

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00077514
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Iniciativas comunitarias Ecorregión Mediterránea chilena
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2015-01-01 / 2021-09-30

**Strategic**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- ☐ 3: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team considered these changes to the project as a result.

**Evidence:**

El proyecto consideró los cambios en el entorno para ajustar su implementación. Todos estos cambios fueron documentados en las actas del Comité Directivo, informes anuales (PIR), en la evaluación de medio término (EMT) y en la evaluación final del proyecto (EF). Se distinguen dos etapas de implementación, la inicial desde 2015 a 2017; y la post-EMT 2017-2020.

Los cambios adoptados post-EMT son los siguientes:

- Ajuste de la metodología de selección de territorios y comunidades con las que se trabajó durante la duración del proyecto.
- Conformación de equipo de gestión del proyecto, con profesionales a cargo de regiones para dar un seguimiento más permanente y cercano a las actividades en los territorios.
- Adopción de metodología escala de paisaje para conservación de biodiversidad y acciones de adaptación al cambio climático.
- Ajuste en la gobernanza del proyecto, de Comité Directivo a Comité de Socios, con mayor participación intersectorial.
- Ajuste de indicadores del proyecto, reflejados en el marco de resultados de la Revisión Sustantiva.
- 2 extensiones de plazo de proyecto para poder cumplir con los resultados propuestos. La primera, se debió a los ajustes metodológicos implementados, que implicaron un mayor tiempo en la ejecución. La segunda extensión, se aprobó hasta febrero de 2021 por dificultades en la implementación de las actividades programadas durante el segundo semestre de 2019 (por la crisis social) y el primer semestre de 2020 (por la pandemia de COVID-19).

Por lo tanto, el año de finalización del proyecto - enfocado en la sistematización de lecciones aprendidas, la ampliación de los resultados a nivel de políticas públicas y las estrategias de continuidad en cada una de las Iniciativas a nivel de paisaje -, fue afectado por factores externos, ralentizando el proceso de cierre.

(revisar EMT, Revisión Sustantiva y PIR 2020).

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ReporteFinalEMTCMS_7581_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ReporteFinalEMTCMS_7581_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ReporteFinalEMTCMS_7581_301.pdf</a> )	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 1:18:00 PM
2	2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS4577-GEFID4939_7581_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS4577-GEFID4939_7581_301.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS4577-GEFID4939_7581_301.docx</a> )	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 1:20:00 PM
3	RS1_Proyecto_88249_13032019_Visado_7581_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RS1_Proyecto_88249_13032019_Visado_7581_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RS1_Proyecto_88249_13032019_Visado_7581_301.pdf</a> )	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 1:19:00 PM

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- ☒ 3: *The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution .The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings1 as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

**Evidence:**

El proyecto se alinea con el Plan Estratégico con respecto al área de "Aceleración de las transformaciones estructurales para el desarrollo sostenible" y la solución emblemática: soluciones basadas en la naturaleza. El proyecto es anterior al Plan Estratégico 2018-2021 por lo que los indicadores del RRF del Plan Estratégico no aparecen en el marco de resultados del proyecto, sin embargo, contribuye al indicador 1.4.1.2 del Plan Estratégico.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Relevant****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them?

- ☐ 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)*
- ☐ 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- ☐ Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

El proyecto definió una metodología de trabajo territorial que permitió la participación de grupos beneficiarios clave para la gestión y conservación de la biodiversidad y medidas de adaptación y mitigación al cambio climático. Se focalizó el trabajo en comunidades rurales, altamente vulnerables al cambio climático y a la pérdida de la biodiversidad, por el impacto en sus sistemas agro-alimentarios y economía local. 692 beneficiarios directos (370 mujeres y 322 hombres) y 48 Organizaciones de Base Comunitarias (38), OSC-socios (4) y ONG (6) participaron directamente en la planificación, implementación, monitoreo y evaluación de proyectos liderados por la comunidad (incluidos los procesos de planificación a escala de paisaje).

Esta participación permitió realizar los ajustes a la implementación.

Las lecciones aprendidas están siendo recopiladas en un estudio de sistematización del proyecto.

(Revisar informe de sistematización)

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Informelll_Cayumanque_7581_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Informelll_Cayumanque_7581_303.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Informelll_Cayumanque_7581_303.pdf</a> )	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	3/11/2021 7:20:00 PM
2	Informelll_Pumanque-Lolol_7581_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Informelll_Pumanque-Lolol_7581_303.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Informelll_Pumanque-Lolol_7581_303.pdf</a> )	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	3/11/2021 7:20:00 PM
3	Informelll_Putú-Huenchullamí_7581_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Informelll_Putú-Huenchullamí_7581_303.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Informelll_Putú-Huenchullamí_7581_303.pdf</a> )	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	3/11/2021 7:21:00 PM
4	Informelll_SanNicolás_7581_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Informelll_SanNicolás_7581_303.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Informelll_SanNicolás_7581_303.pdf</a> )	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	3/11/2021 7:21:00 PM

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- ☐ 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

**Evidence:**

El proyecto realizó gestión del conocimiento y rescató las lecciones aprendidas. Ello permitió realizar ajustes en la implementación, en la selección de territorios, definir las alianzas con instituciones y actores claves y corregir/ajustar los problemas en la implementación.

Estos temas fueron trabajados con el Comité Directivo (revisar actas adjuntas), además anualmente se discutían en la preparación del PIR, junto a la RTA, la Oficina de País, Punto Focal Operativo GEF y Directora de Proyecto en el Ministerio del Medio Ambiente.

Además, por las características del proyecto, con trabajo directo con comunidades rurales, se realizaban procesos para rescatar aprendizajes y evaluar las acciones que se estaban ejecutando.

Finalmente, se contrató una consultoría para sistematizar el trabajo realizado en los territorios con enfoque de escala de paisaje. También el proyecto preparó un informe final de cierre, que contribuirá con mayor información documentada (se adjunta informe narrativo de cierre).

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Acta_CDS_06122018_7581_304.pdf">Acta_CDS_06122018_7581_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Acta_CDS_06122018_7581_304.pdf)</a>	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 1:36:00 PM
2	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Acta_CDS_21032019_7581_304.pdf">Acta_CDS_21032019_7581_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Acta_CDS_21032019_7581_304.pdf)</a>	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 1:36:00 PM
3	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Acta_CDS_28012020_7581_304.docx">Acta_CDS_28012020_7581_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Acta_CDS_28012020_7581_304.docx)</a>	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 1:37:00 PM
4	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Acta_CDS_CMS_7581_304.pdf">Acta_CDS_CMS_7581_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Acta_CDS_CMS_7581_304.pdf)</a>	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 1:38:00 PM

5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

- ☐ 3: There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- ☒ 2: *While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).*
- ☐ 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

#### Evidence:

El proyecto implementó un total de 9 iniciativas a escala de paisaje (840.000 hectáreas), teniendo como beneficiarios/as:

- 678 beneficiarios/as directos (pequeños agricultores, 358 mujeres y 316 hombres) participaron en la planificación, implementación, seguimiento y evaluación de los proyectos comunitarios.

-18 beneficiarios directos (líderes de OSC, 12 mujeres y 6 hombres) participan en la planificación, implementación, seguimiento y evaluación de los procesos de planificación a nivel de paisaje en Puchuncaví-Quintero, Pumanque-Lolol, Putú-Huenchullamí y San Nicolás.

-11.664 personas (6.045 mujeres y 5.619 hombres) se benefician indirectamente de la implementación y resultados de los proyectos financiados por FPA (Chalinga-Salamanca, San Felipe, Petorca, Peñalolén, Talca, Talcahuano, Santa Cruz, Pumanque, Santa Olga, San Nicolás, Lolol y Constitución).

- 48 (38 organizaciones comunitarias, 4 OSC y 6 ONG) recibieron capacitación a través de 51 proyectos comunitarios y procesos de planificación a nivel de paisaje. El 56% de las OSC están dirigidas por mujeres. El 67% de los proyectos indígenas son liderados por líderes indígenas.

La ampliación de los resultados del proyecto vienen por dos vías: 1) Fondo de Protección Ambiental del Ministerio de Medio Ambiente; 2) Proyecto GEF para la restauración de biodiversidad entre las regiones de Coquimbo y Biobío que será implementado por FAO y el Ministerio del Medio Ambiente (revisar PIR 2020, que corresponde al informe final del proyecto)

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Principled****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- ☐ 3: The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

**Evidence:**



El equipo contaba con evidencia de participación de sagregada por hombres y mujeres, tanto en las iniciativas a escala de paisaje en los territorios, como en los cursos y talleres de capacitación a comunidades. Los resultados cuantitativos muestran que el 56% (27/48) de las organizaciones comunitarias y las OSC asociadas están dirigidas por mujeres y el 67% (2/3) de los proyectos indígenas. están dirigidos por líderes indígenas. Además, el 52% de los beneficiarios directos (358/678) en la escala del proyecto liderado por la comunidad son mujeres.

Se realizó un programa de capacitación 2019-2020 para líderes/as de OSC y técnicos/as locales a escala regional (regiones de Valparaíso, Metropolitana, O'Higgins, Maule, Ñuble, Biobío y La Araucanía), con enfoque de paisaje, de base comunitaria y de género. Además, el PNUD elaboró una publicación en línea sobre los resultados del análisis de género en el primer semestre de 2020.

Debido a la crisis social y la pandemia COVID-19, el proyecto reprogramó (en la segunda mitad de 2020) el seguimiento piloto Pumanque-Lolol según los criterios y recomendaciones que fueron propuestos por el Análisis de Género reportado en el PIR (2019), para abordarlos en el marco del desarrollo de paisajes socioecológicos resilientes. Esta situación permitió contar con lecciones adicionales sobre el manejo adaptativo en situaciones de pandemia, permitiendo monitorear el impacto sobre cómo las comunidades abordaron este nuevo escenario, identificando factores de género y el vínculo con el cambio climático.

(Revisar informe de sistematización y final)

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- ☐ 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- ☐ 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

#### Evidence:

Se monitorearon periódicamente los riesgos sociales y ambientales asociados al proyecto. El registro se realizó en ATLAS y en los PIR (informes anuales). El proyecto estaba clasificado con riesgo bajo. Respecto al último periodo del proyecto, se detectaron los siguientes riesgos:

1) Salud, seguridad y condiciones laborales de la comunidad: producto de la COVID-19 se restringieron actividades presenciales, decretándose cuarentenas y cordones sanitarios. Esto impactó a las comunidades laboralmente y en la conectividad. Además las instalaciones sanitarias rurales no contaban con todos los elementos requeridos.

2) Movilización social: desde octubre de 2019, el país está en una crisis social y política, por tanto, la toma de decisiones, prioridades gubernamentales y libre circulación cambiaron.

Para ambos riesgos, el proyecto implementó medidas adaptativas, que permitieran el cumplimiento de los resultados.

Uno de ellos es el trabajo telemático, kit y capacitación en medidas sanitarias para beneficiarios/as, extensión de acuerdos de subvención y extensión del proyecto hasta el 28 de febrero de 2021.

(Revisar PIR 2020)

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SESComunidadesmediterraneas88249_7581_307">SESComunidadesmediterraneas88249_7581_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SESComunidadesmediterraneas88249_7581_307.pdf)</a>	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 4:22:00 PM

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- ☒ 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.
- ☐ 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

### Evidence:

El proyecto está clasificado en riesgo bajo.

El proyecto no recibió reclamos durante su implementación.

Las personas involucradas conocían los procedimientos para realizar sus reclamos/observaciones.

Se procuró mantener la comunicación fluida entre beneficiarios/as y equipo de gestión del proyecto. Para ello se contaba con coordinadores regionales que apoyaban la gestión en los territorios y reportaban sus avances.

También se mantuvo una comunicación fluida entre equipo de gestión, Ministerio del Medio Ambiente y PNUD.

A través de la OIRS (Oficina de Información y Reclamos) del Ministerio del Medio Ambiente, se recibieron consultas relacionadas con la metodología y lugares de intervención del proyecto. La información se proporcionó oportunamente.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Management & Monitoring****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- ☐ 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

**Evidence:**

El proyecto dispone de un plan de seguimiento y evaluación costado, incluyendo los mecanismos de seguimiento, que son los informes anuales (PIR), informes trimestrales y evaluaciones. Todos ellos se completaron en tiempo y forma.

Respecto al monitoreo de las acciones en los territorios, esta actividad la realizaban directamente los coordinadores regionales y supervisaba el Coordinador Nacional del Proyecto. Lo que posteriormente se reflejaba en los informes de avances trimestrales y anuales.

El monitoreo de los indicadores del marco de resultados eran responsabilidad del Coordinador de Proyecto, quien reportaba en los informes respectivos su nivel de cumplimiento.

(Revisar informes anuales, PIR)

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

10. Was the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)
- ☒ 2: *The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)*
- ☐ 1: The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

**Evidence:**

El Comité Directivo, denominado Comité de Socios en este proyecto, se reunió con la frecuencia estipulada en el documento de proyecto y existen actas que respaldan dichas reuniones (revisar actas CD).

En estas reuniones se presentaban los avances del proyecto y las metodologías de trabajo. En esta instancia intersectorial participaban: Ministerio del Medio Ambiente, Ministerio de Agricultura, CONAF, INDAP, SAG, INFOR, Agencia de Sustentabilidad y Cambio Climático (ASCC), FOSIS, CORFO, Punto focal operativo GEF, representantes de otros proyectos GEF y PNUD.

Se esperaba que el Comité pudiera impulsar acciones, alianzas estratégicas, estrategias de sostenibilidad, pero ello solo ocurrió en tres casos: convenio entre INDAP y MMA; acuerdo de producción limpia entre la ASCC y la comunidad de San Nicolás; y alianza entre GEF IECB-CONAF-GEF Comunidades.

(Revisar PIR 2020)

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- ☐ 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.*
- ☐ 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

**Evidence:**

El proyecto monitoreó los riesgos anualmente en el PIR (informe anual) y se actualizaron el Atlas y PIM S.

El proyecto adoptó medidas adaptativas, principalmente en los riesgos asociados a cambios políticos, crisis social y pandemia.

(Revisar PIR)

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Efficient****Quality Rating: Exemplary**

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

☒ Yes

☐ No

**Evidence:**

El proyecto disponía de los recursos asignados y aprobados por el Secretariado del GEF para las actividades planificadas.

El proyecto terminó con una ejecución total del 98% de sus recursos asignados. La distribución de los fondos se realizó según los componentes definidos en el documento de proyecto.

(Revisar acta de cierre de proyecto)

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AWP_2020_88249_CMS_7581_312 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP_2020_88249_CMS_7581_312.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP_2020_88249_CMS_7581_312.docx</a> )	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 5:08:00 PM
2	AWP_2021_88249_v08022021.docx_7581_312 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP_2021_88249_v08022021.docx_7581_312.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP_2021_88249_v08022021.docx_7581_312.pdf</a> )	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 5:08:00 PM
3	AWP88249-2018_7581_312 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP88249-2018_7581_312.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP88249-2018_7581_312.pdf</a> )	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 5:07:00 PM
4	AWPPDLA2019_7581_312 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWPPDLA2019_7581_312.PDF">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWPPDLA2019_7581_312.PDF</a> )	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 5:08:00 PM

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- ☒ 3: *The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

**Evidence:**

El proyecto tenía planes de adquisiciones y los actualizaba dependiendo de los ajustes en la planificación anual. Los procesos de contratación de bienes y servicios se planificaban al inicio de año, en concordancia con lo planificado en los planes de trabajo. Se implementaron medidas de adaptación cuando, por ejemplo, no existía el proveedor adecuado o se daban retrasos en las licitaciones. Todos los procesos se realizaron siguiendo el manual de normas y procedimientos de PNUD. (Se adjuntan planes de adquisiciones)



**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Plan_Adquisiciones_GEF_CMS_2018_7581_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Plan_Adquisiciones_GEF_CMS_2018_7581_313.pdf)	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 6:47:00 PM
2	Plan_Adquisiciones_GEF_CMS_2019_7581_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Plan_Adquisiciones_GEF_CMS_2019_7581_313.pdf)	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 6:47:00 PM
3	Plan_Adquisiciones_GEF_CMS_2020_7581_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Plan_Adquisiciones_GEF_CMS_2020_7581_313.xls)	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	2/10/2021 6:48:00 PM

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- ☒ 3: *There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)*
- ☐ 2: The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.
- ☐ 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

**Evidence:**

Los procesos de compra de bienes y servicios tienen presupuestos referenciales que permiten comparar el valor en el mercado.

Además el proyecto estableció sinergias con múltiples iniciativas para poder optimizar el uso de los recursos, como por ejemplo:

-BIOFIN-PNUD

-Proyecto GEF Montaña y GEF Humedales

-Iniciativa del Fondo de Protección Ambiental del Ministerio del Medio Ambiente

-Bosque Modelo Cachapoal de CONAF, Instituto Forestal (INFOR) y Proyecto FAO-GEF (SIMEF)

(Revisar PIR)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective

Quality Rating: Exemplary

15. Was the project on track and delivered its expected outputs?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence:

El proyecto logró la mayoría de los resultados propuestos. Durante la segunda etapa (post EMT) hubo un progreso significativo en la implementación del proyecto y la contribución a los objetivos ambientales globales, producto del trabajo en terreno (iniciativas a escala de paisaje y Acuerdos de Subvención de Bajo Valor).

El proyecto implementó nueve (meta: ocho) iniciativas a nivel de paisaje en la ecorregión mediterránea en las regiones de Valparaíso, Metropolitana, O'Higgins, Maule, Biobío-Ñuble y Araucanía, cubriendo un área efectiva de 840.000 hectáreas.

Hay 8 plataformas de múltiples partes interesadas establecidas y que operan a nivel de paisaje (correspondientes a los paisajes enumerados anteriormente). El Departamento del Fondo de Protección Ambiental (FPA) de la División de Educación Ambiental y Participación Ciudadana y la División de Biodiversidad lideraron, con el apoyo del Proyecto, un grupo de trabajo dentro del Ministerio del Ambiente para identificar arreglos de gestión factibles para fortalecer el financiamiento de iniciativas basadas en la comunidad a nivel de paisaje.

Se financiaron 58 proyectos comunitarios y planificación de iniciativas a nivel de paisaje (38 financiados por el FMAM; 1 financiado por BIOFIN-PNUD; y 19 financiados por FPA).

A nivel de paisaje, los planes de manejo apoyados por el proyecto cubren cerca de 352,700 hectáreas (108% de la meta ajustada de 2017)

Entre otros resultados de fortalecimiento de capacidades y gestión de conocimiento.

(Revisar PIR con detalle de resultados logrados)

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- ☒ 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)
- ☐ 2: There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.
- ☐ 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

**Evidence:**

El proyecto realizaba informes trimestrales de progreso e informes anuales. Se realizaban reuniones periódicas de seguimiento (cada tres meses, como mínimo) lo que permitía hacer los ajustes del proyecto. En la primera etapa del proyecto, antes de la EMT, el avance del proyecto fue lento, pero con la implementación de las recomendaciones de la evaluación, el ajuste metodológico y el fortalecimiento del equipo de gestión se lograron mayores avances.  
(Revisar informes anuales y planes de trabajo)

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- ☒ 3: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 2: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- ☐ Not Applicable

#### Evidence:

El proyecto fue diseñado para desarrollar, demostrar e incorporar la entrega de beneficios ambientales de importancia mundial por parte de organizaciones comunitarias en la gestión de paisajes en peligro crítico o en la eco región mediterránea chilena. Se esperaba lograr esto mediante el logro de cuatro resultados: 1) manejo sostenible de paisajes para la conservación de la biodiversidad; 2) demostración / promoción de la conservación y mejora de las reservas de carbono mediante el uso de la tierra, el cambio de uso de la tierra y la silvicultura, y los sistemas locales de monitoreo de carbono; 3) mantenimiento y mejora de los flujos de los servicios forestales y agro ecosistémicos para sustentar los medios de vida de las comunidades locales; y 4) desarrollo de la capacidad comunitaria y gestión del conocimiento.

Por tanto, el foco fue el trabajo con los grupos específicos y en territorios seleccionados para la intervención: comunidades rurales con un alto grado de vulnerabilidad social y ambiental.

Durante la implementación del proyecto, las comunidades fueron consultadas, capacitadas y co-gestoras en el desarrollo de las iniciativas.

(Revisar PIR e Informe de Sistematización del proyecto)

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Sustainability & National Ownership****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- ☐ 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

El proyecto se implementó bajo la modalidad CO S upport to NIM. Las partes interesadas y los socios d el proyecto participaron activamente en la toma de d ecisiones a través del Comité de Socios. El Ministeri o del Medio Ambiente, como el asociado en la imple mentación, realizó un monitoreo y evaluación del cu mplimiento de los resultados.  
La Oficina de PNUD realizó el monitoreo programáti co, operativo y financiero.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)<sup>8</sup> adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- ☐ 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

Los arreglos de gestión se ajustaron post EMT, fortaleciendo el equipo de gestión del proyecto y ampliando el Comité de Socios para poder tener una mayor representación institucional; además, se introdujeron los ASBV para entregar recursos a las comunidades para que gestionaran sus proyectos.

Al Ministerio del Medio Ambiente y las comunidades se les aplicó un análisis de capacidades (PCAT).

El Ministerio del Medio Ambiente recibe transferencias de fondos en el marco del proyecto por regla fiscal del país.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.*
- ☐ 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

**Evidence:**

El proyecto cuenta con una estrategia de salida, que permitirá dar sostenibilidad a los resultados. Esta es estrategia fue conocida por las partes y el Comité de Socios.

El Ministerio del Medio Ambiente, a través de su División de Educación, continuará con el trabajo con comunidades.

(Revisar acta de cierre Comité de Socios).

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ActaCDSFinal25022021_7581_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaCDSFinal25022021_7581_320.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaCDSFinal25022021_7581_320.docx</a> )	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	3/11/2021 7:40:00 PM
2	PPTCDSestrategiadesostenibilidad_7581_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PPTCDSestrategiadesostenibilidad_7581_320.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PPTCDSestrategiadesostenibilidad_7581_320.pdf</a> )	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	3/11/2021 7:43:00 PM
3	PPTCDSresultadosaprendizajesdesafios_7581_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PPTCDSresultadosaprendizajesdesafios_7581_320.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PPTCDSresultadosaprendizajesdesafios_7581_320.pdf</a> )	andrea.cabezas@undp.org	3/11/2021 7:43:00 PM

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**



2.1. Difundir y compartir las lecciones aprendidas del proyecto en otras instancias de trabajo inter ministerial y con otros Servicios Públicos, como por ejemplo Convenio MMA-INDAP; Proyecto GEF “Restauración a escala de paisaj e de la biodiversidad y sus servicios ecosistémicos en zonas agroforestales y su entorno natural” de la División de R RNN; Creación de condiciones para ampliar la experiencia a otras comunidades a través del apalancamiento de recursos; Estrategia de intercambio de experiencias con FOSIS, entre otros.

2.2. Poner a disposición de la comunidad en general, a través del sitio Web del Proyecto alojado en el sitio Web de EDUPAC-MMA, los principales resultados y lecciones aprendidas.