

CAF-GEF PIR for Fiscal Year: 2022
(Period: July 2021 to June 2022)

PART A – Project Implementation Progress & Risk Management

1. PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Title:	Supporting The Chilean Low Emissions Transport Strategy (CLETS)		
Implementing Agency:	Development Bank of Latin America CAF		
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment of Chile		
Project partners:	Chilean Agency for International Cooperation for Development (AGCID), Ministry of Transport and Telecommunications, Ministry of Housing and Urban Planning,		
Geographical Scope:	Cities of Santiago, La Serena – Coquimbo, Concepción, Temuco, Villarrica (Chile)		
Participating Countries:	Chile		
GEF project ID:	9742	CAF Project ID:	CAF/GEF 004
Focal Area(s):	Climate Change	GEF OP #:	
GEF Strategic Priority/Objective:	CCM-2 Programme 3	GEF approval date*:	November 11, 2019
CAF approval date:	April 17, 2020	Date of first disbursement*:	NA
Actual start date¹:	June 7, 2021	Planned duration:	60 months
Intended completion date*:	June 30, 2026	Actual or Expected completion date:	June 30, 2026
Project Type:	Full-sized Project	GEF Allocation*:	GEFTF
PPG GEF cost*:	US\$ 2,900,000.00	PPG co-financing*:	
Expected MSP/FSP Co-financing*:	US\$ 58,222,300,00	Total Cost*:	US\$ 61,122,300.00
Mid-term review/eval. (planned date):	December, 2023	Terminal Evaluation (actual date):	NA
Mid-term review/eval. (actual date):	NA	No. of revisions*:	NA
Date of last Steering Committee meeting:	NA	Date of last Revision*:	NA
Disbursement as of 30 June, 2022	NA	Date of financial closure*:	June 30, 2026
Date of Completion:	June 30, 2026	Actual expenditures reported as of _____:	US\$ 0
Total co-financing realized as of _____	NA	Actual expenditures to date:	US\$ 0
Leveraged financing:	NA		
Project summary²	The project aims to demonstrate systemic impacts of integrated zero- or low-emission urban public mobility systems.		

¹ Only if different from first disbursement date, e.g., in cases were a long time elapsed between first disbursement and recruitment of project manager.

² As in project document

	<p>The CLETS project obtained GEFTF financing for US\$2,900,000. Counterpart funding from the Government of Chile is estimated at US\$58.222.300 for a total project cost of US\$61,122,300 and includes the following 3 components:</p> <p>Component 1. Promotion of policy, planning and regulatory frameworks that foster accelerated adoption of integrated low-emissions mobility systems (Outcome B) through Participation, Knowledge Management and Capacity Development in the framework of a Chilean Low Emissions Transport Strategy (CLETS) (US\$1.62M GEFTF, total US\$1.69M). This Component seeks to remove non-financial barriers to the penetration of low- or zero-emissions vehicles in fleets and to innovative smart mobility. It is measured by Indicator 5: Degree of support for low GHG development in the policy, planning and regulatory framework. The Component gathers activity in four main lines of action, directed towards the removal of non-financial barriers, the formalization and diffusion of the CLETS and facilitating the replication of project's pilot initiatives and demonstrative activities.</p> <p>Key outcomes of this component will include: Increased available information for planning, designing and implementing innovative sustainable urban mobility systems at national and subnational levels; An enhanced policy, technical and regulatory environment to promote sustainable urban mobility; Increased capacity for sustainable-transport innovation at national and subnational level and best practices shared nationally and internationally.</p> <p>Component 2. Demonstrative and Catalytic Actions that demonstrate and operationalise financial mechanisms to support integrated low-emissions mobility systems (Outcome C) (US\$1.04M GEFTF, total US\$59.04M). Within this Component, Financial mechanisms to support GHG reductions will be demonstrated and operationalised. It is measured by Indicator 6: Degree of strength of financial and market mechanisms for low GHG development. The Component supports up to four technically assisted investments in measures relevant to the CLETS, as well as the provision of capacity for a current CLETS demonstration (namely, that occurring in Transantiago) to act as knowledge source for replication and uptake.</p> <p>Key outcomes of this component will include: Technically assisted investments in sustainable urban mobility measures in representative, upscale-supportive urban areas and technically assisted investments in integrated urban planning measures in representative, upscale-supportive urban areas.</p> <p>Component 3. Monitoring and Evaluation (US\$102,000 GEFTF) for an adequate monitoring of all project indicators to ensure successful project implementation and evaluation.</p>
<p>Project status FY2022³</p>	<p>The Project Cooperation Agreement between CAF, the Ministry of Environment (MMA) and the Chilean Agency for International Cooperation for Development (AGCID), was signed on June 7th, 2021. (Annex 1)</p> <p>6 months after the signature of the Cooperation Agreement, the Inter-institutional agreement between the prosecutor's offices of the MMA (executing agency) and AGCID (financial administrator) was signed on January 21st 2022. (Annex 2,3)</p> <p>During the first year of the project there was a change of administration of the national government of Chile on March 11, 2022.</p> <p>After the authorization of signatures from the administrative agency AGCID for disbursement requests, the designation of the responsible person in charge of the project from the MMA is in progress.</p>

³ Please add additional lines to keep prior year implementation status (if any)

	<p>The first disbursement was requested on may 2022 for USD 95.000 and is expected to be received the first weeks of July. (Annex 4,5)</p> <p>As of March 2022, the final version of the ToRs for hiring the Project Coordinator and endorsed by the Executive President of CAF was finalized. In accordance with the Cooperation Agreement, the MMA sent the evaluation and selection report in June 2022 to obtain CAF's no objection to the result, the process continues with attention to the recommendations made by CAF. (Annex 6,7)</p> <p>For the Establishment of the Project Steering Committee (CDP), the MMA has sent a letter to the Ministry of Transport and Telecommunications (MTT) to know the designated person who will be part of the committee. (Annex 8)</p> <p>Initial phase documents such as the General Procurement Plan, the Operative Plan with the adjustment of the critical path of the initial phase are in the process of being prepared.</p>
--	--

Planned contribution to strategic priorities/targets⁴	<p>The objective and proposed activities of the project are aligned with the programming priorities, and specifically focused on Demonstrating systemic impacts of integrated low- emission urban mobility systems (CCM-2 P3). The project will produce the higher-level outcomes of promoting policy, planning and regulatory frameworks that foster accelerated adoption of integrated low-emissions mobility systems (Outcome B); and of demonstrating and operationalizing financial mechanisms to support integrated low-emissions mobility systems (Outcome C).</p> <p>Component 1. Promotion of policy, planning and regulatory frameworks that foster accelerated adoption of integrated low-emissions mobility systems through Participation, Knowledge Management and Capacity Development in the framework of a Chilean Low Emissions Transport Strategy (CLETS), is measured by <i>Indicator 5: Degree of support for low GHG development in the policy, planning and regulatory framework.</i></p> <p>Component 2. Demonstrative and Catalytic Actions that demonstrate and operationalize financial mechanisms to support integrated low-emissions mobility systems. Within this Component, Financial mechanisms to support GHG reductions will be demonstrated and operationalized. It is measured by <i>Indicator 6: Degree of strength of financial and market mechanisms for low GHG development.</i></p>
---	---

2. PROJECT OBJECTIVE

State the global environmental objective(s) of the project⁵

<p>The objective of the “Supporting the Chilean Low Emissions Transport Strategy Project” (“CLETS”) is to demonstrate systemic impacts of integrated zero- or low-emission urban public mobility systems. Planned outcomes include: (i) Degree of support for low GHG development in the policy, planning and regulatory framework, (ii) Non-financial barriers are removed faster than in BAU scenario, (iii) A Chilean Low-Emission Transport Strategy is ready to formalize and counts with the support of diverse stakeholders, (iv) Replicas facilitated, (v) Degree of strength of financial and market mechanisms for low GHG development, and (vi) Investment mobilized.</p>
--

⁴ For Full Size Projects this information is found in the front page of the project Executive Summary; for Medium-Sized Projects the information appears in the MSP brief cover page.

⁵ Or immediate project objective

Please provide a narrative of progress made towards meeting the project objective(s). **Describe any significant environmental or other changes (results) attributable to project implementation.** Also, please discuss any major challenges to meet the **objectives** or specific project **outcomes** (not more than 300 words)

NA

Please provide a narrative of progress towards the stated GEF Strategic Priorities and Targets if identified in project document ⁶(not more than 200 words)

NA

⁶ Projects that did not include these in original design are encouraged to the extent possible to retrofit specific targets.

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the **CAF Task Manager**⁷ will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:

- (i) Progress towards achieving the project objective(s)- see section 3.1
- (ii) Implementation progress – see section 3.2

Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The CAF Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.

3.1 Progress towards achieving the project objective (s)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ⁸	Baseline level ⁹	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2016	Progress rating ¹¹
Objective¹² To support Chile in a transformational shift towards low-emission urban mobility systems	Reduced growth in GHG emissions. Tonnes of CO2 equivalent avoided, both direct and indirect, over the impact period					NA
Outcome 1: To promote policy, planning and regulatory frameworks that foster accelerated adoption of integrated low-emissions mobility	Disaggregated degree of support for low GHG development in the policy, planning and regulatory framework					NA

⁷ For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

⁸ Add rows if your project has more than 3 key indicators per objective or outcome.

⁹ Depending on selected indicator, quantitative or qualitative baseline levels and targets could be used.

¹⁰ Many projects did not identify Mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant.

¹¹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

¹² Add rows if your project has more than 4 objective-level indicators. Same applies for the number of outcome-level indicators.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator ⁸	Baseline level ⁹	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2016	Progress rating ¹¹
systems (Outcome B)						
Outcome 2: To demonstrate and operationalise financial mechanisms to support integrated low-emissions mobility systems (Outcome C)	Degree of strength of financial and market mechanisms for low GHG development					NA

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project objective(s) (*To be provided by CAF-GEF Task Manager. Please add columns to reflect all prior year ratings*)

FY ____ rating	FY ____ rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and explaining reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating (*To be completed by CAF GEF Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager*)

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
NA		

This section should be completed if project progress towards meeting **objectives** was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation (*To be completed by Project Manager*).

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When
NA			

3.2 (a) Project implementation progress

Outputs ¹³	Expected completion date ¹⁴	Implementation status as of June 30 th 2022 (%)	Implementation status as of June 30 th 2022 (narrative description)	Comments if variance ¹⁵ . Describe any problems in delivering outputs	Progress rating ¹⁶
Output 1.1.1: Information campaigns	June, 2026	0%			NA
Output 1.1.2: Training	March, 2026	0%			NA
Output 1.1.3: MRV system	June, 2026	0%			NA
Output 1.2.1: Support to the formalisation and diffusion of the Chilean Low Emissions Transport Strategy	December, 2022	0%			NA
Output 1.2.2: Experience exchange and dissemination, national level	March, 2026	0%			NA
Output 1.3.1: Support to the interoperability of methods of payment	December, 2025	0%			NA
Output 1.3.2: Energy certification of vehicles	March, 2023	0%			NA
Output 1.3.3: Collective-taxi information crowdsourcing	June, 2024	0%			NA
Output 1.3.4: Open Data strategy	June, 2026	0%			NA
Output 1.4.1: Dissemination (international level)	March, 2026	0%			NA
Output 1.4.2: Identification, systematisation and promotion of best practices	June, 2026	0%			NA
Output 2.1.1: ZLE Transantiago (knowledge source)	March, 2026	0%			NA
Output 2.1.2: ZLE Bus in Concepción and Temuco	September, 2024	0%			NA
Output 2.1.3: ZLE Collective taxi in La Serena	December, 2024	0%			NA
Output 2.2.1: Integrated urban mobility intervention in Villarrica	March, 2025	0%			NA
Output 3.1.1.- Periodic reviews and independent terminal evaluation conducted	June, 2026	0%			NA

¹³ Outputs and activities as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision.

¹⁴ As per latest workplan (latest project revision)

¹⁵ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

¹⁶ To be provided by the CAF Task Manager

Overall project implementation progress ¹⁷ (*To be completed by CAF- GEF Task Manager. Please add columns to reflect prior years' ratings*):

FY2022 rating	FY _____ rating	Comments/narrative justifying the rating for this FY and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
MS		<p>The first year of implementation of the CLETS project has been very challenging. After signing the cooperation agreement between CAF-MMA-AGCID, it was necessary to fulfil an important milestone as a requirement of the beneficiary country Chile, in which the executing agency MMA and administrator AGCID signed an inter-institutional cooperation agreement. Once the inter-institutional agreement was fulfilled, a new challenge related to the context arose with the change of national government, which due to the corresponding period of transition of authorities, had an effect on the rescheduling of the activities of the initial phase.</p> <p>Even in the face of all the factors that influenced this first stage, the MMA and AGCD personnel now in charge of the project have made the necessary efforts to make the request for the first disbursement, which is about to become effective, and have directed the contracting process for the project coordinator.</p>

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating. (*To be completed by CAF Task Manager in consultation with Project Manager*)

Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
NA		

This section should be completed if project **progress** was rated MS, MU, U or HU during the previous Project Implementation Review (PIR) or by the Mid-term Review/Evaluation (*To be completed by Project Manager*).

Problem(s) identified in previous PIR	Action(s) taken	By whom	When
NA	NA		

¹⁷ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

3.3. Risk

There are two tables to assess and address risk: the first “risk factor table” to describe and rate risk factors; the second “top risk mitigation plan” should indicate what measures/action will be taken with respect to risks rated **Substantial** or **High** and who is responsible to for it.

RISK FACTOR TABLE

*Project Managers will use this table to summarize risks identified in the **Project Document** and reflect also **any new risks** identified in the course of project implementation. The **Notes** column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, **as relevant**. The “Notes” column has one section for the Project Manager (**PM**) and one for the CAF Task Manager (**TM**). If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The CAF **Task Manager** should provide ratings in the right hand column reflecting his/her own assessment of project risks.*

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
Management structure	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems		X					PM :		X				
										TM: Project operational documents are under preparation						
Governance structure	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs	Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. TOR unclear	Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR			X				PM :			X			
										TM:						

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
Internal communications	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment		X					PM:		X				
										TM: Communication process may take time although relations between team members are good						
Work flow	Project progressing according to work plan	Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable	Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation			X				PM:			X			
										TM: the activities of the initial phase have been rescheduled on several occasions						
Co-financing	Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time	Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic	A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize	X						PM:	X					
Budget	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget	X						PM:	X					
										TM:						
Financial management	Funds are correctly managed and	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or	X						PM:	X					

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
	transparently accounted for		indication of mismanagement of funds							TM:						
Reporting	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting		X					PM:		X				
										TM:						
Stakeholder involvement	Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners	Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners	Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders		X					PM:		X				
										TM:						
External communications	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or	X						PM:	X					

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
	understand project and are regularly updated on progress	successfully transmitted	misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident							TM:						
Short term/long term balance	Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected	X						PM:	X					
										TM:						
Science and technological issues	Project based on sound science and well established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties	X						PM:	X					
										TM:						
Political influences	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives	X						PM:	X					
										TM:						

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating					
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be
INTERNAL RISK																
Project management																
Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary				X						PM:	X					
											TM:					

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be	
EXTERNAL RISK																	
Project context																	
Political stability	Political context is stable and safe	Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation	Very disruptive and volatile	X						PM:	X						
										TM:							
Environmental conditions	Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors	Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes	Project area has very harsh environmental conditions	X						PM:	X						
										TM:							
Social, cultural and economic factors	There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results	Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed	Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers	X						PM:	X						
										TM:							
Capacity issues	Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners	Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity	Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance	X						PM:	X						
										TM:							

Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Project Manager Rating						Notes	Task Manager Rating						
				Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be		Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be	
EXTERNAL RISK																	
Project context																	
Others, please specify				X								X					

If there is a significant (over 50% of risk factors) discrepancy between Project Manager and Task Manager rating, an explanation by the **Task Manager** should be provided below

NA

TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN
Rank – importance of risk Risk Statement – potential problem (condition and consequence) Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the risk Who – person(s) responsible for the action Date – date by which action needs to be or was completed

Rank	Risk Statement ¹⁸		Action to Take	Who	Date
	Condition	Consequence			
Substantial	Change of national government and authorities	Delay in starting the project	CAF support in the generation of a minor adjustments plan to the project and initial documents	CAF, MMA, MTT, AGCID	Nov 30, 2022

¹⁸ Only for Substantial to High risk.

Rank	Risk Statement ¹⁸		Action to Take	Who	Date
	Condition	Consequence			

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High) (*Please include PIR risk ratings for all prior periods, add columns as necessary*):

FY2022 rating	FY_____ rating	Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium		Some risks inherent to the initial phase and the context of change of authorities in the beneficiary country were materialized, however, the teamwork between the agencies involved CAF-MMA-AGCID has allowed the actions to be redirected.
		If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the Mid-Term Review/Evaluation please report on progress or results of its implementation

4. RATING MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Based on the answers provided to the questions in 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 below, the **CAF Task Manager** will provide ratings for the following aspects of project monitoring and evaluation:

- (i) Overall **quality** of the Monitoring & Evaluation plan
- (ii) Performance in the **implementation** of the M&E plan

4.1. Does the project M&E plan contain the following:

- Baseline information for each outcome-level indicator Yes No X
- SMART indicators to track project outcomes Yes No X
- A clear distribution of responsibilities for monitoring project progress. Yes No X

4.2. Has the project budgeted for the following M&E activities:

- Mid-term review/evaluation Yes X No
- Terminal evaluation Yes X No
- Any costs associated with collecting and analysing indicators' related information Yes X No

Please rate the **quality** of the project M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU):

4.3 Has the project:

- Utilized the indicators identified in the M&E plan to track progress in meeting the project objectives; Yes No X
- Fulfilled the specified reporting requirements (financial, including on co-financing and auditing, and substantive reports) Yes X No
- Completed any scheduled MTR or MTE before or at project implementation mid-point; Yes No X
- Applied adaptive management in response to M&E activities Yes No X
- Implemented any existing risk mitigation plan (see previous section) Yes No X

Please rate the performance in **implementing** the M&E plan (use HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU):

4.4. Please describe activities for monitoring and evaluation carried out during the reporting period¹⁹

Submission of the PIR Y1 2021-2022

4.5. Provide information on the quality of baseline information and any effects (positive or negative) on the selection of indicators and the design of other project monitoring activities

¹⁹ Do not include routine project reporting. Examples of M&E activities include stakeholder surveys, field surveys, steering committee meetings to assess project progress, peer review of documentation to ensure quality, etc.

NA

4.6. Provide comments on the usefulness and relevance of selected indicators and experiences in the application of the same.

NA

4.7. Describe any challenges in obtaining data relevant to the selected indicators; has the project experienced problems to cover costs associated with the tracking of indicators?

NA

4.8. Describe any changes in the indicators or in the project intervention logic, including an explanation of whether key assumptions²⁰ are still valid

NA

4.9. Describe how potential social or environmental negative effects are monitored

NA

4.10. Please provide any other experiences or lessons relevant to the design and implementation of project monitoring and evaluation plans.

NA

5. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS

5.1. Please summarize any experiences and/or lessons related to project design. Please select relevant areas from the list below:

- Conditions necessary to achieve global environmental benefits such as (i) institutional, social and financial sustainability; (ii) country ownership; and (iii) stakeholder involvement, including gender issues.
- Institutional arrangements, including project governance;
- Engagement of the private sector;
- Capacity building;
- Scientific and technological issues;
- Interpretation and application of GEF guidelines;
- Factors that improve likelihood of outcome sustainability;
- Factors that encourage replication, including outreach and communications strategies;
- Financial management and co-financing.

5.2. Please highlight a few major achievements resulting so far from the project implementation, including but not limited to:

²⁰ Assumptions refer to elements of the “theory of change” or “intervention logic” (i.e, the problem is a result of A, therefore, if we change B, this will lead to C) and not to pre-conditions for project implementation. It is a common mistake to include statements such as “political will” as an assumption. This is rather a necessary condition to implement the project.

- Concrete results, both on-the-ground and normative
- Gender
- indigenous peoples
- Private Sector
- Sustainability
- Innovation
- Upscaling