

Implementation Plan of Recommendations

Project Title and Reference No.: Protecting Biodiversity and Multiple Ecosystem Services in Biological Mountain Corridors in Chile GEF ID 5135

Contact Person (TM/PM): Robert Erath robert.erath@un.org

	PLANS			
RECOMMENDATIONS	ACCEPTED (YES/NO/PARTIALLY)	WHAT WILL BE DONE?	EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE	REPOSIBLE OFFICER/ UNIT/ DIVISION/ AGENCY
<p>1. To MMA: The EA has a crucial role for providing institutional sustainability. Considering the Project identified many needs and developed several activities for the sustainability of results but that there is no agreed sustainability plan, there is a risk of lack of continuity. Therefore, MMA should develop a sustainability plan through meetings with the main project partners (SEREMIs, SAG, INDAP, CONAF) to agree</p>	Partially	<p>The purpose of including a Local Environmental Governance component in the project was precisely to create the necessary capacities in municipalities to address ecosystem approaches oriented to natural resource management at local governments. This bottom up approach is meant to be a lasting effect with enough self-reliance to not only manage natural resources locally but also for continuity in establishing the necessary vertical connections with subnational and national policies and regulations. This being said, and in terms of what will be done, consultations can be held with MMA</p>	end of 2024	MMA in consultation with Task Manager and LACO Subregional office for southern cone

Management-Led Terminal Review, UNEP

	PLANS			
RECOMMENDATIONS	ACCEPTED (YES/NO/PARTIALLY)	WHAT WILL BE DONE?	EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE	REPOSIBLE OFFICER/ UNIT/ DIVISION/ AGENCY
on tasks from each of the partners to sustain activities where needed, support the consolidation of results and activities for scaling to achieve impact.		on their plans and ability to follow up with Municipalities on these results.		
2. To MMA: GEF Montaña clearly generated important environmental outcomes, but also many social outcomes (income generation, improved livelihoods, empowerment of women and youth). However, the Project has not shown how its generated these social benefits. Recognizing that social benefits, human rights and equity are well-known requisites for the consolidation and wider uptake of environmental benefits, it is recommended that MMA	Partially	The socioeconomic benefits also fall under the responsibility of Local Environmental Governance at the municipal level. The project has documented several results and what could be done is to hold consultations with MMA to see if there are ways to improve the assessment of these socioeconomic benefits.	end of 2024	MMA in consultation with Task Manager and LACO Subregional office for southern cone

Management-Led Terminal Review, UNEP

	PLANS			
RECOMMENDATIONS	ACCEPTED (YES/NO/PARTIALLY)	WHAT WILL BE DONE?	EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE	REPOSIBLE OFFICER/ UNIT/ DIVISION/ AGENCY
clearly identifies and communicates the generated social outcomes. Also, the above-mentioned sustainability plan should highlight how social benefits will be achieved in the future, through the ongoing or new initiatives.				
3. To MMA: Given the wealth of publications, communication products, videos, project results, etc. available on the project website, and the high number of visits to this website, MMA should ensure its continued availability and maintenance. It eventually could become a more general (not directly project related) environment portal for in	Yes	The portal is not just project related. It is already hosted permanently at the MMA, guaranteeing its permanence as a repository of project results. For evidence please visit: https://gefmontana.mma.gob.cl/	Done before project end	MMA and project team

Management-Led Terminal Review, UNEP

	PLANS			
RECOMMENDATIONS	ACCEPTED (YES/NO/PARTIALLY)	WHAT WILL BE DONE?	EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE	REPOSIBLE OFFICER/ UNIT/ DIVISION/ AGENCY
the Mediterranean region.				
4. To UNEP: Some achievements and insights from the Project are of regional and global importance and contribute to the expected achievements of UN Environment. This includes the mainstreaming of biodiversity in different (productive) sectors, establishment of conservation district, practice of SFM in sclerophyll forest, and the biodiversity monitoring system, connected to environmental management plans. To consolidate these results at international level, UNEP should identify these achievements and	Yes	<p>UNEPs response is ongoing on several levels.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The BD/LD GEF unit has developed a dashboard that provides the links with projects and makes the information accessible for the development of future project in terms of lessons and good practices. In fact the learning for this project has already been used by UNEP staff for the development of other projects in the region and globally. 2. The subregional office for the southern cone LACO has engaged staff including programme analysts and a communications specialist who is in continuous contact with the teams at the ministry responsible for project results and the communications outfit that worked with the project. Together they continue to coordinate exchanges and 	This is an open end recommendation to “apply lessons” and as such is already being implemented, hence there is no “completion date” as such.	UNEP wide

Management-Led Terminal Review, UNEP

	PLANS			
RECOMMENDATIONS	ACCEPTED (YES/NO/PARTIALLY)	WHAT WILL BE DONE?	EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE	REPOSIBLE OFFICER/ UNIT/ DIVISION/ AGENCY
develop direct follow-up actions to insert them in existing (ongoing) projects and new (GEF or non GEF) initiatives underway in other countries and regions.		<p>showcasing as well as applying lessons from the project in other initiatives and countries of the region.</p> <p>3. UNEP’s new delivery model encompasses i) systematic mapping of projects under PCPs assessed by CAG and ii) an improved coordination between regional offices and technical divisions for the development, implementation and monitoring of projects. This includes better alignment of development and monitoring of indicators for the donor (GEF Core Indicators) and UNEP’s PoW/MTS goals. Under this scenario the analysis and uptake of lessons from projects has a more systematic foundation.</p>		
5. To UNEP: Although co-financing was reported, additional leveraged funds were not well	Yes	Updated operational guidelines have been shared by UNEP’s GEF Coordination Office. Following this recommendation these guidelines	Starting immediately for new project development	UNEP wide

Management-Led Terminal Review, UNEP

	PLANS			
RECOMMENDATIONS	ACCEPTED (YES/NO/PARTIALLY)	WHAT WILL BE DONE?	EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE	REPOSIBLE OFFICER/ UNIT/ DIVISION/ AGENCY
sustained by certification letters and no co-financing was confirmed by sources at the end of the Project. Therefore, UNEP should strengthen and closely follow operational guidelines on estimating, reporting and verifying co-finance, both in-kind and cash.		will be adhered to by project teams including GEF BD/LD and regional/subregional teams that collaborate in the development and implementation of projects.	and implementation.	

The following is a summary of lessons learned from some of the project’s experiences and based upon explicit findings of the review. They briefly describe the context from which the lessons are derived, and the potential for wider application:

Lesson Learned #1:	Different SMART indicators are needed along the project impact pathway (output, outcome and impact). The present project was designed with good quality indicators at the output level, with adequate quantitative, measurable information that had concrete baselines and protocols to measure. At the same time, the Project used the accumulated output indicators at an aggregate level to indicate achievement of outcomes and the project objective. Therefore, the project design did not foresee the provision of additional information to measure outcomes and impacts so that the achievement of these could not be assessed to the same level of objectiveness as the outputs.
---------------------------	--

Management-Led Terminal Review, UNEP

<p>Context/comment:</p>	<p>The provision of additional indicators could have indeed helped to better assess the real impact of the project at the outcome level. Fortunately the evaluation went a long way in showcasing the before and after scenarios of the project and its accomplishments at that level beyond the objective verification of results.</p>
<p>Lesson Learned #2:</p>	<p>Including indicators for social outcomes is key to monitor and report on all benefits and impact of in an environmental management project. Even though the Project is fully focused on environmental impacts, it generates many benefits for people, both directly and indirectly. The project results framework included a list of indicators for project performance and results, all expressed at the level of number of municipalities, activities or hectares that were positively affected. However, it did not include indicators on the number of people (disaggregated by region, gender, type of benefit, etc.) that benefitted from the project activities or results. Therefore, it missed the opportunity to show and communicate an important portion of its positive impact.</p>
<p>Context/comment:</p>	<p>Project design fell under a timeframe of GEF directives when the assessment of socioeconomic impact was only being introduced in an incipient manner. Hence it was not warranted that the number of beneficiaries and related indicators could have been captured in a more integral way since the onset. The good news is that the local environmental governance capacities have been sustainably established at the municipal level and the socioeconomic benefits can still be assessed as the positive impact continues after the project.</p>
<p>Lesson Learned #3:</p>	<p>Without a clear application of a gender approach, opportunities are missed to strategically plan and monitor the participation and empowerment of women, youth and disadvantaged groups. At the same time, this does not mean that positive change cannot be generated. The Project did not have a clear gender strategy, plan or indicators. Its reporting on gender achievements was marginal. Therefore, it was not clear what and how the Project targeted gender inclusion, differentiating stakeholder groups (by gender, age, ethnicity or disabilities) and its positive results were not clearly identified or communicated. In spite of these missing tools, the Project achieved a high level of participation in all activities (project management, participation and benefits) and clearly had a positive effect on women and youth groups.</p>

Management-Led Terminal Review, UNEP

<p>Context/comment:</p>	<p>In hindsight this makes sense, but crosscutting gender aspects were only just emerging in GEF programming directions at the time of project design and their assessment was thus only gradually introduced throughout implementation.</p>
<p>Lesson Learned #4:</p>	<p>Optimal stakeholder involvement in research, good capacity building and immediate application were key to generating academic-quality field research and monitoring systems, applied to local environmental management. Thanks to collaboration with academic institutions and high-quality leadership by the PMU, the GEF Montaña project had a strong academic approach to biological and ecosystem services assessments and monitoring, that could be applied to actual land management practice. Although there was a gap between the high level of academic research and the local capacity to process this information and to use it in practice, the Project managed to ensure that innovative academic knowledge was immediately used by local beneficiaries. It did so by training and involving partner agency staff (municipalities) in research and monitoring activities, but also to immediately connect the information and monitoring system to local environmental planning. This was done through good coordination between the biodiversity and local environmental planning thematic areas in the Project.</p>
<p>Context/comment:</p>	<p>We concur. The coordination and interaction between components was indeed well carried out which added to the strength of project impacts.</p>
<p>Lesson Learned #5:</p>	<p>Directed support and collaboration with municipality staff enhanced impact and sustainability: The municipalities were the key stakeholder group for the Project because they are decision makers at the adequate scale of desired impact (landscape). The Project achieved this by maintaining continuous and direct communication with municipality staff, combining participation in activities with progressive training, establishing a personal network of peers and achieving concrete and visible results, that were directly communicated to the general audience. Also, the Project ensured that with a change in administration, the collaboration with the Project was not only continued but increased, to achieve even more appropriation from the incoming authorities. This direct working relationship contributed to the continuity of activities, additional (human, financial) resources and to the coordination of activities between (groups of) municipalities.</p>

Management-Led Terminal Review, UNEP

Context/comment:	We agree. And as stated under Lesson 1, this confirms the review's assessment of project impact beyond a more adequate selection of outcome indicators.
Lesson Learned #6:	Having an NGO as fund administration agency with a mission similar to the Project generates added value for the Project. For administrative reasons, UNEP used two NGOs (CONDESAN and Sendero de Chile Foundations) as fund administration agencies. Besides their high-rated administrative performance, this provided an additional benefit for the Project: both NGOs had specific expertise that could be directly applied to the Project and its Biodiversity Monitoring and Local Environmental Management thematic areas benefited from direct collaboration with the two NGOs.
Context/comment:	Indeed. And this implementation arrangement modality is well appreciated by the countries working with UNEP as IA as it focuses on creating in-country capacities above and beyond agency growth (resident agency model).