explain how the project relates to GEF 4577 which addresses certified forest. February 12, 2013 See Q13 above.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	September 14, 2012 Please give details of management links with Sendero de Chile Foundation and TNC. February 12, 2013 Cleared.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	September 14, 2012 PMC is at 5%	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	September 14, 2012 This will be revisited once additional details of Components is addressed in Q13. February 13, 2013 Cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	September 14, 2012 Cofinance is \$19.25 million giving a ratio of 1:3.42. Please amend Table C to include only one type of cofinance per line. February 13, 2013 Cleared.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	September 14, 2012 UNEP is contributing \$250,000 (in-kind) cofinance which would appear low given the links to UNEP's program identified in C.2.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	September 14, 2012 Not at the moment. Please address	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage		<p>issues above.</p> <p>February 12, 2013 Please address issues related to C estimate and overlap/synergy with existing UNDP project in the same ecoregion.</p> <p>February 14, 2013 All issues addressed. This project is technically cleared and may be included in a future work program.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>1. Efforts to work with existing UNDP project to maximize synergy and collaboration.</p> <p>2. Carbon benefits to be refined.</p> <p>3. Fuller details of socio-economic and gender issues.</p> <p>4. Involvement of private sector particularly through the certification elements.</p> <p>5. Deeper assessment of risks.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 14, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 12, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 14, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	February 14, 2013 Yes proposed activities are appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	February 14, 2013 Yes budget is justified for the range of activities proposed.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	February 14, 2013 The PM recommends the PPG for CEO approval. Please note that PPG approval is pending CEO clearance of the PIF.
	4. Other comments	February 14, 2013
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 14, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.