



**Mid-term Review (MTR) for UNDP-GEF Project N° 88249
Support for civil society and community initiatives to generate
global environmental benefits through subsidies and microcredit.**

**Environment Ministry (MMA) Project / UNDP-GEF
Sustainable Mediterranean Communities - GEF SMC Project - Chile**

MTR Implementation Period: March and April 2017

Final Report of the Mid-Term Review

***Prepared by International Consultant Sandra Cesilini
and National Consultant Juan Anjari***

April 26, 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The MTR team especially acknowledges the Environment Ministry, the Project Unit and UNDP for their support and openness to the analysis of all aspects related to the project. Likewise, the team thanks all key stakeholders interviewed for their willingness to collaborate in the review process and their contribution to the final result of this.

INDEX

- ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS – ACRONYMS..... 3**
- 1- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 4**
 - 1.1 SYNOPSIS OF PROJECT INFORMATION.....4
 - 1.2. BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....4
 - 1.3. SUMMARY OF PROJECT PROGRESS.....6
 - 1.4. MTR SCORES AND PROGRESS SUMMARY TABLES7
 - 1.5. SUMMARY OF MTR CONCLUSIONS10
 - 1.6. SUMMARY TABLE OF THE MTR RECOMMENDATIONS.....12
- 2- INTRODUCTION 13**
 - 2.1. PURPOSE AND GOALS OF THE REVIEW:.....13
 - 2.2. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE REVIEW:.....13
 - 2.3. STRUCTURE OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW:.....15
- 3- PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND CONTEXT.....15**
 - 3.1. DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT: ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIOECONOMIC, INSTITUTIONAL AND POLITICAL.....15
 - 3.2. PROBLEMS THAT THE PROJECT PROPOSES TO RESOLVE:.....17
 - 3.3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND STRATEGY.....19
 - 3.4. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION:.....20
 - 3.5. PROJECT TIMELINE AND MILESTONES21
 - 3.6. PRIMARY STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED.....21
- 4- FINDINGS21**
 - 4.1. PROJECT STRATEGY21
 - 4.2. PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS28
 - 4.3. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT33
 - 4.4. SUSTAINABILITY.....38
 - 4.5. LESSONS LEARNED.....39
- 5- CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS42**
 - 5.1. CONCLUSIONS42
 - 5.2. RECOMMENDATIONS.....46
- 6- LIST OF ANNEXES.....48**

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS – ACRONYMS

CATEM: Landscape Advisory Board of the Mediterranean Ecoregion (*Consejo Asesor Territorial de la Ecorregión Mediterránea*)

PB: Project Board

SC: Project Steering Committee

SMC: Sustainable Mediterranean Communities

CONAF: National Forestry Corporation (*Corporación Nacional Forestal*)

CORFO: National Development Corporation (*Corporación Nacional de Fomento*)

CP: Communities of Practice

DEAyPC: Environmental Education and Public Participation Division

NPD: National Project Director

MTR: Mid-Term Review

PT: Project Team

GEF: Global Environment Facility

EPF Environmental Protection Fund

GEF: Global Environment Facility

LLI: Landscape-Level Initiatives

INDAP: Institute of Livestock and Farming Development (*Instituto de Desarrollo Agropecuario*)

LBMA: Environmental Law (*Ley de Bases del Medio Ambiente*)

MEFyT: Ministry of Economy, Development and Tourism

MSME: Micro, small and medium enterprises

M&E: Monitoring and Evaluation

MMA: Chilean Environment Ministry

LFM: Logical Framework Matrix

ABP: Agricultural Best Practices

ERF: Expected Results Framework

CSOs/NGOs Civil Society Organizations/Non-Governmental Organizations

ODEPA: Chile Office of Studies and Agrarian Policy

NWFP: Non-Wood Forest Products

CLMP: Comprehensive Landscape Management Plan

MSPLM: Multi-stakeholder Platform for Landscape Management

IP: Indigenous Peoples

UNDP: United Nations Development Programme

PRODOC: Project Document

CSR: Corporate Social Responsibility

SBDAP: Biodiversity and Protected Areas Service

1- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. SYNOPSIS OF PROJECT INFORMATION

Project title:	"Support for civil society and community initiatives to generate global environmental benefits through subsidies and microcredit (MMA / UNDP-GEF Sustainable Mediterranean Communities Project)".			
Identification of GEF project	N°4939	Project funding	<u>Upon approval</u> (millions of USD)	<u>Upon presentation of the EMT/MTR</u> (millions of USD)
Identification of UNDP project:	N° 88249	GEF funding:	3,311,614*	681,000.68
Country:	Chile	IA and EA possess:		
Region:	Latin America	Government:	12,119,772**	
Area of interest:	Multi Focal Area	Other: Beneficiaries: UNDP/EU:	4,000,000 1,000,000	Not implemented due to seasonal shift
Operating program:		Total cofinancing:	17,119,772	Only in kind
Implementation agency:	Environment Ministry	Total Project expense:	20,431,386	
Other partners involved:		Project document signed (project start date):	MMA 30.09.14 UNDP 03.10.14 MINREL 06.11.2014	
		Anticipated (operational) end date:		

*Funds managed by UNDP

**Funds managed by MMA through the Environmental Protection Fund (USD10,000,000).

1.2. BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The purpose of the GEF project, Sustainable Mediterranean Communities, is to develop, demonstrate and integrate the contribution of significant global environmental benefits from community organizations in the management of seriously threatened landscapes in the Chilean Mediterranean ecoregion, through the following components: 1. Sustainable landscape management to conserve biodiversity; 2. Demonstration/promotion of the conservation and improvement of carbon reserves through soil use, change in soil use, fishing, and local carbon monitoring systems; 3. Maintenance and improvement in the flow of forestry and agricultural ecosystem services to maintain the livelihood of local communities and 4. Development of community capacities and knowledge management.

The project proposes a collaborative effort between diverse public, private and civil society stakeholders who are connected to a landscape, to undertake projects that address problems in sustainable local development and generate local and global environmental benefits, for inclusion and alignment with ecological, economical and social outputs in landscape-level initiatives, which will facilitate the synergy between projects to produce greater, longer-lasting effects.

Project activities will be carried out in pilot landscapes in the Mediterranean ecoregion. This sampling will provide sufficient variety and scale to this landscape approach to generate reliable experiences and knowledge, as well as contributions to the public policy discussion.

The GEF SMC Project will support the coordination of eight pilot landscapes to ensure the dissemination of knowledge and lessons learned throughout the ecoregion and on a national level, establishing a technical-financial mechanism for coordination on an institutional level by the Environment Ministry, with the participation of other governmental institutions through a Steering Committee, with

institutional arrangements for its implementation. This mechanism will include a new funding window from the Environmental Protection Fund (EPF) from the Environment Ministry, to directly support the Landscape-Level Initiatives.

The project proposes a gradual intervention approach, focused on strengthening community capacities and those of its organizations, improving governance and participation, focusing on the development of landscape-level initiatives that promote social, economic and environmental sustainability and resilience of landscapes.

1.3. SUMMARY OF PROJECT PROGRESS

Project activities in this initial stage have been focused on project establishment on a national and landscape level to progress towards implementation. Early management was institutional and involved establishment of the Steering Committee. For initially approaching the three landscapes defined in the Prodoc, the project took advantage of already existing landscape participation platforms known as Model Forests (in the Araucanía and O'Higgins Regions) and the Alhué Agricultural Community in the Metropolitan Region. In two other landscapes, the Maule and Biobío Regions, this connection was made through the Regional MMA Seremi and municipalities in support of the participating SC government institutions. A recent preliminary approach examined the possibility of conducting an experience in the landscape of Ventanas, Valparaíso Region, an area of high environmental interest.

Progress towards results varies between landscapes, reaching milestones proposed in the Project Strategy. The strong point across the board has been in activities to build the participation and capacities of communities and their civil society organizations, for the purpose of developing pilot experiences. To date, the project talks about pilot projects I and II, distinguishing between the first 3 landscapes announced as opposed to the second group; totaling 5 landscapes covered by the project out of a total of 8 proposed.

As part of the strategy for sustainable landscape development, 3 Comprehensive Landscape Management Plans (CLMPs) have been formulated through a participatory process: one in Alto Malleco (CLMP of Curacautín and Lonquimay), another in Coltauco, Doñihue and las Cabras, and the third in Cayumanque corresponding to the Araucanía, O'Higgins and Biobío regions, respectively. In terms of landscape management, the Prodoc proposes the establishment of Multi-stakeholder Platforms for Landscape Management. However, landscape is currently managed through existing platforms, without improvements in governance or use of the CLMPs developed as management instruments.

In parallel, the Project has developed 5 Pilot Projects I (3 in Araucanía with Mapuche Pehuenche indigenous participation and non-indigenous participation); 1 in the O'Higgins region and 1 in the Metropolitan Region. Of these projects, three are in the preliminary implementation stage with grant transfer. In addition, 5 Pilot Projects II in participative development (1 in the Araucanía Region, 2 in the Maule Region, 2 in the Biobío Region). Strengthening of community skills and organizational capacity-building are reflected in the participation, development and kickoff of pilot projects I and II. The Project has seen progress in the formalization of a community organization corresponding to the Cayumanque Landscape, which leads a CLMP formulation and development of 2 pilot projects.

The project, in parallel, has engaged with and developed a work plan with 3 Communities of Practice, specifically: Apícola de Lefuco, an apicultural community with reduced capacities (located in the Araucanía Region); Agroecológica de San Nicolás, an agroecological community in full operations; and Género y Medio Ambiente, a third community on gender and the environment (Biobío Region) currently discontinued.

Internal steps have been taken with the Environment Ministry to strengthen the Environmental Protection Fund, incorporating a local and community participation approach in initiatives for environmental sustainability, with the creation of a new tender in 2017: "EPF Sustainable Projects Tender (2017-2018)".

Project implementation, due to the gradual approach, proposed in the strategy, centered on community capacity-building and development of pilots, covering several diverse landscapes, the limited scope of

the project itself and the absence of an effective operating strategy, the Project Team efforts and achievements to date, has shown slow progress toward the result when compared to the high goals set in the Prodoc. However, the experience in landscape management implemented is generating lessons and learnings that require systematization, in order to strengthen management and make progress toward achievement of results before restating goals on a realistic scope for the initiative.

In terms of **Lessons learned (LL)**, these can be synthesized into the following, regarding:

- a) Methodological criteria and approaches: i) An adaptive management must be applied to different work sites, presenting solutions to differential challenges in each of these; ii) The role of Pilot Areas is of utmost importance. The methodological selection criteria for the areas to incorporate into national programs should be systematized as a result of the evaluation of the pilot experiences. iii) the time required by the processes in the pilot experiences, prolonged delays have a significant negative effect on the parties involved, generating mistrust and putting the sustainability of the LL actions at risk.
- b) Participation and involvement of stakeholders i) Participation of civil society and its organizations in different Project instances. Sustainable management modes are established as they generate institutional tradition; ii) the importance of the role of the private sector. When addressing issues of biodiversity in a landscape where land is privately owned, local spaces for coordination between small producers and major corporations who interact in the same landscape are fundamental; iii) The educational institutes involved in the project assure changes in awareness and advocacy in youth.
- c) Demand for work on a landscape level: i) on a landscape level, these should be addressed systematically during Project implementation, given that this is not a commonly applied approach.
- d) the logic of the process and grounding in environmental institutionality: i) project strategy as a process whose purpose is to install a public policy in the medium and long term, grounded in institutionality and traditional and economical environmental management instruments, validating the role of decentralized governments and social communication as support; e) Project design, goals indicators and implementation strategy: This aspect demands a profound feasibility analysis prior to making the decision to move forward in its implementation. Another lesson corroborated during the MTR is the need to strengthen the risk focus applied to management in the project design, results- and sustainability-oriented progress, above all in this type of UNDP-GEF / Environment Ministry project.

1.4. MTR SCORES AND PROGRESS SUMMARY TABLES

TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS BASED ON THE MTR GUIDELINE¹

Project Strategy	Indicator	Final project goal	Mid-term level and assessment
I. Project objective: Develop, demonstrate and integrate the achievement of significant environmental benefits by community organizations in the management of seriously threatened landscapes in the Chilean Mediterranean Ecoregion.	I.1. Number and type of critically threatened indigenous landscapes that have been restored, maintained, improved.	For 2018, at least 8 landscape-level initiatives (>1,200,000 hectares) have established consensus-based management plans that are being implemented for maintenance, restoration and improving landscape resilience.	On track
	I.2. Number of multi-stakeholder governance mechanisms (MSPLMs) established and operational at the landscape and ecoregion level (Steering Committee)	There is an inter-institutional coordination mechanism in place to complement the EPF 2.0, in the coherent financing of initiatives in the LL framework.	On track
	I.3. The Environment Ministry has a new financing mechanism to support landscape management initiatives.	For 2018, a new EPF mechanism focused on LLs (EPF 2.0) has financed 38 or more community projects.	NOT on track
	I.4. Number of community-driven projects financed for conservation of biodiversity, ecosystem services and carbon collection monitoring.	The communities have a leadership role in the planning and management of LLs and participate with their respective MSPLMs	On track
Result 1. Sustainable landscape management for biodiversity conservation.	1.1. Hectares of land where sustainable management is practiced for conservation of biodiversity: a) number of comprehensive land management plans formulated and under implementation; c) hectares of land under certified production.	By the end of 2018, 38 or more vulnerable communities: a) will certify the production of at least 700,000 hectares of land; b) will directly protect at least 32,000 additional hectares of land through local schemes	NOT on track
	b) N° of community forestry management plans and associations formulated and implemented.		NOT on track
	1.2. Type of public instrument modified to support community-driven projects on a landscape level.	At least 4 public instruments (including the EPF) have been modified by 2018 to support community-driven projects framed within landscape initiatives	NOT on track
Result 2. Demonstration / promotion of the conservation and improvement of carbon reserves through soil use, change in soil use, and fishing, and local carbon monitoring systems	2.1. Community-appropriate methodologies for monitoring increased carbon reserves, proven and adopted by local communities.	By the end of 2018, at least five sample plots of land of 200 hectares each where forest management is practiced and there is oversight and quantification of carbon collection.	On track
	2.2. TCO2E (secuestradas)	29,200 tCO2eq over the duration of the project.	On track
Result 3. Maintenance and improvement in the flow of forestry and agricultural ecosystem services to maintain the livelihood of local communities	3.1. Hectares in the productive landscape area under sustainable land management practices	By the end of 2017, at least 20 vulnerable communities have adopted a leadership role in sustainable management planning of 140,000 additional hectares of productive land.	On track
	3.2. Hectares of degraded land	Rehabilitation of at least 10,000 hectares of degraded agricultural land}	On track
Result 4. Development of community capacity and knowledge management.	4.1. Number of CSO participants that receive training for landscape-level strategic planning activities	At least 103 (78+5+20) CSOs have received support and training and have successfully implemented grant projects at a value >10,000 USD	On track
	4.2. Number of best practices and lessons learned disseminated on a landscape, ecoregional and national level	4.2. Improved capacity for knowledge management and collaborative project development for adaptive landscape management	On track
		4.3. Improved capacities among community stakeholders monitoring and evaluating their projects and landscape trends.	On track
Key indicators for the assessment	Red=NOT on track	Yellow=On track	Green=Goal reached

TABLE 2. OUTPUT SCORE AND PROJECT ACHIEVEMENTS:

Action	MTR Validation	Description of Achievement
Project Strategy	N/A	<p>The Project has been conceived and designed to develop, demonstrate and integrate the contribution of significant global environmental benefits from community organizations in the management of seriously threatened landscapes in the Chilean Mediterranean Ecoregion.</p> <p>The Project strategy is pertinent and relevant with country goals, identifying barriers and actual underlying hypotheses. The Project proposes a gradualness to address the results-oriented milestones, but it does not show an implementation, development and sustainability strategy that standardizes, monitors, evaluates processes and supports replication and effective progress towards results. The logical framework reflects a strategy and includes hypotheses and risks that may influence Project implementation. However, several initial problems can be observed in terms of the determination of baselines. Likewise, several indicators and their goals are incoherent and many are overly ambitious. In this sense, they require review and reformulation. Finally, it will be necessary to incorporate indicators associated with gender.</p>
Progress towards Results	<p>Project Objective: Develop, demonstrate and integrate the achievement of significant environmental benefits by community organizations in the management of seriously threatened landscapes in the Chilean Mediterranean Ecoregion.</p> <p>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</p>	<p>Progress towards achievement of goals is seen as moderately slow, with few concrete outputs. In this sense, of the 4 goals established in the document, 3 of these are feasible with an adjustment of goals and indicators. On the other hand, the fourth presents a high risk of non-completion.</p> <p>Obstacles present in the implementation stage, plus ambitious goals and indicators.</p>
	<p>Result 1. Sustainable landscape management for biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>Highly unsatisfactory (HU)</p>	<p>This review scores progress towards this result as high risk, primarily due to the ambitious nature of the goals, with slight progress; this is scored as unsatisfactory.</p> <p>Not achieved to date: community associations and management plans, only an association under study.</p> <p>Steering Committee achieved, limited results-based management for achieving modified institutional Programs.</p>
	<p>Result 2. Demonstration/promotion of the conservation and improvement of carbon reserves through soil use, change in soil use, and fishing, and local carbon monitoring systems.</p> <p>Unsatisfactory (U)</p>	<p>Achievement of this result is feasible, although it shows little progress towards results, scoring it as unsatisfactory.</p> <p>During initial implementation 3/5 Pilot Projects I achieved (value forestry services); and 5 Pilot Projects II, in implementation stage, which address sustainable agricultural and forestry production, in the process of participative development.</p> <p>Goal 2: no progress</p> <p>Both results indicate little progress towards mid-term goals established in the Multi-annual Plan.</p>
	<p>Result 3. Maintenance and improvement in the</p>	<p>Considering the ambitious goal and slow development of pilot projects for a multitude of reasons; progress towards results is</p>

	<p>flow of forestry and agricultural ecosystem services to maintain the livelihood of local communities</p> <p>Moderately unsatisfactory (MU)</p>	<p>slight.</p> <p>No progress shown towards mid-term goals (Multi-annual Plan)</p>
	<p>Result 4. Development of community capacity and knowledge management.</p> <p>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</p>	<p>The project has focused its actions on building community capacities associated with the achievement and progress of pilot projects I and II, respectively, and on the progress in 2 communities of practice. The goals proposed are very ambitious, meaning that progress has not been significant. On the other hand, there has been little progress and a major gap in terms of knowledge management.</p>
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	<p>Moderately unsatisfactory (MU)</p>	<p>Most of the activities planned have not been carried out; and fundamentally, in terms of project management, there have been major difficulties in starting up a formal project monitoring feature as a communication and outreach strategy for the project. On the other hand, at the time of this MTR, inconsistencies were observed between the anticipated project budget and the availability of these resources.</p>
Sustainability	<p>Moderately Probable (MP)</p>	<p>At the time of this MTR (March 2017), the major challenges of the SMC Project had not yet been resolved, in terms of capitalizing on the lessons that arise (or should arise) from the first half of implementation to contribute to the achievement of results and sustainability.</p> <p>Implementation conditions and organizational and project gaps, as well as the implementation team, do not favor sustainability.</p> <p>The interest and motivation of the steering committee to participate in the SMC Project, without having clarity on their contributions, does not lend itself to sustainable pilot projects, similar to the situation with regional and national partner institutions regarding the commitment to provide funding.</p> <p>A change in the resource allocation methodology and integration of other habitual funding mechanisms from the Environment Ministry could favor Project sustainability.</p> <p>Finally, the sustainability of each of the pilot projects cannot yet be scored, given that in large part, they have not yet been implemented.</p>

1.5. SUMMARY OF MTR CONCLUSIONS

On a design level: The current form of addressing landscape problems has been insufficient. The Project PRODOC is pertinent and relevant in the presentation of problems that it wants to address, and in the hypotheses and barriers identified. The existing hypotheses and risks hinder progress toward results; and these require addressing by the Project Team, adjusting the management strategy in the second half. Based on the review results and recommendations made to the Logical Framework, the project Team should propose adjustments regarding the scope of goals and indicators and timelines (which were identified during the MTR to be overly ambitious and unrealistic in terms of existing capacities), receiving support from UNDP RTA for subsequent validation by the Project Council and processing with GEF/Environment Ministry.

On an effectiveness level: The strategy proposed in the Project design is based on a gradual approach with concrete milestones centered around the idea that the community organizations, once trained and with solid support and mentoring, can be responsible for achieving resilient and sustainable landscapes in the Chilean Mediterranean ecoregion. In the case of the Project, this strategy exceeds its potential, limiting the achievement of the results proposed. In addition, between the Project Strategy and the Project Implementation, there is a gap identified in an inadequate operating strategy and a lack of monitoring and evaluation strategy (M&E) based on achievement of results. This has not favored an engaged implementation and has not allowed progress in the four components, and generation of the expected lessons learned and good practices. For the second half of the Project, the Team should analyze, adjust, and focus the operating strategy and work plan, along with the necessary adaptation of the logical framework.

On an efficiency level: The Project has not been able to move significant project resources in the landscapes, having targeted most of the resources towards contact with communities to explain the Project, hold trainings, select local organizations and oversee decision-making, but not for pilot project implementation as anticipated. As committed at the outset of the Project, this review concludes that co-financing needs a concrete and detailed account of contributions received and their use. Project management at the Environment Ministry has contributed towards strengthening the focus of multi-stakeholder, local and community participation for environmental sustainability, reflected in the Sustainable Projects Tender (using the EPF as a means of micro financing). However, it remains unclear what the strategy will be for EPF strengthening proposed by the National Coordinator in accordance with the National Manager, so that it is part of the management strategy in the second stage.

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E): There is no real M&E system for the Project. Field visits are an opportunity for tracking beneficiaries, but these are not adequately systematized. Therefore, there are no data records that could be used in tracking tools. The lack of baselines at the level of the Logical Framework and pilot projects will hinder the measurement of both results and their social, economic and environmental resilience/sustainability.

To improve effectiveness and strengthen M&E management, monitoring should be implemented by reconstructing baselines and with ongoing evaluation focused on progress towards results. Based on the recommended adjustments to the Logical Framework, operating plan and work plan, the second half of the Project will require implementation of an M&E strategy based on measuring progress towards results (rather than compliance with activities), which will input into the Project's adaptive management.

Involvement of key stakeholders: The communities and CSOs involved with the Project participate only through pilot projects I and II. This is not the case with MSPLM, given that current operations are not part of a plan with a broader scope, and there are no plans to develop a strategy for incorporation into levels of decision making. The key institutional stakeholders have not been involved to the extent expected. Although they have supported landscape installation, they have not provided financial or institutional resources for Project consolidation. The Steering Committee (SC) has met and made decisions on a macro level. Although it has identified the need to hold work meetings to define concepts and proposals under a common approach between participating institutions, this has not yet taken place. One landscape stakeholder that would promote management of the Project is the "Model Forest"

platforms. These platforms have served as links that support Project implementation, but they have not achieved as much as expected. The same has occurred with the Alhué Agricultural Community. The Project needs to strengthen the operating strategy for these cases, through a work plan that strengthens the participation of key landscape stakeholders.

Civil society stakeholders have a high degree of involvement in Project activities, but very low capacity to collaborate on obtaining results. Decision-making mechanisms in place for landscape operations have been transparent and appropriate. These have been designated in all landscapes with a relevance criterion, all were applicable and decisions were well-founded. Further explanation of this mechanism would be useful.

Administration and finance: In its activities and progress toward results, the project has not shown cost-efficiency, with weak management of that aspect. This may be explained by the lack of an adequate operating strategy during the first stage. Given that the Project includes a highly-qualified professional in administration and finance to advise on financial management and risk management in projects, as well as investment planning, this should be fully taken advantage of to improve the Project's financial management.

To date, there has been no reliable accounting of in-kind contributions from CSOs/NGOs and government agencies (except partially from the Environment Ministry) and no back-up has been provided for financial contributions that were expected in the form of co-financing from any of the key stakeholders. The Project shows a limited implementation of resources on a pilot project level, and a limited management capacity with communities and MSPLM.

Sustainability: The knowledge and lessons generated in these early initiatives (pilot projects) were expected to provide the basis for defining the strategy (or strategies) with the rest of the LLIs to be implemented in the Mediterranean ecoregion of Chile. However, at the time that this MTR was filed, the main challenges for the SMC Project had not been resolved. For example: successful scaling of the pilot project initiated in the first half of the SMC Project to the Landscape-Level Initiatives (LLI) level, which would enable progress towards a collaborative effort with public and private interests; how to ensure that other institutional stakeholders (local, regional and national; public and private) contribute with their own funding instruments and technical assistance. It is still possible to revert this Project implementation deficiency during the second half of the SMC Project, through a pilot project tender. However, the technical and economic considerations of the tender, the organizational and project deficiencies, and the implementation team itself, as well as the lack of MSPLM operations and establishment of the CATEM, should be analyzed before launching the tender and mutually agreed upon with the Environment Ministry authorities and the UNDP Chile Office.

With respect to **appropriation**, the SMC Project has been implementation to a great extent at the landscape level, at least at the sites of pilot projects begun or being implemented during the first half of the Project (local scale). This will undoubtedly contribute to the sustainability of these initiatives in their respective landscapes.

Future threats: During the development of this MTR, the following future threats were identified: i) a lack of definition of roles between different levels of government, added to a certain resistance to change by those who make policies; ii) insufficient internal and external management capacities in CSOs regarding implementation and operation of pilot projects; iii) Lack of an inter-institutional network that engages in environmental actions that ensure the socio-environmental comprehensiveness of the intervention; which increases the associated risk of abandoning the project; iv) the permanence of cultural patterns that continue to favor the discrimination of women and indigenous peoples, in particular in terms of leadership and participation; v) Significantly older beneficiary populations, who may not be able to sustain their projects over time; added to potential problems associated with inheritance rights regarding the installation of shared enterprises in individual lands and possible conflicts between local communities involved in the pilot projects, leading to abandonment; vi) Change in government, in institutional directors, political priorities and strategic focus; and vii) environmental risks or socio-natural phenomena (earthquakes, fires, snowstorms; droughts; biological plagues, etc.) which reverse the progress made.

1.6. SUMMARY TABLE OF THE MTR RECOMMENDATIONS

N-	RECOMMENDATIONS
OBJECTIVE AND RESULTS	
1.	Adjust and implement the Project's logical framework based on the specific recommendations resulting from the MTR for the objective, each goal and results indicator.
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.	
2.	Conclude the first stage of the Project with lessons learned.
3.	Systematize, assimilate and disseminate lessons learned from the first phase of the project based on landscape experiences.
4.	Prepare, validate and put into practice an implementation strategy for the 2nd stage of the Project, with an exit strategy, ensuring the sustainability of results.
5.	Prepare, validate and implement a strategy with a work plan for the Steering Committee.
6.	Prepare, validate and implement a management strategy with a work plan for MSPLMs that implements the CLMP and ensures results.
7.	Strengthen strategies with the following approaches: Landscape, governance, expanded participation, gender, indigenous issues, with monitoring and evaluation to ensure results.
8.	Prepare a communication and outreach strategy that raises the visibility of the Project and favors participation.
9.	Strengthen the operations strategy of the Project's monitoring and evaluation mechanism and management of the Project Team in this area, in order to ensure effective financial management, implementation of activities, adaptive management, progress and achievement of results.
10.	Improve management of the Project Team.
11.	Strengthen the Gender and Indigenous Issues approach in the strategy for the 2nd stage of the Project. Incorporate indicators for these areas into the logical framework, results pilot project and project tender.
SUSTAINABILITY	
12.	Develop a technical and economic strategy for the LLI tender in compliance with minimum recommended considerations.
13.	Apply a risk management mechanism to ensure achievement and sustainability of results.
14.	Systematize the SMC Project with lessons learned and proposed contributions to public and institutional policy in sustainable environmental and landscape management.
15.	CROSS-CUTTING
	Extend the opening of decentralized units; Generate more and better human capital; Plan an agenda in conjunction with the country's authorities; Plan a coordinated and engaged inter-institutional strategy; Analyze the synergy with other international cooperation projects

2- INTRODUCTION

The Mid-term Review (MTR) was made based on specifications described in the terms of reference (**Annex I**), in compliance with the Guidance for conducting midterm reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects (2014)¹, and the technical and methodological proposal prepared by the MTR Team. This was developed in conjunction and coordination with the National Project Director and Manager and the UNDP - GEF Team. The MTR also involved key project stakeholders, beneficiaries, co-financers, implementers, counterparts indicated in the PRODOC and all those incorporated into project development and considered relevant for this MTR (**Annexes III and VII**)

2.1. PURPOSE AND GOALS OF THE REVIEW:

The purpose of this MTR is to provide an analysis of the progress of Project implementation, identify potential design problems, review achievements in outputs and also determine progress towards achieving objectives and expected results. In this context, the purpose of this consultancy is to evaluate compliance with project objectives and outputs midway through the implementation period, as defined in the Detailed Work Plan and the respective Annual Work Plans approved by the Project Board and UNDP.

General Objective: Propose adjustments to the project's logical framework, as well as a strategy for monitoring, systematizing and evaluating the project, which enables decision-making by applying the principles of adaptive management to ensure compliance with objectives, results and expected outcomes.

Specific objectives:

1. Review progress on project implementation.
2. Identify current or potential problems in project design; evaluate and recommend the need to reformulate components regarding strategy, results, outputs, activities, indicators, goals; based on changes in the political, institutional, economic and social context of the project.
3. Advise on compliance with objectives; identify and document lessons learned; and recommend actions that can be taken to improve the project and orient the second half of implementation, with the aim of optimizing progress towards achieving objectives.
4. Provide an appreciation of the reliability of co-financing commitments and specific recommendations for managing GEF resources to progress towards the scope of the objectives.
5. Provide a review of project management on levels of strategic and operating direction, management and implementation of consultancies.

The MTR also detailed some complementary objectives that support the identification of qualitative aspects: i) examine issues related to project sustainability and a timely exit strategy; ii) clearly identify relevant aspects, which will be important inputs in the final evaluation; and iii) promote accountability and transparency, in assessing and identifying progress in project compliance and achievements.

2.2. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE REVIEW:

The review used a multiple methodology, applying a participatory, human rights and gender, multi-stakeholder, sector and level (national, regional and local) approach, in accordance with the socio-geographical and participatory approach of the SMC Project, the ToR and the technical proposal for the review matrix presented in the Initial Report Document, validated at the MTR Kick-off Workshop². This logical framework matrix integrated general aspects required by the MTR Terms and Conditions and the specific measures/general aspects assessed. It involved documentary analysis, interviews, surveys and focus groups during field work and subsequent analysis. The overall MTR activities are described based

¹ UNDP - GEF. 2014. Guidance for conducting midterm reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects, http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/midterm/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf

² Mid-term Review Kick-off Workshop, Monday, March 6, 2017, UNDP Chile Offices.

on the achievement of outputs. For practical purposes, an *activities timeline* is added, which includes sub-activities (**Annex II**).

1. Identification and review based on evidence of all relevant sources of information: This included key stakeholders/participating interest groups, experiences implemented and documents generated in the project preparation and implementation phase. This early stage covered the **office research** phase, involving stakeholder mapping (**Annex III**) and an analysis of institutional and legal documents (**Annex IV**). Preparatory meetings were held with the Project Team, the UNDP Chile Office and UNPD GEF Regional Technical Assistance (**Annex VII**), to ensure a sound review from the Review Team in keeping with the technical proposal presented.

2. Preparation of information surveying instruments: Questionnaires from individual and group interviews (**Annex IX**); validated in the MTR Kick-off Workshop (**Annex V**).

3. Preparation of the Kick-off Report (Output 1 - MTR)³: this includes the work methodology, division of responsibilities between the national and international consultant, presentation of a list of interviews and documents for analysis; a matrix tailored to the consultancy and a timeline of MTR implementation activities. This was validated by the parties responsible from the UNPD Chile Office and Project Team (**Annex VI**).

4. Field visits (Output 2, March 6 to 15, 2017): The purpose of these was to identify the progress of project implementation; this involved visits to pilot experiences, communities who participated in the five pilot projects, interviews were conducted with multiple stakeholders to gather background on aspects reviewed, progress on project implementation (and their vision on the analytical process of the project's strengths and weaknesses, how it has operated and the impact this has generated on the sector).

5. Contact, collaborative and participative interviews with key project stakeholders based on the UNDP-GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. The review team applied a multi-stakeholder approach, a gender and human rights, sector and level approach (national, regional and landscape-local), conducting interviews with 30 people (UNDP members, representatives of national, regional and local governments, companies, CSOs), 6 focus groups with representatives from the communities where pilot experiences are developed, and 2 collective workshops with UNDP and Government representatives (Annex VII and photo log Annex X).

6. Presentation of finding upon mission completion ⁴ (Output 3): Findings, recommendations and preliminary conclusions were presented (**Annex VIII**⁸); information validated in a meeting by the Environmental Education and Public Participation Division Chief of the Environment Ministry, the Technical Team of the SMC Project and the UNDP-GEF Team.

7. Analysis and systematization of results of the background review, interviews with key stakeholders and group meetings with communities from the 5 projects, monitoring of responses.

8. Preparation and presentation of final reports (draft and final versions) (Output 4).

9. Review and incorporation of comments into final report.

10. Preparation of final report and executive summary (Output 5).

³ Mid-term Report (MTR) Kick-off Report, presented March 1, 2017 and validated in the MTR Kick-off Workshop.

⁴ Workshop for presentation of preliminary MTR findings, UNDP Office, March 15, 2017.

2.3. STRUCTURE OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW:

The structure of the MTR responds to overall aspects presented in the ToR and the Guidance for conducting MTRs of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects.¹ The review team examined and scored the quality of project implementation. In this sense, the elements reviewed were: i) Project strategy: design and results framework/logical framework; in the analysis of the formulation, this considers the design relevance and logic, and its permanence in the face of changes verified in the context of the implementation process; ii) Progress towards results and barriers to achieving objectives; iii) Project implementation and adaptive management; management mechanisms, work planning, financing and co-financing, project-level monitoring and review systems, implication of interested parties, information and communication. In the analysis of the implementation and achievement of results, the review team evaluates the information in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency; and iv) Project sustainability through risk assessment: financial, socio-economic, institutional framework and governance, and environmental.

The MTR has used *key analysis and assessment criteria*, both for projects and for programs established in OECD documents (relevance, internal and external design cohesion, impact/effect, efficacy, efficiency and sustainability); which UNDP also applies to GEF-funded projects. The analysis of the formulation has considered the design relevance and logic, and its permanence in the face of changes verified in the context of these years. The analysis of the implementation and achievement of results has considered the information in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. The review team also conducted an analysis of the sustainability of project results and outlines a series of recommendations and a synthesis of lessons learned. In this sense, the review focused on gathering experiences, best practices and specific knowledge produced during the project implementation process, as inputs for organizational learning, visibility of practices with local communities and other institutions.

The Project was rated on the elements reviewed, based on criteria and guidelines used by UNDP for GEF-financed projects⁵ (see **Annex XIV**), according to:

Progress towards results and Project implementation and adaptive management: The MTR used a scale of 6 (six) points: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

Sustainability: The following scale of 4 (four) values was used: Probable (P) Insignificant risks to sustainability; Somewhat probable (SP) Moderate risks; Somewhat improbable (SI) Significant risks; and Improbable (I) Serious risks.

3- PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND CONTEXT

3.1. DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT: ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIOECONOMIC, INSTITUTIONAL AND POLITICAL

The Chilean Mediterranean Ecoregion covers approximately 22,428,937 hectares (61.55% of the country's surface area)⁶, occupying an area from north of Antofagasta in the north, to near Valdivia in the south. It represents the only Mediterranean scrub ecoregion in South America, is the most threatened of the ecoregions in the country, and one of only five Mediterranean ecosystems throughout the world. It has the greatest biological diversity and the greatest agricultural value, with significant carbon reserves. It is the most densely populated area with the greatest soil degradation and least

⁵ UNDP - GEF. 2014. Guidance for conducting midterm reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects.

See: http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf

⁶ The MTR has verified the 2007 Forestry, Farming and Livestock Census, national benchmark for the regions from Antofagasta in the North to Valdivia in the South (Antofagasta to los Rios regions), which comprise the Mediterranean Ecoregion, totaling 22,428,937 hectares.

protection of its biologically diverse ecosystems and habitats. Very little of the original plant cover in the ecoregion remains (less than 15% according to most of the studies), making it highly fragmented.

From an environmental perspective, the Mediterranean ecoregion is formed by gradients of soil depth and water availability. Plant formations include different types of forest resources and formations: i) Dense rare forests, formed by local formations (with coniferous perennial species *Austrocedrus chilensis*, or Cordillera cypress, or deciduous species with the *Nothofagus* genus); which are typically found in moist valley floors or in fertile areas near rivers, therefore very difficult to find in their original state; ii) Open lowland forests and perennial species, appropriately called scrubland, of which very few remain; the coastal scrub is different from that of the inner formations; iii) Savanna-type forests, where thorns are also common, considered scrubs degraded by land use, introduction of non-native pastures and unsustainable pressure from livestock.

It has a rich diversity of plant and animal species, with high levels of local and regional endemism. It is a source of important ecosystem services in terms of carbon capture; contribution of wood biomass, a source of heating and energy for cooking for approximately 4.2 million inhabitants in central Chile. Agriculture depends on ecosystem services that deliver plant genetic resources, soil fertility and pollination, and covers 70-75% of the original area of the region, depending on water in aquifers recharged by forest areas; fifteen of these aquifers have limited use due to over-extraction and/or insufficient recharge. The ecoregion also covers the upper and middle segments of the river basins of thirteen major rivers, providing water for domestic, agricultural, commercial and industrial use; intact and fully functioning Mediterranean ecosystems help reduce the risk of hazardous flooding in agricultural and urban areas and facilitate the recharge of aquifers.

From a socioeconomic perspective, the Mediterranean Ecoregion was the center of intense colonization and settlement; main source and agricultural development for domestic consumption and export, and the most densely populated area of the country, with fields of different size, productivity and respective levels of technology. About 85% of the original plant cover in the region has been significantly modified. The impact reflects a combination of habitat conversion, progressive fragmentation and cumulative degradation of ecosystems and extensive soil areas; with loss of endangered species and endangered habitats and invasion of non-native species harmful to ecosystems, impacting the overall benefits with considerable loss of local ecosystem services. Land degradation is considered to affect more than 150,000 hectares per year at the national level, where the greatest degradation occurs in the Mediterranean region; intense in the north, with water scarcity and in the densely populated central areas, where infrastructure and urban growth projects are important land consumers. Other factors include the inefficient use of land through forest degradation. The ecoregion also suffers from the consequences of inefficient use of biomass energy, land conversion and the degradation and unsustainable use of temperate forest.

In addition, forest fires are an important source of greenhouse gas emissions and loss of habitats and biodiversity in the scrubland. With respect to its population, more than one million people living in rural areas of the Mediterranean Ecoregion are poorer or live in more marginal socio-economic conditions than urban populations.

Due to competition for land use and the lack of comprehensive or broad management approaches, the entire territory and even specific states are used over and over again in search of the more mono-functional and short-term objectives, which are often changed with the next intervention.

From a legal context, Chilean land use legislation addresses individual sectors: agricultural legislation regulates the agricultural land use and urban legislation regulates urban land use. Therefore, there are legal gaps when land use changes from agricultural to urban. Legislation thereby leaves room for regulatory loopholes that allow the deterioration of environmental values.

On the other hand, government agricultural, livestock and forestry development programs have focused on promoting the management of productive units as part of a larger national development project. However, this accelerated quest for economic growth has left little room for environmental concerns. Although the restructured Chilean environmental institutions are working to establish a Biodiversity and

Protected Areas Service (SBDAP), there is still no strategy to address these problems at the territorial level. Local authorities (governed by Law 18.695 of the Constitutional Law of Municipalities) have broad powers in regulating social and productive interactions at the local level, however, little ability to overcome landscape barriers in long-term planning.

The institutional framework that most directly affects rural areas is made up of the Ministries of Agriculture, Environment, Economy, Development and Tourism, Social Development, Ministry of Interior and Public Security, and the Ministry of Labor and Social Security. The Ministry of Finance controls program financing and can also be considered part of the institutional framework due to its role as guarantor in the allocation of resources and use of public funds. Each ministry develops and implements policies, strategies, plans, programs and activities based on human, material and economic resources in keeping with their competencies. As such, the focus of the ministries is to achieve institutional goals and objectives, using the approach that the respective ministry considers most appropriate to achieve the goals of the State.

At the landscape level, the principles of decentralized management are applied for operation of different policy instruments (CORFO, INDAP, CONAF, MMA). In addition, when these institutions work together and formalize agreements regarding the transfer of public funds, they must meet requirements such as having a budget item, inclusion in the Register of Legal Entities and signing an agreement, in addition to being under the supervision of the Comptroller General of the Republic. For the Environment Ministry, approval of the Ministry of Finance is required.

3.2. PROBLEMS THAT THE PROJECT PROPOSES TO RESOLVE:

The Chilean Mediterranean Ecoregion occupies a central role in the country's sustainable development. It concentrates essential social and cultural values, strategic economic heritage and environmental values of global importance. The pressure exerted by productive activities on the landscape places all these values at risk, especially those associated with the global environment.

The sustainability of ecosystem services in this region, its biodiversity and economic productivity require an approach that provides opportunities, means and motivation for community organizations to develop, acquire and/or manage the financing, knowledge and skills necessary to develop and manage their resources in order to derive benefits from environmental development at local and global levels.

In this scenario, landscape planning is considered a tool that would allow implementation of coordinated actions, depending on the landscape potential and the needs of the communities and the various stakeholders involved. However, although many communities and local governments have a mandate to plan and manage land use in benefit of sustainable development, they generally do not have the knowledge, skills or financial resources to carry out planning processes on this issue, nor are they able to establish the necessary public-private synergies. For this reason, the long-term solution identified to respond to ecosystemic degradation and loss of the global environmental values, lies in the promotion of the work coordinated between the communities and public and private stakeholders to identify and develop innovative and appropriate techniques that favor biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and sustainable land management. This would use sources of investment (grants or loans) for the projects they control, in individual landscapes where social, economic and biophysical synergies can be generated, both locally and globally. To this end, community organizations must formulate landscape management strategies with the help of their institutional partners, which include social, economic and ecological results, with an aim to increase resilience. The projects they design and implement will contribute to these results, in and of themselves and in unison with others.

3.3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND STRATEGY

The project is targeted at protecting and improving the global environmental values of the Mediterranean Ecoregion of Chile. It seeks to promote the development and/or adoption of Agricultural Best Practices by CSOs, with minimal use of resources and implementation of community conservation activities. Replication of this in the landscape by hundreds of small producers will contribute to improving resistance to climate change, productivity, resource efficiency and marketability niches. It will strengthen access to microfinance, sustainability and ecoregional resilience.

The initiative proposes a landscape management approach, a strategic geographical partner, a gradual approach that builds capacities, institutional coordination, commits and sets aside resources efficiently, strengthens civil society networks and mechanisms, strengthening social capital to support the implementation and adaptation of new practices and land uses. The project outlines landscape management and planning as a participatory community process, in an action-reflection-adaptation practice, which favors reaching the landscape objective.

The project strategy proposes a gradual management, with a *first stage* where resources and attention have focused on a set of productive landscapes differentiated within the ecoregion, to generate knowledge from a reflection on the implementation of community initiatives within landscape planning and management strategies, multi-stakeholder coordination at the landscape level, production and sustainable marketing. The proposal is that as the first set of landscape-level initiatives (LLIs) evolve during implementation, the lessons learned will enable adaptation and establishment of other LLIs throughout the ecoregion. Results of LLI implementation will lead to lessons learned from experience that will be applied to the development of policy recommendations, guidance and direction, as in-depth feedback for this process of improving global environmental values and sustainable local development in the ecoregion. The strategy for the second stage proposes to coordinate institutional support, seeks to identify multi-stakeholder local coordination mechanisms that support CLMP strategies and development, with local participation mechanisms; with systematization, communication and knowledge management for sustainability and replication of experiences.

The third stage proposes to build capacities in CSOs and at a landscape level through hands-on learning, since they carry out sustainable development and/or conservation initiatives that promote biodiversity, avoid carbon emissions from biomass and soil and/or optimize ecosystem services.

The purpose of the GEF SMC project is to develop, demonstrate and integrate the contribution of significant global environmental benefits from community organizations in the management of seriously threatened landscapes in the Chilean Mediterranean Ecoregion, through the following components: 1) Sustainable landscape management to conserve biodiversity; 2) Demonstration / promotion of the conservation and improvement of carbon reserves through soil use, change in soil use, fishing, and local carbon monitoring systems; 3) Maintenance and improvement in the flow of forestry and agricultural ecosystem services to maintain the livelihood of local communities; 4) Development of community capacities and knowledge management; y 5) Monitoring and evaluation of activities.

The project proposed a collaborative effort between diverse public, private and civil society stakeholders who are connected to a landscape, to undertake projects that address problems in sustainable local development and generate local and global environmental benefits, through landscape-level initiatives (LLIs), which will facilitate the synergy between projects and sustainability to produce greater, longer lasting effects.

3.4. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION:

The GEF SMC Project strategy proposes an institutional mechanism that supports project implementation and management, constituted by a Project Board responsible for strategic decision making and project management. Board members include: Environment Ministry (Executing Agency), UNDP (Implementing Agency) and a representative of the project beneficiaries (Senior Beneficiary). The Environment Ministry fulfills the executive role of the project and through the National Project Director is responsible for the project work plan coordination, management and monitoring. Another operational entity is the National Project Manager, which guarantees that the project produces the results specified in the project document. On an operational level, the project team involves one administrative and financial assistant and two professionals for field monitoring and evaluation. The senior beneficiary represents and ensures beneficiary interests with the Project.

The role of UNDP is to oversee the implementation and achievement of project outputs, through tracking, to ensure the quality of the Project and appropriate use of GEF funds. The local UNDP office is in charge of the project's technical and financial management, in close collaboration and consultation with the Executing Agency. It communicates timely progress to the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordination

Unit, which provides technical assistance in assuring the quality of project implementation through a Regional Technical Advisor. UNDP Chile is responsible for: i) Providing financial and auditing services to the project; ii) Selecting and hiring project staff; iii) Supervising implementation of the project budget; iv) Designating independent financial auditors and reviewers; and v) Ensuring that all activities, including calls for tender and financial services, are carried out in strict compliance with UNDP-GEF procedures. In addition, it supports implementation and sustainability at the ecoregional and national levels of the Steering Committee; participation of relevant government institutions, which supports and contributes to the management of planned activities and projects generated from the landscapes, providing effective knowledge in the areas of management, oversight and policy advocacy to ensure long-term financing based on a greater coordination of the various institutional development instruments, which address issues of land use and resources in the ecoregion.

In support of landscape management, the project proposes the establishment of the Landscape Advisory Board for the Mediterranean Ecoregion (CATEM) responsible for the technical approval and authorization of projects, recommendations, etc. Operationally it is responsible for the presentation of portfolios with the projects to the Steering Committee (SC) for final approval and financing.

The Multi-Stakeholder Platform for Landscape Management (MSPLM), an entity constituted by various stakeholders in the landscape, is responsible for operating and making the project and the Landscape-Level Initiatives (LLI) sustainable. It is made up of representatives of civil society organizations, NGOs, local government, and regional offices of national agencies and institutions; it provides the space for analysis, reflection and agreement on proposals and initiatives, elaborates the strategy and the Comprehensive Landscape Management Plan and the LLIs; it monitors implementation, engages networks and financing for sustainability; it ensures achievement of management goals and indicators and the adaptive process. The MSPLM operates through a Technical Secretary, responsible for managing the LLIs.

Civil society organizations and indigenous communities are stakeholders responsible for identifying, designing, implementing, monitoring, evaluating and coordinating their small grants projects to obtain landscape management results in relation to global environmental benefits, economic productivity and ecological sustainability (generation, implementation and sustainability of Landscape-Level Initiatives).

3.5. PROJECT TIMELINE AND MILESTONES.

The premise of the project is that landscape planning and management is a participatory community process that can be characterized by repetitive steps in an action-reflection-adaptation (Participation - Training - Adaptation) practice, aimed at achieving a broad objective at the landscape level. For this reason, basic landscape planning and project management methodology include the following steps: 1) Definition of the landscape and formation of a landscape management body of multiple stakeholders; 2) Definition of a common vision of landscape, results and governance; 3) Participatory formulation of a landscape strategy and action plan, establishing indicators at the landscape level; 4) Development of proposals, review and approval of financing; 5) Implementation of projects, monitoring, evaluation, generation and dissemination of knowledge; 6) Reflection of the MSPLM on the experience of landscape management and adaptive management; and 7) UNDP review of implementation challenges.

3.6. PRIMARY STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED

The key stakeholders considered in the design, implementation and operation in project implementation phase are those described in the PRODOC⁷ and MTR Technical Terms and Conditions; (NGOs, civil society organizations, beneficiaries organized in different ways), private companies, government and cooperation agencies (**Annex III**). The MTR analyzed the participation of stakeholders in various project instances, reflected in each of the sections, covering an analysis from design to implementation.

⁷ PRODOC UNOD-GEF Project No. 88249, Support for civil society and community initiatives to generate global environmental benefits through subsidies and microcredit. Environment Ministry / UNDP-GEF Sustainable Mediterranean Communities Project.

4- FINDINGS

4.1. PROJECT STRATEGY.

Project Design This included an evaluation of **Relevance** in the formulation of the Project, substantive definitions of actions carried out, coherence between governing and guiding standards, objectives, measures and means; as well as the degree of coherence between objectives and the needs/interests of individuals, Chile and GEF. The problems addressed by the Project are relevant.

- ❖ The Project has identified the multi-causality of the degradation of the Mediterranean Ecoregion and the potential contribution with local, national and global benefits. It proposes a promotion of an engaged multi-stakeholder comprehensive landscape management, financing issues for productive initiatives with an environmental focus, and specifically proposes building the capacities of Civil Society Organizations so they can fulfill the role as a hub of initiative creation.
- ❖ The Project identifies four concrete *barriers* that it proposes to address in order to achieve results. It identifies the hypotheses for each barrier, which argue the causality of the problem, and which should be overcome. However, these hypotheses address large constraints that are too complex to be addressed by the Project, in terms of time and capacity.
- ❖ The hypotheses fall primarily to community capacities, knowledge, practices, organization and management; they identify the communities as a cause of the problem and fundamental agent for change in sustainable management of the landscape. The latter hypothesis is a high risk (and threat) for the attainment of the **proposed** goals and results.
- ❖ The barriers and hypotheses do not address the capacities and management of government institutions as managers and agents of change in sustainable landscape management, in an engaged and coordinated manner. They are merely succinctly mentioned but not addressed by the Project, making this a cause that does not support progress towards results. In addition, there is no identification of barriers related to development instruments currently promoted by the State and how these may facilitate or hinder the achievement of results. Project goals propose the revision and modification of at least 4 institutional programs including the EPF (objective 1), and almost no progress has been made on these goals, only actions with respect to the EPF.
- ❖ The SMC Project proposes to strengthen financing mechanisms for initiatives/projects on a landscape scale, turning the EPF into an EPF 2.0. Internal efforts have been made in the Environment Ministry/EPF to strengthen the Program's focus, meet cofinancing goals, and make progress towards the achievement of project goals. The XX version of EPF 2017 has carried out the Sustainable Projects Tender, whose thematic issues are in line with the project objective⁸ with an associative, community and sustainable approach that which seeks to promote projects from the local level that strengthen actions previously developed to improve the environmental quality of the landscape, increase awareness and appreciation of the environment, and incorporate and promote environmental education and public participation. Another EPF competition awarded (November 30, 2017), is the Local Environmental Management (GAL) where the Project Team promoted synergy with the SMC Project, in search for project development.⁹
- ❖ The co-financing report of the Environment Ministry Project GEF SMC, corroborates the synergy, confirming that the thematic lines of the project tenders are in line with the objectives of the SMC project.

⁸ Sustainable Project Tender/EPF/Environment Ministry, see: <http://www.fpa.mma.gob.cl/concurso-proyecto-sostenible.php>

⁹ Local Environmental Management Tender/EPF/Environment Ministry, see: <http://www.fpa.mma.gob.cl/concurso-gestion-ambiental-local.php>

- ❖ As of March, this national tender was in the contracts signing stage with the organizations that were awarded financing. It aims to finance 30 total projects with 30 million CLP each (with a total of 900 million, 50% in 2017 and the remainder by 2018).¹⁰

Point 3.6 of the GEF SMC Project Work Plan (October 2016 - March 2017) proposes a series of actions aimed at strengthening the EPF and the LLI financing mechanism, subject to revision and results of the MTR; actions that require prompt attention.

Although engagement with and between public stakeholders is key to the goals of the Project in terms of inter-institutional participation and landscape sustainability, the engagement and coordination of public stakeholders towards the establishment of real synergies to enhance environmental effects in the Mediterranean ecosystem. The case has been the same with respect to the interaction with private stakeholders and the development model promoted at an institutional level. There were difficulties in practice with regard to institutional arrangements.

- ❖ In the strategy and institutional arrangements, the Project proposes the development of the Steering Committee, as a participatory opportunity for supporting investment in the EPF in the landscape. This SC was established and the institutions signed different intent to support agreements. As of the date of the MTR, this SC does not have an inter-institutional work plan as proposed in the 2016 Annual Operating Plan (AOP). The situation is the same when bringing the SC down to the landscape level.
- ❖ The Project proposes the establishment of the Landscape Advisory Board for the Mediterranean Ecoregion (CATEM) to be responsible for technical authorization and approval of the projects. However, this goal has not been reached, perhaps associated with poor national engagement with the landscape (project lacks capacity to simultaneously carry out the Multi-Annual Plan and the AOP, and a focus on moving forward in other territories and still in the development and early implementation stage of the pilots).
- ❖ The project proposes approaching the landscape through *“landscape management platforms”* (already existing with proven track record). However, it did not consider, as an underlying hypothesis, that the current capacities of this sector, in its internal and external management, are a real contribution to the achievement of the Project's goals. This has revealed weaknesses in management capacity, adversely impacting project management at the landscape level. Interviewed stakeholders claim that public institutions *“do not take this approach seriously,”* which would promote an active public participation. Although the discourse strengthens public-private alliances, this is challenging in the regions if there is no previous or personal connection. The participation of authorities must be promoted in these spaces of analysis, reflection and establishment of agreements for initiatives (e.g., social development, SERNATUR). The work methodology has been noteworthy, coherent and clear.
- ❖ The Project's successful landscape approach stands out, although upon implementation, it has faced challenges with the Multi-Stakeholder Platform for Landscape Management (MSPLM). The project's strategic management has been weak in triggering institutional participation in national and landscape mechanisms for sustainable and resilient governance.
- ❖ The Project proposes the development of MSPLM and CATEM, as an institutional arrangement. Their actions would support the project in the development of CLMPs, pilot projects and LLIs. These three outputs have been the results of consultancies with participation of landscape actors, but not of previously strengthened landscape governance structures, with the exception of Cayumanque landscape that could go in parallel with the development of the Platform and the CLMP, marking a favorable difference in the management capacity of the latter. In addition, no actions are detected that strengthen the sustainability of landscape governance and resilience, but rather actions focused on the governance of pilot projects.

¹⁰ Co-financing report; Ministry of the Environment - Sustainable Mediterranean Communities Project, November 2016.

- ❖ At the time of the MTR, the MSPLMs do not show an operational strategy or plan (the project AOPs are not considered by the MTR Team to be synonymous or equivalent to the CLMPs, since the latter are more likely to be instruments for the identification of project lines). The differences between the three identified MSPLMs can be seen in the leadership, management and networking capacities, elements that may have limited the strengthening of multi-stakeholder participation, investment coordination, incorporation and recognition of CLMPs as management tools to strengthen sustainability.
- ❖ The PRODOC¹¹ provides details on the project management mechanisms, defining the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved. The Environment Ministry (MMA) is the government agency responsible for Project implementation, which includes coordinating, managing and tracking the work plan through the National Project Director. A Project Council (which includes the Environment Ministry, UNDP and a Senior Beneficiary) is the party responsible for making strategic project management decisions. However, in this context, there are no roles and responsibilities defined for the position of “National Project Director”, which is included in the project's Organizational Structure, which would enable monitoring and evaluation. The review process identified several actions corresponding to this position, which superimposed with those of the National Project Manager, with detriment to the project's cost effectiveness and progress towards results.
- ❖ The Project Council PRODOC also considers the participation of a representative (senior beneficiary) of the project beneficiaries, whose main function is to ensure the project results are conducted from the perspective of the project beneficiaries. The MTR did not identify this participation, inferring that this is due to the project implementation process. This situation should be evaluated by MMA and UNDP regarding the relevance of participation, governance and sustainability of results.
- ❖ The strategy also defines the formation of the Project Team, involving an administrative/financial assistant and two professionals in charge of monitoring and evaluation. The integration of findings, including the project approach, the four lines of action (institutionality, community capacities, LLI development and knowledge management), strategic progress milestones towards results, has identified the aforementioned as a weakness, i.e., the small number of professionals to respond to actions by result by landscape.

On the other hand, ***Project relevance*** was analyzed, i.e., whether the Project is significant based on national, regional and local priorities, and whether the practices developed have contributed or can contribute to strengthening the project objectives. In this sense:

- ❖ The project goals and results are highly consistent with national priorities. They are in line with international agreements that have been signed and ratified, and with national and, in some cases, regional strategies and plans on climate change, desertification and biodiversity. It seeks to generate significant global benefits while enhancing Chile's objectives in terms of biodiversity conservation and mitigation of climate change in the areas of land use, forestry and the battle against soil degradation.
- ❖ The project contributes to growing Chile's national and international commitments to sustainability by improving community and institutional capacities to generate environmental benefits, through decentralization and operationalization of its governance mechanisms.
- ❖ The Project addresses regional and local priorities, based on MMA diagnostics and targeting, through participatory landscape diagnosis and with information from secondary sources, achieving the development of Comprehensive Landscape Management Plans (CLMP). These make a socio-environmental characterization, description of thematic lines (issues of interest, prioritizing and characterization), portfolio of individual projects, identification of potential alliances and possibility of integration.

¹¹ Section 5.1, pages 81-83, define the “Project Management Mechanisms” and the “Roles and Responsibilities of the parties involved” in Project management, as well as the “Organizational Structure”.

- ❖ The results of interviews with local stakeholders and communities are a testimony to the approach of local and community priorities through the CLMP. However, in most cases, local stakeholders do not recognize the existence of CLMP and the relevance of its use as an effective tool for landscape management. The experience of the work team in the field shows that the problem is not the lack of awareness of the existence of CLMPs, but their lack of clarity as tools to support decision making and how to use them.
- ❖ On the other hand, in the strategic Project implementation there is no evidence of progress in the generation of local alliances and the use of CLMPs in institutional management, in order to minimize risks, leverage resources and give sustainability to the initiatives.
- ❖ The CLMP are the result and outcome of consultancies, which have worked to gather regional development background information, followed by a participatory analysis of institutional, community and other key stakeholders associated with the landscape around the definition of strategic guidelines and work issues according to their potentialities and needs, and the visions and interests of the diverse stakeholders for strengthening landscape development. The Project has developed 3 Comprehensive Landscape Management Plans (CLMP) through a participatory process. They are instruments of territorial management; they identify possible areas, ideas and projects to be developed and encourage sustainable landscape development. They propose improving environmental, economic and social resilience, but they do not show lines of action to strengthen the resilience of governance. They identify institutional and other actors, but not a strategy for their linkage, engagement and coordination. They appear to be used more as an element of project analysis and proposals, which requires an operational complement to their implementation. To date they relate to pilot project implementation, but not to engaging and coordinating with stakeholders in the landscape. Two of the CLMPs in their structure do not identify the institutional structure and context that they fall under, the reason for which is clarified below.
- ❖ The CLMPs have been developed on the hypothesis that the MSPLM is responsible for their implementation, a faulty hypothesis considering that the MSPLMs to date do not have a strategy or operational plan. In addition, there are differences identified between the 3 MSPLMs in terms of leadership and management capacities, elements that may have limited the incorporation and recognition of CLMPs as management tools in the cases of Alto Malleco (CLMPs in Curacautín and Lonquimay and Coltauco, Doñihue and Las Cabras, although this is not the case with the last CLMP in Cayumanque).
- ❖ A key factor also lies in the design and structure of the CLMP, with a broad and marked difference that is unfavorable to those associated with the Model Forest initiatives, and very favorable regarding the Landscape Management Plan for Ránquil, Quillón and Florida. This situation shows the early absence of terms of reference for Project development, with a definition of the scope of the output that is coherent with the project goals. It also shows the difference between the consultants who developed the output, a situation that needs to be analyzed by the project. In support of the CLMP identified and the weaknesses of the remaining two, it addresses considerations for strategic management, governance, risk and sustainability, such as: Actions for the implementation of the CLMP, implementation model, system and procedures of the tracking and evaluation system, and communication and outreach plan. These lessons learned must be substantiated in the other CLMPs if the project expects to achieve effective results. Undoubtedly these significant differences already mark wide gaps in MSPLM and landscape management.

The relevance of the ***project strategy*** was analyzed and it provides an effective route to ensure the achievement of expected results, and to evaluate the decision-making process. Regarding this:

- ❖ The project strategy presents a theoretical proposal with relevant approaches, considering that it places the role of agent of change on civil society organizations in obtaining sustainable landscape development with global environmental benefits. The gradual process indicated is relevant in theory, whereby in an initial stage the CSOs and NGOs, local government agencies and the private sector develop a CLMP, and then an LLI. A second stage is aimed at coordinating institutional support, and a third stage, at building CSO and landscape-level capacities from learnings in the field.

- ❖ The review did not see a strategy for the implementation, development and sustainability of each of these stages, standardizing processes in order to ensure results, sustainability and replicability. The strategy proposes the implementation of pilots, followed by replication of the experience in other landscapes, based on best practices and lessons learned. However, evidence of the strategy of replicating the experience in other landscapes cannot be expected to be obtained due to the development stage of the activities and pending stages. For the generation and dissemination of knowledge, the Project has contemplated evaluating the implementation of individual projects and analyzing the experiences to obtain lessons and knowledge applicable to other communities and systems. It has proposed the development of 10 communities of practice, to gather learnings and to become a capacity transference center. To date, the project has engaged with and developed a work plan with 3 Communities of Practice: 1) Apícola de Lefuco, an apicultural community, indicating a reduction in its capacities (Araucanía Region); 2) Agroecológica de San Nicolás, an agroecological community in full operations; and 3) Género y Medio Ambiente, a gender and environmental community (Biobío Region) currently without operations. In November 2016, after evaluating the operations, contribution of these communities and the demands placed on the Project Team in terms of capacities and resources, the project considered that in relation to Communities of Practice, the strategy was to ensure that they are installed as part of the natural development process of the pilot projects in the landscapes where SMC GEF is generating the CLMP and MSPLM.¹² With respect to communities of practice, an inadequate implementation strategy was identified, based on the disparate operations, which surpassed the capabilities of the Team, with dubious impact. However, the review considers that this is part of the *design lessons learned* from the Project, and is in line with the strategy presented by the current National Manager, where strategy coherence for the second phase of the project will be relevant, according to the goals proposed and Project capacities.
- ❖ In relation to the barriers, hypotheses and risks that arise at each stage, the strategy lacks a mechanism for risk management and a robust monitoring, evaluation and reporting system by stage that supports decision-making and progress towards results.
- ❖ Internal conflicts within the Project Team culminated in a change of manager and the monitoring and evaluation team. Decisions between the executive and implementing entity, with the support of the GEF Focal Point, were resolved as best possible, seeking an agreement and progress of the project, but the relevance of due process and participation of the parties involved was not clear. The Project shows no strategy for the prevention and management of internal and external conflicts. This particular situation had an impact on the oversight and operational management of the project, on transparency and re-establishment of trust.
- ❖ The oversight, management and operational decisions are made based on the Project's organizational hierarchical structure. Strategic and political management decisions are made in conjunction with the National Director and the Head of the Environmental Education and Public Participation Division.
- ❖ Pilot project-level decisions are made by civil society organizations, in assembly and in a relevant participatory manner. Decision-making in participating indigenous communities should ensure cultural relevance in decision-making. In this case, the project does not have a differentiated strategy.
- ❖ Strategic decisions in landscape management are made by the National Project Director in conjunction with a hierarchical structure when appropriate and in conversation with the manager and strategic partners, with civil society organizations and with community associations in the process of formalization.
- ❖ The evaluation identifies a nonexistent external communication strategy and zero visibility of the project outside the areas where it currently works.

¹² Communities of Practice Report 29-11-2016, SMC UNDP-GEF Project Coordination.

Logical Framework (LF) and Results Framework.

This MTR has involved a SMART analysis and assessment of the Logical Framework, on its results and indicators. The results of this action are shared in the tables described in **Annex XI**.

❖ ***Findings of the logical framework assessment with respect to the general objective, its goals and indicators.***

The PRODOC proposes a step-by-step strategy, with specific relevant steps described in Point 3.3., which are in line with the Project components, the landscape-level and community-based approach, to achieve resilient and sustainable landscapes. This is consistent with the COMDEKS Program¹³ (The Community Development and Knowledge Management for the Satoyama Initiative Program), whose lessons learned indicate that this type of initiative requires time and long-term support from the government and multiple stakeholders, ranging from 5 to 10 years, requiring mentoring and funding to achieve this type of results. However, as the review team moved forward in evaluating the implementation progress, it detected the high expectations expressed in PRODOC at the time it was created. Goals and indicators were presented, which are (currently) excessively ambitious for the real Project capacities (time, resources and technical equipment) as well as the capacities available in the landscapes and the achievable scopes in the planned times.

Below are the findings of the Logical Framework assessment. Later, Table 3 of the “Recommendations” section presents a synthesis of the Smart assessment and main recommendations, and **Annex XIII** provides the details of the assessment, recommendations and specific measures.

The effectiveness assessment for the goals and indicators, through the *Smart analysis* provides a vertical synthesis that indicates: lack of specificity; its designs will pose a challenge for measurement; most goals are difficult to achieve, with medium and low realism based on the possibilities of the project, and many of them exceed the proposed times for management and the internal and external circumstances that the project must face. The synthesis of the Smart assessment, by goal and indicator (horizontal evaluation), concludes and recommends that these should be evaluated, adapted and adjusted to the current capacities and time remaining in the project, determining the actual feasibility of achievement and effective contribution.

❖ ***Findings of the logical framework assessment with respect to results 1 to 4, goals and indicators.***

For Result 1, the Smart assessment indicates that its goals and indicators are specific and measurable; highly ambitious; their design lacks realism and coherence with the project's timelines and capacities, indicating that it is unlikely they will be reached as they are presented. In relation to Result 2, the assessment indicates a lack of coherence between the goal and N-1 indicator and the result, and suggests an evaluation and adjustment, considering the impact associated with the result beyond the proposed specific output. For Results 3 and 4, the goal and N-1 indicator, by design, are mutually incoherent in definition and focus. The goals and indicators of the results are measurable, ambitious, with little realism based on the project's capacities, and challenging to achieve within the project timeline.

In general, the main objective, results, goals and indicators can be improved upon. In terms of actual measurement of achievements, it is important to strengthen the baselines, which today are general and in some cases minimal or even absent. The assessment of medium-term goals is hampered by the type of goal and project indicator. The evaluation sought the relationship with the multi-annual plan, but this is based on result outputs and is not always clear and consistent with the indicators and target results. This affects overall monitoring of results, relegating it to a level of activity tracking.

¹³ Communities in action for landscape resilience and sustainability the COMDEKS Programme; see: <file:///F:/PNUD/GEF%20Evaluacion%20Proyecto%20CMS/Doc%20proyecto%20GEF%20CMS/Doc%20Proyecto%20CMS/INF%20PUND%20GEF%20Regional/communities-in-action-comdeks-web-v2.pdf>

In short, there is ample room for improvement in the logical framework, with attention to the expected project impact. It is recommended that the goals and indicators be reviewed and adapted to: strengthen their coherence by adapting the design and use of the same concepts; in specificity to favor measurement, prefer quantitative indicators and targets; limited to the real project capacities, which consider human and financial resources, protecting and limiting the scope of the goals by feasibility of achievement, adapted to the remaining project timeline. The adaptation of many of these means reducing the scope of the goal and the indicator, adapting the management strategy and a coherent action plan to the new reality.

❖ **Findings regarding Gender and Indigenous Issues.**

Based on the field inspection, interviews and reading of project documents, it appears that the diagnosis made for project design was general, that no detailed analyses of beneficiaries to identify vulnerabilities or gaps in access were conducted, identifying needs, abilities and knowledge, according to sex, age, community of belonging, etc.

Based on the above, there was no gender focus at the time of project formulation. Although it is addressed in the Project Document, it is not reflected in the logical framework (goals and indicators), in specific actions or in an access strategy. Care was taken in the implementation phase regarding the participation of women and young people as beneficiaries.

Analysis from the perspective of Indigenous Peoples: Based on the above, there was no focus on indigenous peoples at the time of project formulation. It is not reflected in the logical framework (goals and indicators), in specific actions or in an access strategy and cross-cutting thematic.

Regarding indigenous participation, based on the interviews and the landscape visit, there is an active participation of the indigenous communities in the pilot initiatives, in the Region of Araucanía, specifically in Lonquimay and Curacautín, where there is a greater concentration of Mapuche Pehuenche population. The review also identifies the inclusion of reintegrated indigenous youth in their communities, with higher education, generating new formats of technical assistance with professionals who establish a cultural framework shared with the community.

In terms of inclusion, there is a positive incorporation of analysis tools in the communities regarding which practices are most appropriate from a conservation perspective, even with new learnings in older adults that involves re-learning to work with other concepts. However, it is important to ensure ancestral cultural practices, without hindering the strengthening of good practices that favor ecosystem services, protection of the environment, biodiversity and natural resources, considering the project's central objectives and the forest and land degradation factors.

It is considered important for the sustainability of the results and their appropriation by the communities, to encourage work with young people in the projects (given that the population of direct beneficiaries is significantly old, which could limit the sustainability of projects over time). This is due to a contextual situation of the Project's target groups (small agricultural owners of the Mediterranean ecoregion of Chile). Therefore (and without changing the target group), any contribution of the Project in this field will be highly relevant as replicable trials to overcome this reality, and contribute to long-term public development policies.

Taking into account the results' goals and indicators, the Project should ensure an in-depth scope of the definition of the beneficiary in order to identify and select the communities that make a real contribution to achieving the Project objective, its resilience and sustainability. This effort and learning is a contribution to the ToR of the LLI tender in terms of defining the tender beneficiary, land tenure system, surface area, productive system, gender specifications and indigenous issues, etc. It also makes the connection with considerations regarding the beneficiaries of programs from other public partner institutions in the SC, to ensure compliance with requirements and support cofinancing initiatives.

4.2. PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS

This MTR has assessed the degree to which project objectives have made progress, considering internal and external factors that have influenced the achievement or not of the results. It complements the

Logical Framework analysis developed, and focuses on assessing the progress towards expected midterm results.

Progress towards analysis of results: The level of progress towards results and scoring is shared in a series of matrices in **Annex XII**, which address the scoring of the objective, results and indicators. Table 1 shows the scoring summary of the progress towards results in accordance with MTR requirements.

In general, with respect to the scope of the **general objective** based on landscape targeting, structural institutional arrangements, the financing mechanism and enhanced community-driven projects, that there is a certain delay in progress towards achieving goals and a certain risk of not reaching expected benefits, scoring this factor as **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MI)**. However, efforts have been made by the Environment Ministry, specifically with the creation of a new tender for 2017: “EPF Sustainable Projects Tender (2017-2018)”, with an increase in both the amount of funding (CLP 30 million per project) and the implementation period (24 months) which is consistent with what the GEF SMC project promotes. In addition, the 5 pilot projects under implementation are in themselves a source of lessons learned for the future financing mechanism.

In relation to **Result 1**, aimed at achieving sustainable landscape management for biodiversity conservation, supported by a large amount of land under sustainable practices, achieved by associations with management plans implemented and generating changes in public financing instruments, the review scores the scope of this result as high risk, mainly due to the ambitious scope of its goals and the meager progress, scoring as **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** in terms of progress towards results. With regard to **Result 2** related to the demonstration/promotion of carbon reserves conservation and growth through sustainable practices and local carbon tracking systems, based on the establishment of locally manageable and transferable practical methodologies, this is feasible, although little progress has been made towards achieving the result, scoring this between **Unsatisfactory (U)** and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**. **Result 3** would maintain and improve the flow of forest and agro-ecosystem services to maintain the livelihoods of local communities, based on attaining a large amount of land under sustainable practices and soil recovery, resulting from the management of trained civil society organizations. Meager progress has been made towards the result, giving this a score of **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** to **Unsatisfactory (U)**. **Result 4** focuses on community capacity building and knowledge management. Undoubtedly the project shows great efforts in actions aimed at building community capacities of those associated with pilot projects I and II. Progress is scored as marginally satisfactory, considering the ambitious goals proposed. With regard to knowledge management, there is little evidence of progress, with a gap to overcome, giving an average score to the progress of its indicators as **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**.

The assessment of progress towards results shows that the focus has been on covering several landscapes rapidly, applying a degraded environments/landscape approach, combined with a geopolitical (regional) approach. In addition to identifying the participating communities, with the support of local institutions, the Project has invested a great deal of effort (and time) in building community capacities, which is evident in the assimilation of central project concepts by the communities. However, as a strategy, this resulted in longer times for achieving results.

Major efforts have been made to strengthen Community Organizations, although progress has been slow in terms of formalizing these, which call for growth and sustainability in landscape initiatives. Along the same lines, the major effort to mentor and develop pilot projects, in a participatory and bottom-up way, has delayed progress in implementation, delaying progress towards achieving goals and results. This type of initiative is consistent with the COMDEKS Program,¹⁴ but the goals and indicators proposed in the logical framework are generally inconsistent with the SMART evaluation, exceeding the Project's capacities.

¹⁴ A community-based approach to resilient and sustainable landscapes lessons from phase ii of the COMDEKS Programme. <file:///F:/PNUD/GEF%20Evaluacion%20Proyecto%20CMS/Doc%20proyecto%20GEF%20CMS/Doc%20Proyecto%20CMS/INF%20PUND%20GEF%20Regional/comdeks-ii-case-study-publication-web-version-final.pdf>

The strategy identified was preceded by the establishment of institutional arrangements, seeking the structure of national and landscape support, as implied by the establishment of the Steering Committee, with participation agreements. On a landscape level with little progress towards the establishment of the MSPLM, perhaps subject to the existence of landscape management platforms considered by the project to accompany the initiative at a landscape level. Along with the progress of this management structure, landscape management instruments known as comprehensive landscape management plans (CLMP) have been developed, but have not yet fulfilled their role as a tool for an engaged landscape management. Bearing in mind that this management structure and the CLMP are project outputs, to date the concrete impact of this action is pending, a situation that limits and jeopardizes the achievement of several goals and the sustainability of other achievements. Knowledge management still has made insufficient progress.

The Project generally shows a slow implementation process, limiting the achievement of goals and indicators, with general progress towards results as marginally unsatisfactory, ranging from highly unsatisfactory to satisfactory, depending on the result in question. A major gap has been identified in the achievement of the proposed goals, and according to the logical framework assessment, most of these need to be adapted considering the actual project capacity and timeline.

Obstacles to achieving project objectives:

- ❖ Designing project strategy: The gradual approach of the project, with a participatory process - training-adaptation, bottom-up, mentoring over time and major milestones with high time considerations for achievement and high cost effectiveness. This combines with underlying barriers and obstacles, fundamentally CSO capacities. Unidentified barriers such as limited management capabilities of landscape participation platforms, both due to internal and external weakness, a pattern that repeats between landscapes.
- ❖ Logical Framework, design of goals and indicators: Some lack specificity, too ambitious; unrealistic and highly difficult due to scope considering the political and management capacities, characteristics, as well as the project's time constraints with respect to the milestones proposed for progress towards results. **Annex XII** integrates the evaluation and scoring of progress towards results by objective, goal and indicators. Table 3 shares a synthesis of the evaluation and recommendations for adjustment of the logical framework and **Annex XIII** details the adaptation recommendations and measures for the Project's Logical Framework.
- ❖ Project capacities and implementation strategy:
 - i. Project team limited in number and type of professionals according to project activities; inadequate fulfillment of roles and functions based on the achievement of outputs and results; an empty position in the recruitment process during the MTR; limited management capacity based on project needs and in some cases within the same position; conflict situation within the project team, with the subsequent change of professionals and unfavorable impact on project performance.
 - ii. Absence of a written project implementation strategy, which marks a critical path, beyond the AOP and the 2015-2019 Multi-Annual Plan; which would identify the planning and logical sequence for realization of results. This limits the strategic participation of partners at the national and landscape level to specific goals and targets. Absence of internal and external communication strategy and strategy for gathering learnings and good practices, based on results.
 - iii. Lack of a written and operational monitoring and evaluation strategy, focused on achievement of results, applied in ongoing tracking, that promotes timely decision-making.
 - iv. Absence of a risk management and conflict management strategy.
 - v. Need to improve reports that specifically identify the progress and achievement of performance indicators (PIR-ATR, QPR quarterly reports, etc.) and their effective implementation as a feedback tool to improve implementation efficiency.

- vi. Although the regional incorporation strategy is part of the PRODOC, addressing this without concrete results and with closing of previous milestones, hinders and delays the gathering of learnings and lessons learned for good project performance. Due to the geographic characteristics of Chile and the landscapes initially selected, this situation marks a great deal of effort and time dispersion dedicated to Technical Team management (high cost effectiveness), both in political management at institutional and operational level, and at the landscape level. It is noteworthy that the strategy and systematization of lessons and learning is currently underway (given that pilot projects were implemented in 3 regions starting August 2016).
 - vii. Selection of participating communities and civil society organizations, with no apparent criteria established, beyond inhabiting the landscape. This lack of strategy exacerbates the barriers and risks identified. However, the review team recommends establishing a set of rules or standards upon which to establish the determination of participation and community selection (criterion for participation and community selection); minimum budget conditions, as requirements to be met by the communities that aspire to be selected in the call; without restricting the “open call” criterion (such as having a certain degree of verifiable consolidation in the community decision-making mechanisms). Measure applicable to the development of the LLI tender, managing risks, progress towards results and sustainability.
 - viii. Limited landscape management capacity, based on an unapparent landscape structure, a situation that undermines institutional participation, the mentoring of pilot initiatives and negatively contributes to overcoming operational capacities and the effectiveness of the project team, increasing response times and slowing down progress.
- ✦ Related to organizations in their landscapes and local governments: Key stakeholders, their appropriation of the project and sustainability must be interpreted from different pillars to analyze obstacles to meeting project objectives and revise criteria that can be used in reformulating the project funds allocation process. In this sense, two critical pillars have been analyzed: 1) The nature of each organization; and 2) The interaction strategies for each stakeholder in each pilot project.

Pillar 1. Regarding the nature of each organization, this MTR found that project implementation used a very varied typology of organizations, such as: grassroots/community organizations, civil society organizations that are made up of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, organizations that provide technical services (both civil society and consultants), in some cases with technical assistance from stakeholders at the municipal, provincial, regional and national government level and in some cases with financial assistance in organizational aspects. The 3 initial pilot landscapes were pre-defined in the PRODOC (they didn't undergo a selection process), while the remaining 3 pilot landscapes (Maule, Biobío and Valparaiso) were defined within the MMMA priorities, associated with environmental recovery, protection and restoration programs or initiatives.

This selection of organizations did not start from a prior analysis of the type of organizations in existence in the landscape with the capacity to carry out projects (but rather the landscape to intervene was selected and work began from there, using as a starting point different groups of beneficiaries indicated by public institutions that operate in the territory). This implied that the organization did not necessarily have the capacity to implement a project of a given nature. Prior studies carried out on CSOs in the landscape showed that they weren't a match.

Pillar 2. In relation to the stakeholder engagement strategies, alliances were formed to access the project, not necessarily because organizations had worked together previously. Types of alliance: community organizations whose members happen to be direct beneficiaries; and CSOs who acted as recipients of the funds and worked with beneficiaries from local communities. At the time of the MTR, there is still time to reverse the implementation deficiency in the second half of the Project on a local pilot project level through a pilot project tender for organizations, given the shortcomings among participating organizations and those responsible for the pilot projects. The MTR considers that the implementation criteria and bases should be analyzed prior to the launch of the tender. These criteria

and bases must be: supported by learnings from the project implementation stage and pilot projects I and II; consensually validated with the MMA authorities, establishing specific admission guidelines to organizations that do not have project implementation possibilities and cannot offer guarantees of sustainability. These criteria could be based on previous experiences with the small grants program, specifying on a landscape intervention level the characteristics expected of the organizations that apply to the tender. Sustainability guarantees can be provided by Government Institutions such as INDAP and CONAF through programs and projects (PRODESAL, PDTI, PDI), Municipalities in association with INDAP, NGOs, etc., with a proven track record. For example, it may be possible to further the mechanisms for establishing project presentation through an alliance between organizations with previous experience in the implementation of projects with external financing, and communities in the landscapes, thereby strengthening both through learning in a role of co-implementation with the mentor/catalyst organization. To sustain the project's focus, the tender must ensure compliance with the community-based landscape approach to achieve resilient and sustainable landscapes, ensuring the incorporation of resilience indicators.¹⁵

Project Efficiency:

- ❖ In terms of efficiency, the MTR team considers that resources have not been used satisfactorily. During the first phase of project implementation there was no optimization of human resources or financial resources. The intensity of field work with a central team brought on major expenses that represented a very significant portion of total Project resources, leading to an investment during these first 2 years of almost all resources earmarked for travel expenses and per diems for the entire project implementation. With UNDP support, necessary analyses have been conducted to use these more efficiently.
- ❖ The lack of a strategy for the selection of beneficiary communities and the considerations of the capacities of the selected CSOs, ensuring the cost-effectiveness of LLIs, contribution to project objectives, sustainability of results and long-term impact has led to an inefficient use of the resources poured into CSOs (although only a few already have the resources available for their implementation, none have been able to implement them according to the anticipated operational plans). For this reason, the MTR considers that the methodology of CSO tenders as a means of allocating resources will improve the implementation of the pilot projects (this was a proposal from the Project Team in 2015 to be implemented in 2017, considering that the project installation strategy in its early years required a strong presence on the ground; the SMC Work Plan has evaluated and proposed potential financing mechanisms for this proposal¹⁶).
- ❖ The failure to implement tracking tools as a means for monitoring results, an extremely important aspect for tracking any project, as well as the lack of other monitoring and evaluation systems that would have contributed to efficient management, prevented the Project from examining the efficiency of the tools placed on the ground as a whole, but rather on a case-by-case basis during field visits.
- ❖ Institutional arrangements, brought down to a regional level through engagement with partner institutions to reach CSOs without a functional operating structure, produced major differences between regions and a very high dependence on contacts with beneficiaries provided by other national agencies. Large chunks of time were used for training CSOs and the beneficiaries directly, to achieve a minimum development of the pilot projects.
- ❖ Conflict situations, internal political processes within the Environment Ministry (change of 3 Division Chiefs of Environmental Education and Citizen Participation) and personnel changes

¹⁵ Toolkit for the Indicators of Resilience in Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes.

<file:///F:/PNUD/GEF%20Evaluacion%20Proyecto%20CMS/Doc%20proyecto%20GEF%20CMS/Doc%20Proyecto%20CMS/INF%20PUND%20GEF%20Regional/Toolkit%20indicartors%20of%20resilience/Toolkit-for-Indicators-of-Resilience-in-SEPLs.pdf>

¹⁶ Work Plan for Sustainable Mediterranean Communities Project October 2016 - March 2017

(practically a full turnover between 2016 and 2017) have had a strong negative impact on the project and on the levels of trust among beneficiaries. This has required an important effort to reestablish trust and has had an impact on the project implementation times, which has affected the development and quality of project actions.

- ❖ The “*micro capital*” instrument was defined by UNDP to provide financing within the Project framework. In some cases, local beneficiaries (communities) struggled to understand the “Grant Agreement” document, due to the language and format used, as well as the rigidity of the Capacity Assessment (which required a major effort from the project team for completion in the case of the first pilot projects). It would be useful to facilitate its comprehension through a more accessible guideline and consider technical assistance for its preparation and accountability.
- ❖ There is little clarity regarding co-financing, which affects the efficiency in the use of resources, since this prevents a more effective planning. There is a significant difference between the co-financing resources considered in the PRODOC and those existing at the time of the MTR.

Key results at mid-term.

The key results at mid-term are mostly cross-cutting: Project activities in this first stage have focused on establishing the project through institutional arrangements, such as the SC and to a lesser extent the strengthening of expanded landscape management platforms.

The project is in 5 landscape within the Metropolitan, O'Higgins, Maule, Biobío and Araucanía regions, with different degrees of progress and compliance with milestones: Participatory formulation of a landscape strategy, to date 3 Comprehensive Landscape Management Plans (CLMP) (O'Higgins, Biobío and Araucanía) have been prepared; the development of proposals, review and approval of financing and implementation of projects: 5 Pilot Projects I (3 Araucanía, 1 O'Higgins, 1 Metropolitana) / 3 in preliminary implementation with transfer of funds; and 5 pilot projects II in the preparation stage with community participation (1 Araucanía, 2 Maule, 2 Biobío). Strengthening of community skills and organizational capacity-building are reflected in the participation, development and kickoff of pilot projects I and preparation process for pilot projects II.

4.3. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Management Arrangements (MS)

During the development of the MTR, the management and modality of the implementation and execution agencies of the SMC Project have been analyzed and evaluated, as follows:

1. Project execution is considered **moderately satisfactory (MS)** in terms of effectiveness, taking into account the results achieved so far in the present evaluation.
2. The implementation modality is national with support from UNDP. UNDP supports all administrative and operational processes, but the Environment Ministry (MMA) is responsible for decision-making and implementation. For this reason, changes of key actors have an impact on Project implementation. During the first half of implementation, there have been changes that have had a significant impact on the implementation: three Division Chiefs of Environmental Education and Citizen Participation since the Project's inception, two managers and turnover of practically the entire Project team. A similar situation occurred in the Alto Malleco Model Forest participation platform, resulting in a total team turnover. The Project has a person responsible for the financial management, who remains on the team after the mass team turnover. During the review process for the MTR Final Report, there was a change in the National Project Director.
3. The Project has managed to make progress despite institutional changes and logical lag times in the adaptation of new officials that result from changes in high authorities.

Work planning: (MU)

The Project has a 2015-2019 Multi-annual Plan, which proposes annual activities, expected results, assignment of responsibilities and the budget for each output expected at the end of the project by

result and indicator. The Annual Operating Plan (AOP) agreed upon each year, as well as the annual budget, prepared by the project's technical team in consultation with national authorities from MMA and UNDP, approved by the Project Board.

At the beginning of the 3rd quarter of 2016, a Short-Term Work Plan (October 2016 - March 2017), was prepared, which was approved by the Steering Committee in November 2016. This plan synthesizes the main background information and lessons learned from the project's installation and start-up phase, which describes the framework for a strategic and operational project review. It includes a short-term work plan with lines of action ***to implement the necessary adjustments for furthering the project's progress out to date and generating the conditions for fulfillment of objectives and results.*** The lines of action are: a) anticipate the MTR; b) organize and operationally strengthen the project management team; c) reinforce monitoring and adaptive management of the pilot projects underway; d) give continuity and technically and methodologically strengthen new projects in priority regions; and e) evaluate and design a tender for financing replicable and scalable LLIs in the Mediterranean Ecoregion within the framework of a strengthened EPF. This plan marks a before and after in project implementation, with proposals for the second implementation phase.

Regarding the budget and frequency of activities, Project planning is adjusted with stakeholders responsible for implementation on the ground. However, until now, this system has not been put into practice, and there are concerns about roles and functions of different members.

Due to this, at the time of the MTR, considering implementation of proposed activities, in the Multi-Annual Plan and AOP for 2015 and 2016, based on progress towards results, plus the analysis laid out in the Short-Term Plan, the MTR recognizes the positive contribution of this evaluation and planning instrument during the early implementation phase. Considering the advanced stage of the project, the MTR scores work planning as **moderately unsatisfactory (MU)**.

Financing and co-financing: (MU)

The executing agency (Environment Ministry - MMA) has signed a Grants Agreement based on UNDP standards, establishing obligations and attributes of both parties, with a Project start date of November 6, 2014.

GEF funds are non-reimbursable donations, and the executing agency (MMA) is responsible for the proper use of these resources, as well as fulfillment of the activities committed in the work plan.

The following is a summary of the allocation of financial resources, as initially established in the PRODOC in late 2014 (**Chart 1**). Based on this, the MMA would contribute USD 10,000,000, through the Environmental Protection Fund (EPF) and another USD 2,119,772 in kind. Project Beneficiaries would contribute USD 1,000,000 in cash and another USD 3,000,000 in kind. Finally, UNDP/EU would contribute USD 1,000,000 in cash.

Therefore, almost 75% of the resources (USD 15,311,614) would be cash contributions, of which USD 3,311,614 correspond to GEF co-financing. Beneficiaries and the Chilean government would contribute the remaining 25% (USD 5,119,772) in kind.

Chart 1. Allocation of resources by funding source (in USD, as per PRODOC)

Source of funding	Cash	In kind
GEF	3,311,614.	---
National Government (Environment Ministry: cash EPF)	10,000,000.	2,119,772.
Beneficiaries:	1,000,000.	3,000,000.
UNDP/EU:	1,000,000.	---
Total	15,311,614 (75%).	5,119,772 (25%).

Chart 2 shows a summary of the allocation of GEF financial resources anticipated in the PRODOC, how this has been and the degree of implementation of these, at the end of 2016.

Chart 2. Allocation of GEF resources by key activities and implementation (in USD, 2016 year-end)

Results	Total Budget	Implementation Total (by 2016)	% Implementation
1- Sustainable landscape management for biodiversity conservation	2,479,410.	534,624.50*	21,56
2- Demonstration / promotion of the conservation and improvement of carbon reserves through soil use, change in soil use, and fishing, and local carbon tracking systems.	255,484	15,561.58	6,09
3- Maintenance and improvement in the flow of forestry and agricultural ecosystem services to maintain the livelihood of local communities	166,751	1,598,19	0.96
4- Development of community capacity and knowledge management	-	-	-
5- Monitoring and Evaluation	254,275	55,023.16	21,64
6- Management Unit	157,694	74,193.25	47.05
Total Budget Assigned	3,311,614	681,000.68	20.56

*USD 195,123 in funds signed by the Project, implemented with micro-grants are declared (although at the time of the MTR, not all quotas have been delivered), which do not correspond to Environment Ministry co-financing, since they are part of GEF funds.

In financial terms, the MTR considers that budget implementation regarding the achievement of the expected results is **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MI)**.

Chart 3 shows co-financing, in kind and in cash, made by each counterpart, at the end of 2016.

Chart 3. Cofinancing (in USD)

Source of funding	Co-financing (as per PRODOC)	Implemented at 2016 year end	% of Implementation
Environment Ministry (through EPF)	10,000,000	No contributions*	--
Environment Ministry (in kind)	2,119,772	43,477	2.05
Beneficiaries (in cash)	1,000,000	No data	--
Beneficiaries (in kind)	3,000,000	221,906	7.40
UNDP/EU:	1,000,000	No commitment	--
TOTAL	17,119,772	265,383	1.55

In terms of planned co-financing in cash through EPF, as established in the PRODOC, the MMA has not yet made any contribution, and in-kind contributions have been restricted to staff fees (particularly Project Management). Beneficiaries have also contributed exclusively in kind, apart from co-financing.

Likewise, contributions from UNDP/EU were finally not committed or delivered to the Project, due to time delays. It was not possible to channel synergies with other government organizations beyond sharing work experiences on the ground and participating in meetings related to the tender design for 2015.

In summary, by 2016 the Project had made a disbursement for LLI management of USD 237,543, corresponding to the amount committed by the GEF Project for financing pilots I, of which, in 2016 USD 195,123 was paid (disbursed), leaving USD 42,413 for 2017, although with little implementation.

Financing at the time of the MTR has been implemented in the pilot projects in the Region of Araucanía, in keeping with Component 3 Maintenance and improvement of the flow of forest and agro-ecosystem services, Output 3.1.1. Sustainable soil management practices and Output 3.2.1 Rehabilitation of degraded agricultural land

Finally, considering the commitment at the beginning of the Project (in the PRODOC), it is necessary to revise co-financing, generate a concrete record of the contributions and use of funds, and make an additional effort to mobilize the resources initially committed as co-financing by the MMA.

Project Review and Monitoring: (I)

The project has been monitored through Quarterly Reports (Quarter Programme Report Q, which are activity reports rather than reviews), prepared by the Project team, which has satisfactorily measured compliance with the AOP for 2015 and 2016.

The Project team prepared the PIR (Project Implementation Review) in June 2016. This review reports on project progress and issues that need addressing.

Another mechanism for tracking activities and investment was carried out by the Project Team in the pilot projects, in conjunction with the Participation Platform where the project is being implemented.¹⁷

Financial monitoring and registration are carried out daily by the Project's administration and finance officer, with joint evaluation from UNDP through the UNDP ATLAS Financial Project Management system. Project monitoring and evaluation are ongoing as are disbursements to pilot projects. Financial management information that supports decision-making, especially during the second phase of project information.

Although it is not a monitoring and evaluation instrument the Short-Term Plan has made a contribution to the evaluation of progress towards results. Likewise, based on UNDP's monitoring and evaluation policy, a tracking visit was held in April 2016.¹⁸ It analyzed progress in the implementation of the defined work plans, as well as the appropriateness of the implementation strategy adopted to identify obstacles and learnings that could result in strategy adjustments.

At the date of the MTR, the monitoring and tracking team included only one person and was undergoing the interview process for the second professional with a social profile to expand and enhance the team's capabilities. The evaluation of the pilot experiences and interviews, showed that this unit is more focused on the development and implementation of pilot projects I and II than on monitoring and evaluation. The Project has complied with the provision of monitoring instruments and evaluation instruments for tracking and finances, but with little reaction in managing the results of the 2016 PIR, coinciding more with changes in Management and generation of the Short-Term Plan.

Therefore, the MTR has scored the Monitoring and Evaluation carried out by the SMC Project as **Unsatisfactory (U)** with respect to its purpose.

Stakeholder Participation: (MS)

In this dimension, the adaptation and transformation process has been evaluated based on the outputs generated by the Project. This has considered the participation of stakeholders in implementation and their appropriation of the Project, and the effectiveness of the results achieved and sustainability. Two pillars were assessed: 1) The nature of each organization; and 2) The interaction strategies for each stakeholder in each pilot project. This MTR has scored the participation of stakeholders as **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**.

In general, alliances were formed to access the Project, not necessarily because organizations had worked together previously. In a number of cases, civil society organizations were sought who had

¹⁷ For example: Model Forest.

¹⁸ The UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Unit was made up of Marta Cózar (Monitoring and Evaluation Officer) and Manuela Abasolo (Monitoring and Evaluation Professional).

members who were direct beneficiaries of proposed projects, such as the pre-existing senior citizen committees, who could also collaborate with the project. This leads to sustainability problems, given the age of beneficiaries (a form of demographic sustainability), and the renewal of authorities that may lead these organizations to have authorities who are not potential beneficiaries of the Project, in addition to the risk of using individual lands for collective activities that correspond to senior citizens.

The Project Strategy proposed in the PRODOC can be seen in its application with milestones in the pilot experience in the districts of Ránquil, Quillón and Florida in the Biobío Region, Cayumanque Ecosystem Landscape. This shows extensive landscape community participation, where a participatory CLMP has been developed, scored as an excellent model that shows a real strategic landscape management proposal and the creation of the Association of Sustainable Landscape Development in progress. This pilot experience involves risks based on the experience of national associative management. However, clarifying that it is pilot II, in the development stage and that it still has to put into practice MSPLM, CLMP and pilot project management, as well as the legal constitution and operation of the association, the MTR sees that the Project must track milestones, learnings, evaluation of costs, risks and a project exit strategy that supports sustainability. The focus should be on the demand for mentoring in this pilot experience in relation to the whole Project, the cost effectiveness of the initiative (budget, timeline, outputs and results) and the real self-management capacity of the model being created, looking to the feasibility of replication, sustainability and social, economic and environmental resilience. This should be in comparison to other pilots.

Regarding CSOs, who act as direct receptors of project funds and work with beneficiaries, different models were examined, with individual and public-sector beneficiaries (such as schools), who have greater potential sustainability but step away from the project's original definition of beneficiaries. In some cases, they fill the role of professional support. Regarding “communal organizations,” who implement projects directly on their collective land, the only case contacted was facing significant internal difficulties in its implementation.

Report and Communication (MU)

At the time of the MTR, the SMC Project has not yet established a solid communications strategy towards an external institutional audience, and it had not yet been able to structure a blueprint for the flow of information for key stakeholders to fully understand the Project.

Although communication tools are available for Project visibility, they are restricted to a specific target audience who are accustomed to their use. Although this aspect has not been measured, it is assumed that they do not have an impact on the target population to generate the changes of behaviors and practices sought in the landscapes. Due to this, the MTR considers that in terms of communication and outreach, management has been **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**.

The overall evaluation of Project implementation and adaptive management is **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** considering that it has not met most of the activities planned to reach expected results.

4.4. SUSTAINABILITY

MTR development sought to evaluate Project sustainability in relation to results and achievements, through the analysis of financial, economic, institutional and governance risks.

Financial Risks to sustainability

Financial hypotheses of the SMC Project to ensure sustainability: i) This will be achieved by increasing support from decision-makers and potential sponsors of established operational and financing mechanisms; and ii) Effectiveness will be provided by monitoring finance, operations, capacity-building, to understand the mechanism, agreements, identification of funding sources and development of mechanisms to increase support and provide new opportunities, as well as inclusion of other financial stakeholders (public and private).

What is the probability that the financial-economic resources are not available once GEF funds have all been delivered?	Moderately Probable (MP)
Do financial and economic resources come from multiple sources?	<i>Partially</i>
Are these adequate and sufficient for maintaining Project results?	<i>Partially</i>

Socio-economic Risks to sustainability

Socio-economic hypotheses of the SMC Project to ensure sustainability: i) This will be achieved through the generation of social capital, building the capacities of civil society organizations and networks to participate in landscape-level planning and management, as well as in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of community projects; and ii) This will be achieved through the development, implementation and local community participatory monitoring of the Multi-stakeholder Platforms for Landscape Management (MSPLM).

Are there social or political risks that could jeopardize the sustainability of results?	Moderately Probable (MP)
What is the risk that the counterpart appropriation level (including the appropriation of governments and other key counterparts) is insufficient to achieve results and maintain benefits over time?	
Do the diverse key counterparts see that it is in their own interest for Project benefits to continue?	<i>Partially</i>
Is there enough public advocacy and advocacy from counterparts who support the Project's long-term objectives?	<i>Insufficient</i>
Are the lessons learned continually documented and shared by the Project Team; and appropriately transferred to the counterparts so that they can learn from the Project and potentially replicate and/or expand it in the future?	<i>Insufficient</i>

Institutional framework and Governance for sustainability

Institutional and Governance Hypotheses for the SMC Project to ensure sustainability: i) This will be achieved through improved coordination, EPF, capacity building for implementation of sustainable soil management measures by participating ministries and organizations (contribution of each component); ii) Knowledge management and the evaluation and monitoring system will be support tools for decision-making and setting priorities, institutional planning and implementation; iii) Activities in the pilot landscapes will be a source of knowledge for organizations and staff of key institutions, and for generating best practices; and iv) The ability to finance these activities will be complemented and strengthened through new budget allocations, by proposing a recognized and transparent procedure based on a formal standard, which can accommodate new initiatives (the Project provides a comprehensive and permanent replication).

Can the political, legal, financial and structural governance frameworks jeopardize the terms and conditions to obtain Project benefits?	Moderately Probable (MP)
Are the necessary systems and mechanisms being adequately implemented for accountability, transparency and transfer of technical know-how?	<i>Partially</i>

Environmental Risks for sustainability

The objective of the Project is to make a relevant contribution to environmental sustainability as one the components, promoting community capacity-building, implementing cost-effective activities, and encouraging public and private investment.

Environmental Hypotheses of the SMC Project for sustainability: i) The sustainability of results is (to a large extent) determined by the incorporation of economic incentives where possible into community proposals (regional scale); ii) Small producers (local scale) receive an economic benefit in the short and longer term by adopting new practices, through small grants for the incorporation of new sustainable practices; iii) Training and hands-on learning; and iv) Effective monitoring and evaluation is established through a process that is adapted to management, which includes the exchange of experiences and learnings in the landscape and nationally.

Is there any environmental risk that could jeopardize Project results?	Moderately Improbable (MI)
--	-----------------------------------

However, there are environmental risks associated with forest fires in the ecoregion. These are cited in the PRODOC as localized and immediate threats. Apparently the most drastic, this threat could cover the largest proportion of quantifiable losses in a given area, but it is unlikely to be the greatest threat in the ecoregion. The project will work to carry out activities in pilot sites to adopt practices such as suppression or prevention of forest fires, reforestation, restoration and improvement in land use planning. Considering the threat of fire, it is advisable to include a fire risk management plan, with the support and expertise of CONAF.

Sustainability is considered to be **Moderately Probable (MP)** for actions initiated by the SMC Project to be continued once the project is completed.

4.5. LESSONS LEARNED:

Project sustainability considers that lessons learned should be documented and shared by the Project Team, and once systematized, should be transferred to the appropriate counterparts so that they can learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or extend their benefits in the future.

Therefore, the following are recommended for the second half of the Project:

- i) Evaluate how lessons learned from the adaptive management process have been documented;
- ii) Define a strategy to incorporate these, when appropriate, into the strategy and management for the second part of the Project, and a strategy for sharing these with the Project's key stakeholders and partners;
- iii) Define the communication and outreach strategy with other stakeholders.

Based on a review of the information available, which includes the analysis conducted by UNDP in June 2016, also reported in the October 2016 to March 2017 Short-term Plan, and the meetings held with key Project stakeholders, the following lessons learned have been documented.

The main lessons learned from the initial LLI pilot stage involve five general aspects:

a) Methodological criteria and approaches:

- * An **adaptive management** applied to different workplaces is fundamental, with solutions to the varying challenges in each of these. In terms of governance, the flexibility of models applied teaches that the Project was not restrained by the application of a single governance model, but was opened and adapted from experience. However, a comparative systematization of these experiences is required for review when issuing a call to organizations.
- * The installation of the financing process and actions should consider **methodological criteria and approaches** that are common to the entire ecoregion in terms of Project objectives and scope (biodiversity conservation, carbon capture and degraded soil reclaim). But they must also be flexible to the different realities and adapted to the dynamics of each landscape. For example, in

the identification of LLIs: i) Productive landscapes inserted in priority sites for the conservation of biodiversity; ii) Productive landscapes in areas with fragmented or degraded remaining ecosystems; iii) Productive landscapes in areas degraded by poor agricultural and forestry practices; and iv) Productive landscapes with the existence of small agricultural or forestry producer organizations as a core group for the landscape management platform.

- * The role of **Pilot Areas** is of utmost importance. The methodological selection criteria for the areas to incorporate into national programs should be systematized as a result of the evaluation of the pilot experiences, establishing how to put replicability guidelines in practice.
- * The **time** required by the processes in the pilot experiences must be carefully controlled, **prolonged delays** have a significant negative effect on those involved, leading to mistrust and jeopardizing the sustainability of the actions, in addition to the negative impact on cost effectiveness and budget allocation per result. A key lesson is the importance of completing Management Plans immediately after the participatory processes.

b) Stakeholder participation and involvement:

- * It has been observed that the participation of the different stakeholders and their involvement has been varied. In this sense, the effort needed to achieve acceptable levels of participation and involvement implies a revision of the Project implementation mode on the ground, at least regarding the **number of regions** where it will work and the **availability of Project Team professionals** in the regions.
- * It is essential that the participatory process be guided by a strategy and a road map to follow, allowing the Project and participants to know from the outset the purpose of their participation, the role they play, the actions to be carried out and above all, the specific goals and outputs expected from their participation. This strategy follows a **process of continuous adjustment** to the Project's participation and governance process (and in this case to compliance with the project approach, which is community participation and governance to achieve sustainable landscapes). The **systematization of learnings** through participation, governance and mechanisms established by the Project is an opportunity to be initiated soon after the MTR conclusion, to incorporate learnings into project management during the second stage.
- * Participation of **civil society and its organizations** is important in different Project instances. Sustainable management modes are established in such a way that, insofar as they manage to generate an institutional tradition (even in relatively new entities, with less than a decade of existence), it allows them to absorb impacts from leadership changes and continue a line of work that is consistent with community needs.
- * The role of the **private sector** should be taken into account. When addressing issues of biodiversity in a landscape where land is privately owned, **local spaces for coordination** between small producers and major corporations who interact in the same landscape are fundamental. These alliances must be supported and must have **spaces for engagement** to contribute to Project implementation.
- * The **educational institutions** involved in the projects ensure changes in awareness and advocacy in **young people** and, through them, have an impact on the family. A lesson learned was that key local stakeholders should be identified for the establishment of pilot experiences with educational institutions, generating a specific line of intervention to the extent possible, taking care to inform the educational community about its implications.
- * Investing in **organizational capacity building** allows the generating of leaders trained in project language and principles of conservation that are harmonious with productive criteria. This encourages a **qualified participation** in the design of the strategies and an informed mentoring with implementers in each part of the project cycle.

c) Work demands on a landscape level:

- * Work demands on **landscape level** need to be systematically addressed during project implementation, since it is not a commonly applied approach (by public institutions or by producer groups and local organizations).
- * This involves reviewing the landscape-level management installation process through the use of **communities of practice**, the transfer of **lessons learned** from successful experiences, and the strengthening of **inter-institutional management capacities** in the intervention scenarios in the ecoregion.

d) The process logic and linkage to environmental institutionalality:

- * The Project seeks to obtain results and respond to specific impacts through implementation of actions (in the short term). However, special emphasis should be placed on the project strategy as a **process** whose purpose is to install a **medium- and long-term public policy**, linked to **institutionality and traditional and economic environmental management instruments**. This generates and guarantees the conditions for future sustainability and positioning of the leadership of the Environment Ministry (MMA) in the sustainable management of productive landscapes.
- * The role of **decentralized governments** and decentralized teams at the national level is key to achieving results. Projects with a national scope improve their ability to achieve goals as regional government stakeholders succeed in establishing cooperation mechanisms at the landscape level. The lack of this cooperation implies a loss of technical capacities installed at local levels and functions that are hard to fill at a centralized government level.
- * An adequate **social communication** should be placed at the service of the Project. By generating a new institutionalality, there must be at least a basic understanding among all interested parties.

e) Project design, goals and results indicators and implementation strategy:

- * **The relevance and coherence of project design** in aspects of strategy, goal and indicators, in relation to its real capacities and possibilities to carry out actions and reach goals, is a significant learning. This aspect requires an in-depth **feasibility analysis** before making the decision to further its implementation; failing this, it becomes a gamble, with risks and limitations to achievement of results, which can be seen in the present Project. The MTR recommendation to **review and adapt** the design in terms of relevance, goals and indicators is a measure resulting from the evaluation, which is also a lesson learned that could benefit the design of future UNDP-GEF / FMMA projects.
- * The early existence of an **operating strategy and Project Team coordination and management** for Project implementation, validated by the parties, prior to implementation is a fundamental lesson in meaningful management. Their absence or lack of clarity does not support progress towards results, favoring the de-targeting of actions, jeopardizing cost effectiveness, a situation evidenced in this Project. This learning applies to the operation of Project Management Mechanisms.
- * The application of a robust monitoring and evaluation strategy, from the outset and on an ongoing basis, supports adaptive management and progress towards expected results. This learning involves Project implementation and tracking, in aspects regarding the quality of its implementation, and it must be rigorous in the existence, scope, focus and management of M&E instruments, as well as in the capacities of the Project Team performance.
- * The incorporation of **project outputs** at different levels of government must be ensured. When the tools developed by a program are accepted and internalized by national, regional and local authorities, a central part of **project sustainability** is secured, although its long-term use can be revised in the future.
- * The existence of a permanent **communication and outreach strategy** and **exit strategy** considered from the outset are useful measures that should be addressed by the Project immediately and after the MTR.

- * Another lesson corroborated during the MTR is the need to strengthen the risk focus applied to management in the project design, results- and sustainability-oriented progress, above all in this type of UNDP-GEF / Environment Ministry project.

5- CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. CONCLUSIONS

On a design level: The current form of addressing landscape problems has been insufficient on a project installation level. The Project PRODOC is pertinent and relevant in the presentation of problems that it wants to address, in the hypotheses and barriers identified, although the MTR identified other hypotheses addressed in this report that affect progress towards results. The design is in line with national policies and actions and international commitments to biodiversity, climate change and soil degradation. However, it aims to address the solution of sustainable landscape development through institutional arrangements that require political commitment and volition. This is a premise or hypothesis that requires time, consistency and persistence in management, driven by a comprehensive management strategy and robust project oversight, both areas that show manifest weakness. The existing hypotheses and risks hinder progress toward results; and these need to be addressed by the Project Team, adjusting the management strategy in the second half of the Project.

Regarding the Project's Logical Framework, the goals and indicators of the objective and results are measurable, albeit ambitious, and not very realistic in accordance with Project capabilities, exceeding the possibilities of its scope. The achievement of the goals is based on the hypothesis of change in the capacities of the CSOs, in the institutional management engaged through the MSPLM, without estimating the actual Project capacities and timelines, in addition to national and institutional causes and weaknesses in resources (human, financial and temporary) to achieve the goal and results of the PRODOC.

On an effectiveness level: Project design proposes a Project Strategy, consisting of the theoretical stages proposed in the PRODOC. However, the gradual approach with concrete milestones centered around the idea that the community organizations, once trained and with solid support and mentoring, can be responsible for achieving resilient and sustainable landscapes, in the case of this Project, exceeds its potential, restricting the achievement of results. Between the Project Strategy and Project implementation, the gap lies in an inadequate and absent comprehensive operating strategy and a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) strategy based on the achievement of results, which supports engaged implementation, allows progress in the four components or areas of action, by landscape, by landscape level initiative, and in turn generates learning and good practices.

The results of the project are not what was expected at the time of the MTR, neither in the selection of organizations or the landscape-level implementation; and there doesn't seem to be a connection between the projects and the Project's environmental objectives. This has generated a major difference between the expected results and the resources invested, beyond what the MTR had anticipated in advance.

On an efficiency level: The Project has not been able to move significant project resources, having targeted most of the resources towards contact with communities to explain the Project, conduct trainings, select organizations and oversee decision-making, but not for overall pilot project implementation.

As committed at the outset of the Project, this review concludes that co-financing needs to be reviewed; and it also needs a concrete and detailed account of contributions and their use.

The selection of participating communities, their management capacities, the territorial dispersion of initiatives, the apparent lack of operating strategy applied by the previous Project Team and the Project's capacity to address these needs, as well as the participatory development of pilot projects are as the main causes that have limited Project efficiency.

The Project has produced three participatory CLMPs, with different quality in the shape and scope represented in the areas addressed among them. This is detrimental to Project management and goals, as well as the management of the respective MSPLMs and impact as a management instrument.

The design of “pilot projects” follows a similar format, with no baseline for an actual evaluation of results (evaluation considering the state before and after intervention). The Project still has time to assess this situation, identify and document this lesson learned and use the result for the new project stage. More than showing the number of projects per area associated with results and indicators, it needs to establish gaps and focus the project tender.

Project management in the MMA has helped to strengthen the multi-stakeholder approach to local and community participation for environmental sustainability, reflected in the Sustainable Project Tender. This is an action that will support the investment of the institutional contribution and synergy with the SMC project in this second stage of the project, focused on project tender and, until the EPF 2.0 goal, as a micro financing mechanism. However, it remains unclear what the strategy with measurable actions will be for EPF 2.0 strengthening proposed by the National Manager in accordance with the National Director, as part of the management strategy in the second stage of the Project.

According to the co-financing report, there is a synergy between the SMC Project and the Local Environmental Management (LEM) Tender, considering the framework and purpose in line with the Project's goals and initiatives. The Project together with the MMA/EPF must propose the evaluation of the first year of the LEM (2017) tender, to contribute to the LLI tender of the Project and the second year to favor synergies.

The change in the Project Team and in the National Director proposes to improve management, which demands an active effort by the parties in this second stage to improve strategic project management and ensure progress towards the achievement of results. With an ambitious Logical Framework, together with an inadequate operating strategy, its adjustment by the Project Team, accompanied and validated by the UNDP GEF Team, will undoubtedly improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Project in the second half of its implementation.

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E): There is no M&E system in place at the Project level. Field visits are an opportunity for tracking beneficiaries, but these are not systematized. Therefore, there are no data records that could be used in tracking tools. To date no instruments have been developed, a situation that should be corrected.

The lack of tracking tools and general baselines at the level of the logical framework and pilot projects will make it difficult to measure both the results and real social, economic and environmental resilience. The monitoring system is based on the activities report and financial statements rather than monitoring and ongoing evaluation focused on progress toward results. The management of M&E needs to be improved.

The Project provides an evaluation of management and progress toward results in the PIR and in the UNDP April 2016 tracking visit report. Although the latter is not a review, it confirms the weaknesses in monitoring such as the need for mechanisms for analysis, evaluation and stronger management. The reports issued every four months contain information about activities that could be used for M&E, through evaluation and reporting on progress toward fulfilling the goals and indicators proposed in the POA for the period (% of progress during the period). If necessary, they could also contain suggestions for improving management in the coming period. This improvement measure should be replicated in the M&E of financing.

Regardless of why there are no tracking tools, the effort to implement them is viewed as a measure that will help to focus management and M&E in this second stage of the Project. The project team responsible for M&E demonstrates weakness in this area of management, as mentioned in the findings. It is therefore necessary to bolster and focus the duties of the professionals who serve in this role in relation to managing monitoring instruments based on achieving results.

Involvement of key stakeholders Communities and community organizations are involved in the Project, participating through pilot projects I and II. However, this is not the case at the MSPLM level, because current operations do not appear to be included in a work plan with a broader scope; there are no plans to develop a strategy for incorporation into levels of decision making.

The key institutional stakeholders have not been involved to the extent expected in the PRODOC. They have supported implementation of the project in the landscape but have not provided financial or institutional resources to consolidate it. Perhaps this is due to the lack of a strategy and adequate management of the Project, which would increase their participation and support through a specific, realistic and feasible proposal for their involvement.

The Project Steering Committee (SC) has met and made decisions on a macro level; for example, it suggested considering national processes (such as decentralization and deconcentration to further the landscape approach in communities). Although it has been determined that there is a need to hold working meetings to ground the concepts and proposals within an approach shared by all of the institutions involved, this action has yet to be put into practice. One positive development is the proposal to review development instruments requested by the communities but currently not being implemented, in order to orient the innovation proposals offered by the government for the thematic areas of the GEF SMC. Another interesting agreement and one that may be positive for the project is the call for a working meeting with other GEF projects being implemented to understand their components and identify opportunities for linkages between the GEF Focal Point/Environment Ministry and the Project team.

The SC plays a key role in the strategy of incorporating other institutions during implementation of the project, as well as in managing other financing mechanisms. However, the responsibilities of each stakeholder are unclear. In addition, there has been no progress in coordinating the use of own financial instruments with other collaborating institutions to support landscape-level initiatives. Work has been done in the landscape but it is difficult to forge links at the institutional level.

The SC does not have a strategy or work plan that engages national institutional management with institutional work in the landscape (MSPLM) that incorporates the CLMPs and pilot projects as instruments and areas of focus of the public sector, which would provide sustainability and synergy at the landscape level. The failure to create a Landscape Advisory Board for the Mediterranean Ecoregion (CATEM) is evidence of the lack of an appropriate technical linkage entity with knowledge of strategic landscape priorities among the SC, local institutional stakeholders and the communities (MSPLM) that would promote management of the Project. Overcoming this will be key in the second stage, especially in the project LLI tender process and focusing.

One landscape stakeholder included in the PRODOC and which would promote management of the Project is the "Model Forest" platforms. According to the MTR, these platforms have served as links that support project implementation, but they have not achieved as much as expected. The same has occurred with the Alhué Agricultural Community. The Project must strengthen the operating strategy of these platforms through a results-based work and monitoring plan. This will ensure that their actions do more than implement pilot projects but also boost participation of key landscape stakeholders, sustainability and resilience. These instruments should be linked to the SC strategy.

Decision-making mechanisms in place for landscape operations have been transparent and appropriate. These have been designated in all of the landscapes with a relevance criterion; all were applicable and the decisions were well-founded. However, it would be helpful to document this process.

Civil society stakeholders have a high degree of involvement in Project activities, but very low capacity to collaborate on obtaining results.

Administration and finance: The project has one professional who is highly qualified in administration and finance who can advise the projects in relation to financial and risk management, as well as investment planning. This comparative advantage should be utilized to correct and expand on the current role of financial accounting. However, in its activities and progress toward results, the project

has not shown cost-efficiency, with weak management of that aspect. This may be explained by the lack of an adequate operating strategy during the first stage of the project.

To date, there has been no reliable accounting of in-kind contributions from CSOs/NGOs and government agencies and no back-up has been provided for financial contributions that were expected in the form of co-financing from any of the key stakeholders.

The project shows few disbursements and limited implementation of resources at the pilot project level, a limited capacity for community management and dubious levels of mentoring provided by the landscape participation platforms (MSPLM).

Sustainability: The strategy proposed by the Project design (PRODOC) implies that the Landscape-Level Initiatives (LLI) would be based on the “pilot projects” (several currently in development in different scenarios/landscapes) through partner platforms (known as Multi-Stakeholder Platforms for Landscape Management or MSPLM) within the framework of the “Model Forests and Conservation Landscape”.

The knowledge and lessons generated in these early initiatives (pilot projects) were expected to provide the basis for defining the strategy (or strategies) with the rest of the LLIs to be implemented in the Mediterranean ecoregion of Chile. However, as of the date of this MTR (March 2017) the main challenges of the SMC Project that have yet to be resolved with respect to capitalizing on lessons that have arisen (or should arise) during the first half of the execution, in order to achieve the results and sustainability, are as follows: i) How to document and systematize the lessons generated by the pilot projects; ii) How to move from these (local) interventions to developing initiatives “at the landscape level and with a sustainable development approach”. In other words, scaling from the level of pilot projects begun in the first half of the SMC Project to Landscape-Level Initiatives (LLI) to progress toward collaborative work among the public and private sectors; and iii) How to ensure that other institutional partners (local, regional and national; public and private) contribute their own financing instruments and technical assistance.

In addition, with respect to the pilot projects: While there is consensus that the ideas for the initiatives to be financed were identified within the planning process and through a large number of participatory workshops in the territories, there is still no information about the social and biophysical baseline. This is a disadvantage for documenting and systematizing progress in the landscapes and for planning the objectives and roles of local partners in the second half of the SMC Project.

There are possibilities for reversing, in the second half of the SMC Project, the deficiencies in execution at the project level (with more than USD 1 million combined) through a pilot project tender. However, the technical and economic considerations of the tender, the conditions for implementation and the inadequacies at the level of organizations and projects, as well as the implementation team itself and the lack of functioning of the MSPLM and establishment of the CATEM, should be analyzed before launching the tender. Agreement on the tender should also be sought from the Environment Ministry and UNDP Chile.

With respect to appropriation, the SMC Project has been implemented to a great extent at the landscape level, at least at the sites of pilot projects begun or being executed during the first half of the Project (local scale). This will undoubtedly contribute to the sustainability of these initiatives in their respective landscapes. Most of the partners have shown, and continue to show, interest in and motivation for participating in the SMC Project. As of the date of the MTR, information about their contributions to the pilot projects (type of contribution) and the amount of those contributions (magnitude/scale) has not been well documented or systematized. It is unclear whether the Project has effectively been implemented among the regional and national partner institutions (MSPLM and SC) and whether there is a strong commitment from the partners to contribute financial resources to the future sustainability of the Project results. Nor is there clarity about the potential for continuity of Landscape-Level Initiatives (LLI) beyond the Project closure horizon.

Future threats: During this MTR the following future threats were identified: i) Lack of clear functional boundaries among the different levels of government, in addition to a certain resistance to change by policy makers; ii) Insufficient capacity for internal and external management among CSOs with respect

to execution and operation of the pilot projects and specifically in forging local linkages; iii) The lack of an inter-institutional network to coordinate actions to benefit the environment and safeguard the socio-environmental integrity of the intervention. This increases the risk that the work of this project will not be continued, even though deposits were made to the accounts of the organizations; iv) The permanence of cultural patterns that promote discrimination against women and indigenous peoples with regard to leadership and participation; v) Beneficiary groups that are aging and cannot sustain the project over time, as well as potential problems related to inheritance rights to collective enterprises on individual property and potential conflicts among the local communities involved in the pilot projects that result in abandonment of those projects; vi) A change in government, institutional direction, prioritizing of policies and strategic focus. vii) Environmental risks or socio-natural disasters, such as fires, snowstorms, droughts, plagues.

5.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents the recommendations of the MTR evaluation team, with a focus on suggestions for critical interventions, specific interventions aimed at results and the dimensions of implementation/management and sustainability, as well as a set of corrective actions for Project design, implementation and M&E. In addition, there are actions for tracking and reinforcing the initial benefits and recommendations for the future that will strengthen and emphasize the main objectives of the project.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE SMC PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Before sharing the recommendations, the MTR team believes it is necessary to present a synthesis of the SMART evaluation and the recommendations specific to the logical framework (which are summarized in recommendation 1 regarding the results) (Table 3). The details of the evaluation, the reasoning and the measures suggested for addressing adjustment of goals and indicators for the objective and each of the results may be found in **Annex XIII**.

TABLE 3. Synthesis of SMART evaluation of SMC Project logical framework

Project Strategy	Indicator	Goal	Specific	Measurable	Feasible	Realistic	Time	General technical recommendation (recommendation details, Annex VIII)
Objective	1	1	No	With difficulty	With difficulty	Not very realistic	Not applicable	1. Establish consistency with goal and indicate this. 2. Reduce the scope of the goal and indicator.
	2	2	No	With adjustment	With adjustment	Medium	Medium applicability	1. Establish consistency with goal and indicate this in the scope.
	3	3	Yes	Goal: difficult. Indicator: yes	With difficulty	Not very realistic	Not applicable	1. Establish consistency between the indicator and scope of the goal.
	4	4	Goal: No	Goal: difficult. Indicator: yes	Yes, with adjustment	Medium	Not applicable	1. Redefine and reduce the scope of the goal and indicator. 2. Strengthen strategy based on result. 3. Expand generation of projects.
Result 1.	1.a) and c)	1	Yes	Yes	With	No	No	1. Reduce the scope of the goal and indicator.
	1.b)							1. Evaluate wording of indicator scope.
	2	2	Yes	Yes	With difficulty	No	Not applicable	1. Adjust the consistency between the goal and indicator for better measurement and achievement. 2. Modify the scope of the goal. 3. Creation of a pilot experience is recommended.
	2.1	2.1	Yes, but not consistent	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1. Adjust for consistency between goal and indicator. 2. Strengthen the indicator in relation to impact on skills transfer established in the result. 3. Promote pilot experiences with linked inter-institutional management.
Result 2.	2.2	2.2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, with adaptation	Goal and indicator are consistent, but need to evaluate adjustment depending on actual project capacity.
	3.1	3.1	Not consistent, few specifics	Yes	Difficult	No	Not applicable	1. Modify the scope of the goal and indicator to fit the actual capacity of the project.
Result 3	3.2	3.2	Yes, coherent and specific	Yes	Difficult	Goal: no	Not applicable	1. The recommendation is to adjust the scope of the goal and indicator to fit the actual capacity of the project.
	4.1	4.1	Highly specific, no consistency	Yes	No	No	Not applicable	1. The recommendation is to adjust the scope of the goal and indicator to fit the actual capacity of the project.
Result 4	4.2	7						1. The recommendation is to evaluate the goal and indicator; it's not clear whether there is a goal. 2. Establish a quantitative indicator that reflects dissemination.

Table 4 shows the recommendations generated by the MTR, following the considerations in the MTR Guidance for this section. The recommendations are presented in an operative format –characterized as specific, measurable, feasible and realistic– to be addressed in strengthening the Project.

TABLE 4. KEY RECOMMENDATIONS BY RESULT, ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY¹⁹.

N-	RECOMMENDATIONS	ENTITY RESPONSIBLE
OBJECTIVE AND RESULTS		
1	Adjust, validate and manage approval of the logical framework, adapting the indicators of the objective and the results to realistically reflect what the project can feasibly achieve in terms of the specific MTR recommendations (Table 3 and Annex XII).	Project Manager Project Board. RTA UNDP
PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.		
2	Complete the first stage of the Project, with implementation and systematization of lessons learned from pilot projects I and II, the SC, the MSPLM, as well as the Communities of Practice.	Project Board
3.	Collect, integrate and disseminate lessons learned from the first phase of the project on technical aspects, operational aspects (processes, time, cost-efficiency) and financial aspects as well as comparative analysis of landscape experiences and pilot projects. This	Project Manager UNDP Chile RTA UNDP

¹⁹ Based on the Guidance for conducting midterm reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects. See: UNDP-GEF, “Annex 10 Recommendations Table”. 2014. Guidance for conducting midterm reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects; http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf; and Annex J. Table of recommendations (p. 35) for the Terms of Reference of Project No. 88249, “Support for civil society and community initiatives to generate global environmental benefits through subsidies and microcredit (Environment Ministry / UNDP-GEF Sustainable Mediterranean Communities Project)”.

	occurs after development of a framework for systematizing the lessons learned, in addition to a road map for dissemination and incorporating the result into management of the 2nd stage of the Project.	
4.	Prepare, validate and put into practice an implementation strategy for the 2nd stage of the Project that is effective and efficient and consistent with the logical framework and adjusted work plan to ensure achievement of results. It should include the introduction of a project tender model for predetermined eligibility areas and a risk management strategy to deal with identified threats, Project exit and sustainability of results. This recommendation entails evaluation and consideration of an extension period for the Project for closure and exit.	Project Manager Project Director Project Board
5.	Prepare, validate and implement a management strategy with a work plan for the Steering Committee that strengthens and expands participation, puts into practice the institutional contribution to achieving the Project objectives (investment and co-financing) and ensures sustainability of the project results given the risks identified.	Project Manager Project Director Project Board
6.	Prepare, validate and implement a management strategy with a general work plan for MSPLMs, as well as strategies specific to each landscape, to expand and strengthen public-private participation and achieve landscape objectives and implementation of the CLMP. This strategy assesses and considers implementation of the CATEM in supporting the roll-out of the project tender, if applicable.	Project Manager Project Director Project Board
7.	Strengthen the strategies (recommendations 4, 5 and 6) with the following approaches: landscape, governance, expanded participation, gender, indigenous issues, resilience and sustainability; makes them robust with a monitoring and evaluation mechanism to ensure progress and achievement of results.	Project Manager UNDP Chile
8.	Prepare and implement a communication and outreach strategy that reinforces the approaches, strengthens management and achievement of results and raises Project visibility. The strategy should be effective and adapted to the reality and scope of possibilities of the Project, to increase the participation of civil society and national and regional government institutions that are involved.	Project Manager UNDP Chile
9.	Strengthen the operations strategy of the Project's monitoring and evaluation mechanism and management of the Project Team in this area, in order to ensure effective financial management, achievement of activities, adaptive management, progress and achievement of results. Through the addition of specialized staff and creating a stronger strategy for and management of M&E instruments for making timely and pertinent decisions: establish a project tracking tool, with introduction of the tracking tools scheme occurring in phase I and II projects and in new projects resulting from the tender; focus on QPR in the evaluation, identifying the % of progress and proposals for adaptive management measures; strengthen support from UNDP Chile by shortening the focused monitoring visits in accordance with the QPR until project operation is stabilized; increase the team's monitoring capacity and focus the M&E of progress (% of progress) from the POA based on achieving goals.	Project Manager Monitoring and Evaluation and Finance Professionals UNDP Chile RTA UNDP
10	Improve management of the project team: i) Strengthen the Terms of Reference with performance indicators for each position; ii) Improve the cost efficiency of each of the Project Team professionals, centered around maximizing the efficacy and efficiency of professional hours in the field using performance output. Assistance in the field with separation of time, landscape and project; iii) Differentiate between the performance of the National Director and National Manager positions, with specific Terms of Reference for each role and function; iv) Strengthen the team orientation and capacity, holding frequent meetings to monitor and evaluate performance indicators and progress toward results in order to make timely decisions and generate more robust adaptive management; v) Enhance the contribution of the Project Administrative and Financial Assistant, through professional expertise in the areas of risk management for pilot projects and analysis and evaluation of cost-efficiency in the initiatives and the project itself.	Project Manager Project Director / Environment Ministry UNDP Chile.

11	<p>Strengthen the gender and indigenous issues approach²⁰ in the 2nd Stage of the Project:</p> <p>i) Incorporate gender and indigenous issues indicators into the Project's logical framework and add an organizational leadership indicator to the pilot projects and project tender to specifically measure changes in the position of men, women and children in the organizations and the community.</p> <p>ii) Include gender and indigenous issues analysis in the mid-term results on use of project outputs and services and develop baselines for each project to allow for measuring and evaluating progress toward the planned goals. Measure applicable to the project tender.</p> <p>This approach can be achieved through participation of those responsible for gender and indigenous issues from the key institutions as well as CONADI. This measure can be implemented through the Steering Committee and the MSPLM, strengthening the focused participation.</p> <p>As an example: Inclusion of the gender or indigenous issues leadership indicator refers to organizations whose leaders are women or youth in the first case, or people belonging to indigenous groups in the second case. The baseline should include the selection criteria and should not be associated with a number in the case of a tender, since it is not a generic baseline but an indicator. The goal may be that leaders from at least 50% of the indigenous organizations in the landscape belong to the PI and at least 30% of all the organizations are led by women, etc.</p> <p>As an example, in indigenous issues: Number of multi-stakeholder governance mechanisms (MSPLMs) established and operational at the indigenous landscape level; number and type of critically threatened indigenous landscapes that have been restored, maintained, improved; hectares of land managed using sustainable practices for biodiversity conservation, etc.</p>	<p>Project Manager</p> <p>UNDP Chile</p> <p>Other governmental areas with expertise and in consultation with those in charge of gender and indigenous issues within institutions/SC</p>
SUSTAINABILITY		
12.	<p>Develop a technical and economic strategy for the LLI tender in compliance with minimum recommended considerations: consistency with the project objective and results; define the LLI scope and the selection and allocation process; limited to strategic landscapes for the project; a defined user or beneficiary group (application requirement); institutional linkages; address landscape, governance, participation, gender, indigenous issues and cultural relevance approaches; ensure completion of stages (call for tender, application, selection, communication of results, signing of participation agreements, implementation, monitoring and tracking, project closure); must be specific, measurable, realistic and achievable, in accordance with the possibilities of the Project; have an ongoing monitoring and evaluation plan; define a financing mechanism for LLIs and transparent management of resources; define a format for presentation of LLI proposals; ensure, through a mechanism identified and agreed on with the Steering Committee institutions, mentoring for community organizations and beneficiaries participating in the LLIs. This strategy evaluates and determines the real need for implementing the CATEM to strengthen capacity in landscape management.</p>	<p>Project Manager</p> <p>UNDP Chile</p> <p>Project Board</p>
13.	<p>Apply a risk management mechanism to ensure achievement and sustainability of the results of strategies to be developed (Recommendations 4, 5 and 6) in the pilot projects being executed; in the pilot projects II, strengthen the project proposals and implementation; and in the LLI tender, incorporate this approach into the proposed initiatives. The risk management strategy is part of managing the second stage and should include possible extension of the project for an appropriate period for closure and exit.</p>	<p>Project Manager</p> <p>UNDP Chile</p>
14.	<p>Systematize the SMC Project so it provides learning and contributions to public policy,</p>	<p>Project Manager</p>

²⁰ This strategy should maintain the principles and criteria of participation of Indigenous Peoples of the FMMA.²⁰ In the case of forestry projects, compliance must be ensured with the strategy for consultation and participation in indigenous issues contained in the National Climate Change and Vegetation Resources Strategy/CONAF. ii) The community participation opportunities should be communicated widely to the community and its representatives in advance / Convention 169 of the ILO.

	strengthens public programs and management mechanisms as well as financing of multi-stakeholder, local-scale and linked community initiatives, and also promotes social, economic and environmental resilience of the landscape. This measure and output are part of the communication and outreach strategy.	
--	---	--

TABLE 5. CROSS-CUTTING RECOMMENDATIONS

N-	RECOMMENDATIONS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
15	CROSS-CUTTING RECOMMENDATIONS	
15.1	Extend the opening up of decentralized units that have addressed inter-agency issues, so as to prioritize areas of critical poverty and high climate vulnerability, biodiversity and land degradation, in order to define and promote joint interventions and actions and work toward common grounds.	Project Manager, UNDP Chile
15.2	Generate more and better human capital trained in issues of socially and environmentally sustainable development at the local, regional and national levels, as well as in working with the news media.	Environment Ministry
15.3	Plan an agenda in conjunction with the country's authorities , as part of the UNDP strategy with the Government of Chile, that includes actions geared toward linking together the different projects being implemented in the country and focusing on these linkages within the UNDP's own activities.	
15.4	Become familiar with the portfolios of programs and projects of all international organisms collaborating with the Government of Chile and civil society, to organize and prioritize environmental and aid issues, and thereby plan a coordinated strategy .	
15.5	Analyze synergies with other international cooperation projects in each of the landscapes (ecoregions), establishing work experiences in which (to the extent possible) equipment and human resources are shared.	

6- LIST OF ANNEXES

Annex I: Terms of Reference

Annex II: Timeline of MTR activities

Annex II: Map of key stakeholders

Annex IV: Documents reviewed

Annex V: Interview guides

Annex VI: Initial MTR report

Annex VII: List of key stakeholders interviewed

Annex VIII: Presentation of preliminary findings (PPT)

Annex IX: Criteria and questions for interviews

Annex X: Field visits and photographs

Annex XI: SMART analysis and evaluation

Annex XII: Evaluation of progress toward results

Annex XIII: Recommendations for the logical framework

Annex XIV: Scoring scale

Annex XV: Code of Conduct form

Annex XVI: MTR approval form

Annex XVII: MTR comments tracking