Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA 2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE) 4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP) 30
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS 38
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) 42
6. RISKS 44
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION (ONLY FOR PROJECTS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED AN MTR) 48
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS 49
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT 50
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES 54
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT 57
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE 58

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Europe and Central Asia
Country (ies):	Ukraine
Project Title:	Integrated Natural Resources Management in Degraded Landscapes in the Forest-Steppe and Steppe Zones of Ukraine
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/UKR/004/GFF
GEF ID:	9813
GEF Focal Area(s):	Climate Change Mitigation, Land Degradation, MFA
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural Resources in cooperation with Ministry for Development of Economy, Trade and Agriculture
Project Duration (years):	63 months (04 Oct 2017 - 31 Dec 2022)
Project coordinates:	*Annex 2*

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	05/07/2017
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	04/10/2017
Project Implementation End Date/NTE[1]:	31/12/2021
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) [2]	31/12/2022

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	$ 1,776,481
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc[3]:	$ 10,323,267
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)[4]:	$ 1,446,155
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022[5]	$ 1,275,880

[1] As per FPMIS
[2] If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.
[3] This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.
[4] For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.
[5] Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	22 May 2019
Expected Mid-term Review date[6]:	N/A
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	20-24 January 2020 (Independent supervision mission)
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date[7]:	November 2022
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	*It is expected to conduct soonest*

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	*S*
Overall implementation progress rating:	*S*
Overall risk rating:	*S*

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	High risk. Ukraine is in L3 emergency response

Status

Implementation Status ***(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):***	4 PIR

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Oleksandr Zhuravel (GEF project coordinator ai., FAOUA)	Oleksandr.Zhuravel@fao.org
Budget Holder	Raimund Jehle, Regional Programme Leader (REUTD)	Raimund.Jehle@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Tania Santivañez, Agricultural Officer (REUTD)	Tania.Santivanez@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Hernan Gonzalez, Technical Officer (CBC)	Hernan.Gonzalez@fao.org

[6] The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

[7] The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)

(*All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual)*

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators[8]	Baseline	Mid-term Target[9]	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress[10] since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating[11]
	Outcome 1.1	INRM principles integrated into environment, agriculture and forest sector frameworks, policies and programs	Weak policy and legal framework for INRM and lack of management plans at local level to implement INRM Lack of systematic and long-term monitoring of land resources	INRM principles integrated into key national policy frameworks and productive sectors	Strong enabling environment and monitoring system facilitates integration of INRM into land-use planning covering 230 800 ha of land	1. The strong enabling environment among key national stakeholders involved has been developed based on the regular meetings of working groups of CC-LDD and SC members. The enabling environment was strengthened by: a) CC-LDD was expanded to 25 members (including village representatives and local agencies) b) Ukrainian Soil Partnership (UaSP) established to strengthen national policy for INRM and creation of	HS

[8] This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

[9] Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

[10] Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic Co-benefits as well.

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

						systematic monitoring platform c) the project has been supporting efforts to improve national legislation under the committee of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine on Environmental Policy and Nature Management and legislation on Climate Change Adaptation in collaboration with EU4Climate project and MEPNR c) In cooperation with the UaSP created a working group to develop the Strategy for LDN monitoring and hold 3 meetings of WG (November 10th ,2020,December 18th, 2020 and March 11th, 2021) . 2. These efforts have resulted in the development of two national regulations to support INRM and amendments to five laws, the development of a system for environmental monitoring and spatial planning (including LDN monitoring), three incentive mechanisms and two national strategies to support INRM. 3. In cooperation with National Academy of Agrarian Science, Institute of	

						Water Problem and Reclamation the process of establishing Coordination Center of Sustainable Agriculture was launched. The Coordination Center would be developed based on the project testing fields for further scaling up of Conservation Agriculture.	
	Output 1.1.1 Strengthening of the Coordinating Council to combat land degradation and desertification (CC-LDD) to support intersectoral coordination for INRM at national and sub-national level	The CC-LDD provides a platform for coordination and information sharing on INRM Number of ministries and agencies that become members of the CC-LDD	The NAP recommends the establishment of the CC-LDD for enhanced coordination and information sharing, but the recommendations have not been operationalized.	The CC-LDD strengthened with participation from all relevant sectors	Enhanced coordination and information sharing on INRM across sectors	1. The CC-LDD has been established and extended with the new 25 members (Ministry of Health; State Forestry Project Agency; One oblast administration; State Institute of the Soil Protection; 17 local village communities; 3 local regional authorities; one NGOs). 2. First Annual Steering Committee Meeting has been carried out in 2019 and the second meeting postponed. 3. Online Information Sharing Platform launched: https://healthy-soils.org.ua/en/. 4. In collaboration with MEEP, the GEF team included on the - working group to improve national legislation under the committee of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine on Environmental Policy and	HS

						Nature Management (5 meetings, 9 entities, 23 participants), - in the Climate Change Adaptation Working Group (CCA WG) to develop the Framework National Adaptation Strategy (FNAS) in cooperation with EU4Climate project and MEPNR. 5. In cooperation with UaSP and with a participation of Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources, the Ministry of Economic Development, Trade and Agriculture, the State Service of Ukraine for Geodesy, Cartography and Cadastre, created a working group to develop the Strategy on LDN monitoring system (9 entities, 16 participants), hold 3 meetings and finalized the Strategy. 6. Since February 2020, the project's team has been monitoring COVID 19 impact on farmers' activities and shared this data with the relevant partners. 7. National Action Plan to Combat Land Degradation and Desertification (NAP) under the UN Convention to Combat Desertification	

						(UNCCD) revise by the National policy and institutional expert following the MEPNR request. 8. The awareness-raising on and cooperation with the International Network on Fertilizers Analysis facilitated 9. 23 representatives of national institutions attended .5-days training on Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool and updated their knowledge on GHG calculation. 10. The action plan of shelterbelt reconstruction in Kherson oblast was developed. 11. Draft Project Proposal Enhanced mitigation measures on droughts, floods, and COVID-19 within the Bessarabia region in Ukraine has been developed. 12. 12 different meetings were held with agronomy experts to establish the Coordination Center of Sustainable Agriculture. 13. Documents to describe the main goal and objectives of the centre, methods of work, and a roadmap for further cooperation on the sustainable practices were developed.	

						14. World Soil Day event on Productivity of agricultural land in the context of state policy was conducted on 2 December 2021. The Memorandum between the Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Food of Ukraine and UaSP was signed.	
	Output 1.1.2 Improved institutional structures and legislation for sustainable land and shelterbelt management	Number of draft laws and regulations in support of INRM principles approved (i.e. on functional land use, economic incentives, monitoring systems, soil quality standards, and ownership of shelterbelts)	No INRM principles have been agreed at national level and the policy framework is full of loopholes, e.g. unclear ownership rights of shelterbelts	Review of existing laws, regulations and policies related to INRM	Draft laws and regulations in agreed areas approved	1. Two draft laws on Environmental Protection were developed and provided to the Government. 2. Two national legislative regulations developed and approved: - Regulation Measures to address the problem and prevent annual mass fires caused by burning plant residues and burning stubble remains - Maintenance and preservation regulation for field protective shelterbelts located on agricultural lands 3. The amendments to five laws developed and endorsed: -Law of Ukraine “On Land Protection” - Law of Ukraine “About Flora” - Land Code of Ukraine Civil Protection Code of Ukraine - Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offenses 4. Three Legislative models (mechanisms) on shelterbelt management were	HS

						developed and tested. 5. Draft Law on regulating the incineration of vegetation and responsibility for it developed. 6. Draft Strategy for the LDN monitoring developed and submitted to MDETA. 7. Strategy for Environmental Safety and Adaptation to Climate Change developed in cooperation with EU4Climate project and MEPNR. 8. Revised NAP under the UNCCD with performance review submitted to MEPNR. 9. The electronic data interchange and protection Agreements required for filling up the LDN monitoring system developed. 10. Collaboration with State GeoCadastre and Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Food aimed at building a national LDN monitoring system. 12. Recommendations on improving national legislation on land tenure were developed. 13. Methodological approach on soil information collection including the harmonization of indicators on LDN monitoring was developed. 14. Methodological approach on	

						SLM monitoring including soil organic carbon monitoring and its harmonisation with international standards was developed. 15. Action Plan to the Strategy on Land Neutrality Degradation was developed.	
	Output 1.1.3 Strengthened national environmental monitoring systems (NEMS) and spatial planning on land and shelterbelt resources and land degradation control	System in place for environmental monitoring and spatial planning Number of persons in key institutions at national and sub-national level using the system	Tools and methods for environmental monitoring at national level are not up-to-date nor are they harmonized, which makes it difficult to use the generated information for land-use planning	All relevant institutions trained in the use of up-to date tools and methods for environmental monitoring and land-use planning	System in place for environmental monitoring and spatial planning	1. Concept note of land monitoring indicators developed and submitted. 2. Analytical note on the institutional capacity to prepare NEMS developed and submitted. 3. 3 technicians from 3 relevant institutes trained to develop the system of soil salinity monitoring 4. Correlation tables between soil types in the national classification and the international soil classification systems (WRB, FAO 2014) developed. 5. The digital soil maps are improving and to be tied to the cadastral map of Ukraine referring to the WGS84 standards. 6.The methodology on matching Ukrainian soil types with WRB 2014 including the systematized topical dictionary and correlation tables between	S

						around 100 soil types in two scales elaborated. 7. Approach to integrated management of land resources for Agriculture land of Ukraine was developed. 8. People virtually trained on drought monitoring and application in agrometeorology by WMO-FAO. 9. Training on land and shelterbelt resource spatial planning to be held as per LoA with ASSOGU (see output 1.1.5). 10. Report on the current status of agriculture droughts and losses of available water in the south region of Ukraine developed. 11. A systematized topical dictionary for the unambiguous translation of the terms of the Ukrainian soil classification into English was developed. (the design is being prepared) 12. The standardized data structure and format including the metadata for the soil profile database were developed. 13. The capacity of the agrochemical soil data collection and harmonization for further	

						automatic processing was strengthened. 14. The digital soil maps in the resolution 1:200 000 for Kharkiv and Kherson Oblasts of Ukraine tying in the relevant land map provided by State Geo Cadastr and in correspondence with WGS84 standards were developed. 15. The Guidelines on matching national soil classification with WRB 2014 were developed; 16. The consolidation of soil profiles data in collaboration with SCP and the Institute of Soil Science and Agrochemistry for further mapping was performed. 17. The consolidation of data on monitoring sites and agrochemical soil passports for further mapping was performed. Data templates have been developed in collaboration with USP and the Soil Conservation Institute. 18. The development of the recommendations for harmonizing the data exchange between GLOSIS and the National Agriculture Land Degradation Neutrality (ALDN) monitoring platform has started.	

						19. The development of the recommendations for mapping carbon sequestration for different land-use scenarios (agro-technology applications) has started.	
	Output 1.1.4 Establishment of a Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) monitoring system.	System in place for monitoring of LDN indicators at demonstration sites (land cover, land productivity, soil organic carbon)	Tools and methods for LDN monitoring are not up-to-date and a new monitoring system needs to be established	LDN baseline, including SOC, established at demonstration sites	The LDN monitoring system documented and shared for replication in other locations	1. The LDN monitoring platform was developed and established (Administration Module of ALND monitoring platform, Data import module for external data sources, Directory module of ALND monitoring platform, Registers module of ALND monitoring platform, database structures, the algorithm of data import from the land monitoring spots, the algorithm of soil agrochemistry data import and the algorithm of soil profile data import for further mapping were improved and modernized). 2. The layouts to harmonize the soil reference data including the metadata for the soil profile and soil agrochemistry database developed. 3. The next sets of soil data processed and prepared for the further processing: 1000 soil profiles; 30K of soil	MS

						agrochemistry samples; 750 land monitoring data profiles. 4. The layouts to collect soil profile data developed. 5. The 1000 soil data profiled harmonized and prepared for the further processing. 6. 5 meetings regarding the installation and testing of the National Agriculture Land Degradation Neutrality (ALDN) monitoring platform software were conducted. 7. The development of the import/export process and templates for visualizing soil survey data for the monitoring system has started.	
	Output 1.1.5 Integrated land-use management plans at administrative region level	Number of integrated land-use plans	0	1 land-use plan covering at least 50 000 ha of land	At least 3 integrated land-use plans covering 230 800 ha of land	1. Development of integrated land management plans engaging the abandoned lands in Kyiv oblast were finalized. 2. Survey of the amalgamated territorial communities (ATCs) s in Kyiv oblast for defining a feasible pilot was carried out and the pilot ATCs defined. 3. Methodological approach for creation of integrated land resources management maps was elaborated. 4. The abandoned lands including the shelterbelts,	MS

						fields' roads, dried ponds, self-plant, and abandoned forests in the land massive possess by Byshiv and Dmytrivka village communities distinguished and mapped. 5. The integrated land resources management maps including shelterbelts (on the example of Krasnokutsk and Rogan amalgamated territorial communities) were created. 6. The potential of land resources of Krasnokutsk and Rogan amalgamated territorial communities was determined. 7. The vector layers of shelterbelts, self-forested areas, wetlands on Krasnokutsk and Rogan amalgamated territorial communities in the format of shapefiles were created. 8. The vector layer of shelterbelts in geojson and shape formats of Kharkiv oblast was created. 9. The recommendations for elaboration of integrated land management plans engaging the abandoned lands developed.	
	Outcome 1.2 Financial and incentive mechanisms for INRM in place	Number and types of state-led and market-led incentive	Incentives mechanisms for INRM are generally weak in Ukraine due to unclear	Ownership rights of shelterbelts clarified and suitable incentive mechanisms, such	At least two incentive mechanisms in place	1. Three models of shelterbelt management developed considering defining the ownership rights of shelterbelts and	S

	at national and sub-national levels	mechanisms supporting INRM	ownership of resources, and lack of knowledge	as Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) and opportunities for certification of value-chains, identified in the three participating oblasts		based on the suitable incentive mechanisms of management. Models tested in 3 pilot oblasts. As a result, shelterbelt inventory was performed for 1030 ha as well as the ownerships right were defined correspondingly. 2. Two PES schemes for agroforestry practices dissemination developed to be further tested. 3. Value-added chains for highly demanded species of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) and medicinal herbs developed	
	Output 1.2.1 Ownership rights, procedures of inventory and standards for management and planting of shelterbelts	Ownership rights, procedures of inventory and standards for planting shelterbelts defined	Unclear ownership rights of shelterbelts are the main obstacle to their rehabilitation and sustainable use	Standards for shelterbelt ownership and use established	Standards for shelterbelt ownership and use operationalized	1. Recommendations for improving access and operation of shelterbelts for the end-users developed. 2. Practical guide for the implementation of effective shelterbelts' management models. 3. The criteria of plant species selection for the shelterbelt planting in different agroclimatic zones developed. 4. Guideline for shelterbelt inventory developed 5. Thee drafts of Guideline for the species selection for shelterbelt planting developed.	HS

						6. The consultation at Kyiv regional council was conducted (21 attendees). 7. 108 hectares of land plots with uncertain ownership rights and signs of afforestation of shelterbelts in Byshiv and Dmytrivka village councils were selected and the shelterbelt inventory were conducted.	
	Output 1.2.2 Clear criteria and indicators developed for establishment of Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) schemes for INRM	Criteria and indicators developed for establishment of PES schemes	Ukraine has very limited experience with mechanisms for scaling up of INRM, such as PES, and there is a need to etablish clear criteria and indicators	Review of criteria and indicators for establishment of PES schemes with recommendations for Ukraine	Criteria and indicators for establishment of PES schemes in Ukraine developed	1. Criteria and indicators for establishment PES scheme CA and agroforestry developed. 2. Brief description of ecosystem services selected including NTFPs and other environmental services which increase incomes of farmers developed. 3. Recommendation on PES schemes for agroforestry practices dissemination and conservation agriculture scaling focus on the selected project areas developed. 4. The brief stakeholder analysis involved in the recommended PES scheme development and implementation elaborated.	S
	Output 1.2.3 Inclusive and green food and feed value-chains strengthened	Number of inclusive and green food and feed value-chains strengthened	Value-chains are generally neither sufficiently inclusive or environmentally friendly	At least 4 food and feed value-chains analyses using the Markets for the Poor (M4P) methodology	At least 2 food and feed value-chains made more inclusive and	1. Market analysis of NTFPs and inclusive medical herbs with market mapping for Kyiv, Kherson and Mykolaiv oblasts developed.	S

					environmentally friendly	2. Value-added chains assessment for highly demanded species of NTFPs and medicinal herbs developed. 3. The list of criteria and determine areas in the steppe and forest-steppe zones of Ukraine for scaling non-timber goods and medicinal and aromatic herb production developed 4. Concept paper for supporting development of the value-chains of NTFPs and medical-aromatic plant, to improve drought-affected farmers group productivity in Southern Ukraine. 5. Recommendation on shrubs planting and medical herds cropping, and crop rotation schemes with a technological map based on a few local reference examples developed. 6. 1 webinar in Izium, Kharkiv oblast on '"Cultivation of medicinal and honey herbs in Steppe zone of Ukraine and women's leadership"	
	Outcome 2.1 Upscaling of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and climate-smart	SLM and CSA technologies/best practices applied on X ha of land sequestring Y mton CO2	SLM and CSA technologies are applied in isolated locations in Ukraine promoted by research institutes and agro-	10 000 ha	29 400 ha 277 675 mton CO2eq.	1. The best CA practices scaled up on area 248 220 ha due to FFS training and farm-to-farm visits. In total 354 participants from 15 oblasts participated.	S

	agricultural (CSA) practices in production landscapes in the forest-steppe zone		enterprises that are not connected to higher level planning and decision-making processes			2. The best shelterbelts management practices are being disseminated by the means of FFS (5 theoretical and 3 practical sessions in Kyiv, Kherson and Mykolaiv oblasts). 3. CSA and SLM technologies are being disseminated through research institutes and farmers in the rural areas of Kyiv, Kherson, Kharkiv and Mykolaiv Oblasts.	
	Output 2.1.1 Capacity to implement CA in the forest-steppe zone developed and strengthened	Number of conservation agriculture (CA) training events and workshops support by the project Farmers Field Schools (FFS) established Number of farmer-to-farmer exchange visits	Agricultural service providers have limited knowledge and technical skill related to CA	At least two training events each in Kharkiv and Kiev oblasts with around 20 agricultural service providers in total	30 agricultural service providers trained in CA 3 FFS established, and 3 exchange visits organized	1. 9 pieces of training under the field farms schools on CA conducted on 4 pilot oblasts. 2. 354 participants (144 farmers, 98 agriculture service providers, 25 representatives of village communities and others) scaled up their knowledge on CA. 3. 8 farmer-to-farmer visits conducted. Training included representatives from the 15 oblasts: Vinitsa, Kirovograd, Cherkasy, Lugansk, Kharkiv, Kherson, Mykolaiv, Zaporizhya, Kyiv, Khmelnytskyi, Odesa, Zhytomyr, Poltava, Sumy, Ternopil. 4. Curriculum for CA online course developed.	S

						5. CN for the Coordination Center for Sustainable Agriculture developed. 6. Project profile for scaling up the CA practices through establishment of CSA Centers to empower community capacity for stable agricultural production within the Dniester River Basin developed.	
	Output 2.1.2 CA practices demonstrated and upscaled	Number of CA practices implemented in selected production landscapes	It is mainly the steppe area in Ukraine that has adopted CA and only on 2% of soils.	Number of CA best practices implemented on 10 000 ha of land	Number of CA best practices implemented on 29 400 ha of land leading to sequestration of 277 675 mton CO2eq.	1. 3 CA practices combined with subsurface drip irrigation implemented on the pilot project sites in Kherson oblast (20 ha). 2. One enhanced soil maintenance practice was implemented in Kharkiv oblast, on 110 ha. 3. The 8 best practices of CA were disseminated and scaled up on area 248 220 ha. 4. 12 personal meetings and 13 phone interviews with the farmers who practice best soil conservation practices were conducted. 5. An expert group was formed based on the list of FAO experts to evaluate farmers' agronomic practices, as well as the questionnaire and lists of innovator farmers were formed.	S

						6. The FAO Expert Group surveyed 25 farmers based on their practices, production philosophy, technical and technological solutions and conducted 10 visits to the farms to assess the state of technologies and agronomic practices development in Mykolaivska, Khersonska, Kyivska and Dnipropetrovska oblasts. 7. Meetings were held with teaching and scientific staff of 4 top agricultural universities by FAO experts. (Mykolaiv Agrarian University, Kherson Agrarian University, Bila Tserkva Agrarian University, NUBIP). 8. An expert group has been set up to write a Textbook on No-till and Strip-till farming systems for farmers, scientists and experts. 9. FAO experts have developed a textbook structure and prepared two sections - "Management of crop residues", "Cover crops as a basic element of the No-till and Strip-till system ". 10. The optional course on No-till and Strip-till was approved in NUBIP at the agro faculty. The syllabus was developed and	

						approved. 11. 14 farmers were interviewed regarding the agronomic practices. 12. The digest of the Best Soil Conservation Practices has been prepared. It is on the final stage of editing and translation into English.	
	Output 2.1.3 Identification and support to the special needs of rural women at project sites	Number of training events and workshops organized for women's groups, young women entrepreneurs, etc. Number of women-to-women exchange visits	The feminization of agriculture in Ukraine has led to over-representation of women in rural areas and they often shoulder the main responsibility for agricultural activities	At least one training events each in Kharkiv and Kiev oblasts with around 20 agricultural service providers in total	30 agricultural service providers trained in gender issues and the special needs of rural women 2 exchange visits organized	1. Gender oriented desk study was conducted, and results were shared publicly at the conference. 2. 73 female farmers were trained on CA in Kyiv, Kherson, Kharkiv and Mykolaiv oblasts. 3. One-webinar for rural women to discuss their role in the ecosystem services promotion arranged as a part of the FFS on shelterbelts. 4. One article about a rural woman published. 5. 1 field trip on 'The role of rural women in ecosystem services promoting' in Kherson oblast and 1 webinar on 'Cultivation of medicinal and honey herbs in Steppe zone of Ukraine and women's leadership' in Kharkiv oblast were conducted.	MS
	Outcome 2.2 Rehabilitation and sustainable	Best practices for shelterbelt management	Shelterbelts have been allowed to degrade since	1 000 ha	3 600 ha 87 821 mton CO2eq.	1. Shelterbelt inventory was performed for 1150 ha as well as the ownerships right	S

	management of shelterbelts	applied on X ha of land sequestering Y mton CO2	independence due to unclear ownership			were defined correspondingly. 2. Maintenance of 8 ha of newly established shelterbelts and reconstruction of 24 ha of existing shelterbelt was completed in Kherson oblast.	
	Output 2.2.1 Guidelines and capacity for inventory and management of shelterbelts developed	Number of guidelines for inventory and management of shelterbelts	No guidelines exists	Guidelines developed and published	Guidelines applied at project demonstration sites	1. The manual of shelterbelt inventory for farmers and other end users developed. 2. The practical guidelines for the implementation of the effective shelterbelts' management models developed and published in Ukrainian. The English version is in process. The guidelines were tested on three pilot sites in Kherson, Mykolaiv and Kyiv oblasts. 3. The recommendation for the establishing, reconstruction and maintenance of the shelterbelts in the steppe and forest-steppe zones was developed and published based on the pilot implementation in the Kherson oblast. 4. The guideline on best agroforestry practices and in the different agroclimatic zones developed.	HS

						5. The online workshop and round table on implementation of the effective shelterbelt's management models conducted ("Shelterbelts from A to Z"). 6. Guideline on plant species selection was prepared. 7. The methodological approaches to improve the shelterbelt inventory applying the remote sensing monitoring and GIS information on mobile devices developed. 8. Identification and mapping of land including shelterbelts using Earth remote sensing and GIS was performed.	
	Output 2.2.2 Rehabilitation and multipurpose shelterbelt management demonstrated and improved	Number of shelterbelt best management practices implemented	No best management practices have been documented and demonstrated in Ukraine since independence	Number of shelterbelt best management practices implemented on 1000 ha of land	Number of shelterbelt best management practices implemented on 3 600 ha of land leading to sequestration of 87 821 mton CO2eq.	1. Shelterbelt established - 8 ha (Kherson oblast). 2. Shelterbelt reconstructed - 24 ha (Kherson oblast). 3. Shelterbelt inventoried - 1258 ha (2019-2020: 340 ha Kherson oblast; 600 ha – Mykolaiv oblast; 90 ha – Kyiv oblast; 2020 - 2021: Shelterbelt's inventory in 3 village communities of Kyiv oblast started (120 ha in total; 2021-2022: 108 ha - Byshiv and Dmytrivka village council, Kyiv oblast.).	S

						4. Three of the best agroforestry practices (climate resilience agroforestry, nut, and honey production) were applied. 5. Curriculum for FFS on agroforestry developed. 6. 6 webinars and 5 field trips in 3 pilot oblasts under FFS 2 on shelterbelts conducted. 7. The course "Development of effective shelterbelts management models in Ukraine" was developed and presented. 8. Guidelines on Implementation of Efficient Shelterbelt Management Models was developed	
	Outcome 3.1 Adaptive management ensured and key lessons shared	M&E system is in place to support adaptive results-based management and monitoring of upscaling resulting from the project.	No system in place	Implemented project based on adaptive results-based management	Project delivers expected results and shares best practices	The detailed work plan has been updated. M&E matrix is timely monitored. All M&E activities are conducted as per schedule.	S
	Output 3.1.1 Project progress continually monitored, mid-term review/evaluation and final	Mid-term and final evaluation reports	0	Mid-term review recommendations implemented		1.Mid-term evaluation performed, 20-24 January 2020. 2.Mid-term evaluation report submitted. 3.Four PPR submitted and approved. 4. Three PIR submitted and approved.	S

	evaluation conducted						
	Output 3.1.2 Assessment of resilience of tested INRM approaches and feeding back of lessons to field level	Resilience assessment	Resilience is generally not taken into consideration in NRM activities	Resilience assessment using the RAPTA approach of tested INRM approaches to identify the most appropriate implementation pathways for further upscaling	Up scaled INRM approaches are resilient to climate change and other external stressors	Posponed/cancelled	
	Output 3.1.3 Project achievements, results and innovative approaches recorded and disseminated	Project website and social media pages X number of project newsletters X number of awareness/ outreach events organized	Low awareness of INRM, including SLM, CA and CSA	Project website and social media pages established Outreach event organized in connection with project launch	6 project newsletters 4 outreach events	2 – newsletters published, 402 -web-publication and posts, 3 – international publications (FAO; Asahi Shimbun Globe, Japan; conference thesis Uzbekistan), 1 – national TV broadcasting, 1 – national radio broadcasting, 1 – national monography, 3 - national press conferences; 1 – national briefing, 8 - online webinars, 1 – on-line workshop, 3 - national radio interviews, 2 forums - East Expo 2019 and UN Environmental Forum 2021, 1 – national newspaper interview, 16 – outreached events organized,	HS

						1 – animated video produced and translated into English and Spanish in coordination with GSP (40 million visitors) 5– Publications-including - Recommendations for the creation, restoration, reconstruction and maintenance of shelterbelts in the steppe and forest-steppe zones of Ukraine (in Ukrainian), Overview of soil conditions of arable land, Guideline on Implementation of Efficient Shelterbelt Management Models (in Ukrainian); and 2 success story published: One success story published on FAO.org and one success story shared among national media. Publication on shelterbelt management translated into English. 3 short videos from FFS field visits developed and to be disseminated. - Practical part of FFS on 2 July 2021 - Practical part of FFS on 23 July 2021 - Briefing dedicated to World Soil Day (2 December) - Theoretical part of FFS on 18 February 2022	

Action Plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1.1	**N/A**		
Outcome 1.2	**N/A**		
Outcome 2.1	**N/A**		
Outcome 2.2	**N/A**		
Outcome 3.1	**N/A**		

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Workplan)

Outcomes and Outputs[12]	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements[13] (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance[14] in delivering outputs
Output 1.1.1	**The CC-LDD provides a platform for coordination and information sharing on INRM** **Number of ministries and agencies that become members of the CC-LDD**	• Participation Coordinating Council to combat land degradation and desertification (CC-LLD) members in the regional technical events in collaboration with FAO (training, workshops, consultation etc.) • Steering Committee Meeting • Publishing handover hard-copies for SCM • National Meeting on Coordinating Council to combat land degradation and desertification • Communication materials for the International Biodiversity Day and World Day to Combat Desertification and Drought (WDCDD) • Exchange visits on support to the sustainable agriculture • Foundation of Coordination Centre for Sustainable Agriculture (CCSA) based on the pilot plots in Mykolaiv	- World Soil Day event on Productivity of agricultural land in the context of state policy was conducted on 2 December 2021. The Memorandum between the Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Food of Ukraine and UaSP was signed. - 12 different meetings were held with agronomy experts to establish the Coordination Center of Sustainable Agriculture. - Documents to describe the main goal and objectives of the center, methods of work were developed. - A roadmap for further cooperation on the sustainable practices was developed. - A core of farmers who are ready to take part in the Coordination Centre foundation was formed.	**The key beneficiary MEPNR has been totally reorganized in June 2020, which affected the activity of Ministry regarding cooperation with international organizations in the second half of 2020. Besides, the second key beneficiary Ministry of**

[12] Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

[13] Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

[14] Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

		and Kherson oblasts with office in Kyiv • Communication materials for World Soil Day • Journalist visit on the field. Transportation costs/food. Drive through all project oblasts. 3-day event • Translation and publishing recommended FAO publications on soil monitoring and land management into Ukrainian		**Agrarian Policy was restored in first half of 2021 and slowly taking over some functions of the ministry of Economic development, trade and Agriculture. This situation affected the launch of PSC meeting.**
Output 1.1.2	**Number of draft laws and regulations in support of INRM principles approved (i.e. on functional land use, economic incentives, monitoring systems, soil quality standards, and ownership of shelterbelts)**	• Developing Action Plan to the Strategy on Land Degradation Neutrality (translation, revision, proof reading) • Developing the recommendation on improving national legislation on land tenure • Developing the Methodological approach on soil information collection including the harmonisation of indicators on LDN monitoring • Developing the Methodological approach on SLM monitoring including soil organic carbon monitoring and its harmonisation with international standards • Collaboration with State GeoCadastre Services aimed to support developing national geo-spatial system	- Action Plan to the Strategy on Land Neutrality Degradation was developed. - Recommendation on improving national legislation on land tenure was developed. - The Methodological approach on soil information collection including the harmonisation of indicators on LDN monitoring was developed - The Methodological approach on SLM monitoring including soil organic carbon monitoring and its harmonisation with international standards was developed.	
Output 1.1.3	**System in place for environmental**	• Harmonization of the national soil analysis standards with the	- A systematized topical dictionary for the unambiguous translation of the terms of the Ukrainian	

	monitoring and spatial planning **Number of persons in key institutions at national and sub-national level using the system**	international patterns pilot implementation • Development of the standardized data structure and format including the metadata for the soil profile database • Strengthening capacity on the agrochemical soil data collection and harmonization for further automatic processing • The strengthening capacity on the LDN monitoring system development: reclamation and drainage land data collection and mapping • Survey of soil analyses practices • Improved soil monitoring: agrochemical soil monitoring at selected project sites and pilot implementation on soil carbon monitoring on the regional level • Training of relevant institutions in methods for environmental monitoring and land-use planning • Soil Organic Carbon Mapping Training National Level • Training on the data collection, calibration and processing under the Design IT-platform (software) for LDN monitoring • Developing Guideline on agrochemical analysis collecting for laboratory • Strengthening base for laboratory analysis (equipment procurement) • Conference and 2-4 trainings of Soil Analysis	soil classification into English was developed. (the design is being prepared) - The standardized data structure and format including the metadata for the soil profile database were developed - The capacity of the agrochemical soil data collection and harmonization for further automatic processing was strengthened - The digital soil maps in the resolution 1:200 000 for Kharkiv and Kherson Oblasts of Ukraine tying in the relevant land map provided by State Geo Cadastr and in correspondence with WGS84 standards were developed - The Guidelines on matching national soil classification with WRB 2014 were developed; - The consolidation of soil profiles data in collaboration with SCP and the Institute of Soil Science and Agrochemistry for further mapping was performed. - The consolidation of data on monitoring sites and agrochemical soil passports for further mapping was performed. Data templates have been developed in collaboration with USP and the Soil Conservation Institute. - The development of the recommendations for harmonizing the data exchange between GLOSIS and the National Agriculture Land Degradation Neutrality (ALDN) monitoring platform has started. - The development of the recommendations for mapping carbon sequestration for different land-use scenarios (agro-technology applications) has started.	

Output 1.1.4	**System in place for monitoring of LDN indicators at demonstration sites (land cover, land productivity, soil organic carbon)**	• Design IT-platform for LDN monitoring • Pilot testing of LDN monitoring system • Developing the application of connection with systems of national environmental monitoring and national geo-spatial system • Server procurement + hard disks	- 5 meetings regarding the installation and testing of the National Agriculture Land Degradation Neutrality (ALDN) monitoring platform software were conducted. - The development of the import/export process and templates for visualizing soil survey data for the monitoring system has started. - ALDN platform is designed (Administration Module of ALND monitoring platform, Data import module for external data sources, Directory module of ALND monitoring platform, Registers module of ALND monitoring platform, database structures, the algorithm of data import from the land monitoring spots, the algorithm of soil agrochemistry data import and the algorithm of soil profile data import for further mapping were improved and modernized).	
Output 1.1.5	**Number of integrated land-use plans**	• Developing the integrated land-use management plan in selected oblast including the shelterbelt inventory • Developing the supportive legislation for the ILUM plan implementation	- Methodological approach for creation of integrated land resources management maps was elaborated. - The abandoned lands including the shelterbelts, fields' roads, dried ponds, self-plant, and abandoned forests in the land massive possess by Byshiv and Dmytrivka village communities distinguished and mapped. - The integrated land resources management maps including shelterbelts (on the example of Krasnokutsk and Rogan amalgamated territorial communities) were created - The potential of land resources of Krasnokutsk and Rogan amalgamated territorial communities was determined - The vector layers of shelterbelts, self-forested areas, wetlands on Krasnokutsk and Rogan amalgamated territorial communities in the format of shapefiles were created. - The vector layer of shelterbelts in geojson and shape formats of Kharkiv oblast was created. - The recommendations for elaboration of integrated land management plans engaging the abandoned lands developed.	**The PSC was requested for developing the practical regulation for ILMP at the administrative region level with pilot implementation . However, the activity was postponed until the ownership rights on the natural resource caused by the continuous reform of decentralizatio n as well as the**

				opening land market were clarified by project activities.
Output 1.2.1	**Ownership rights, procedures of inventory and standards for planting shelterbelts defined**	**MMMM** **- Consulting on identifying the end shelterbelt users and transfer the ownership rights** **- Facilitation on shelterbelt inventory**	- The consultation at Kyiv regional council was conducted (21 attendees). - 108 hectares of land plots with uncertain ownership rights and signs of afforestation of shelterbelts in Byshiv and Dmytrivka village councils were selected and shelterbelt inventory were conducted.	
Output 1.2.2	**Criteria and indicators developed for establishment of PES schemes**		**done**	**Constraints for activity implementation the lack of awareness among stakeholders regarding payments for ecosystem services and gaps legislation.**
Output 1.2.3	**Number of inclusive and green food and feed value-chains strengthened**	• "Sustainable value-chains analysis and development of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) and inclusive medical herbs "	- 1 webinar in Izium, Kharkiv oblast on ‘“Cultivation of medicinal and honey herbs in Steppe zone of Ukraine and women’s leadership” (55 participants – 41 women, 14 men)	
Output 2.1.1	**Number of conservation agriculture (CA) training events and workshops**		**done**	

	support by the project **Farmers Field Schools (FFS) established** **Number of farmer-to-farmer exchange visits**			
Output 2.1.2	**Number of CA practices implemented in selected production landscapes**	• Developing the on-line interactive training course on Sustainable agriculture focusing on CA for Universities linked to the Regional Alliance on CA in Central Asia • Developing the Guidelines the best CA and CSA practices in Ukraine • Publishing the Guidelines the best CA and CSA practices in Ukraine	- 12 personal meetings and 13 phone interviews with the farmers were conducted. - An expert group was formed based on the list of FAO experts to evaluate farmers' agronomic practices, as well as the questionnaire and lists of innovator farmers were formed. - The FAO Expert Group surveyed 25 farmers based on their practices, production philosophy, technical and technological solutions. - 10 visits to the farms were conducted to assess the state of technologies and agronomic practices development in Mykolaivska, Khersonska, Kyivska and Dnipropetrovska oblasts. - Meetings were held with teaching and scientific staff of 4 top agricultural universities by FAO experts. (Mykolaiv Agrarian University, Kherson Agrarian University, Bila Tserkva Agrarian University, NUBIP). - An expert group has been set up to write a Textbook on No-till and Strip-till farming systems for farmers, scientists and experts. - FAO experts have developed a textbook structure and prepared two sections - "Management of crop residues", "Cover crops as a basic element of the No-till and Strip-till system ". - The optional course on No-till and Strip-till was approved in NUBIP at the agro faculty. The syllabus was developed and approved.	

			- 14 farmers were interviewed regarding the agronomic practices.-The digest of Best Soil Conservation Practices has been prepared. It is on the final stage of editing and translation into English.	
Output 2.1.3	**Number of training events and workshops organized for women's groups, young women entrepreneurs, etc.** **Number of women-to-women exchange visits**	• Farmers survey about special needs and support of rural women under the environmental threats in agriculture	- 1 FFS (field trip) on 'The role of rural women in ecosystem services promoting' (22 participants – 17 women and 5 men) conducted and 1 webinar on "Cultivation of medicinal and honey herbs in Steppe zone of Ukraine and women's leadership" in Kharkiv oblast (55 participants – 41 women and 14 men) carried out.	
Output 2.2.1	**Number of guidelines for inventory and management of shelterbelts**	• Preparing the publication Guidelines for plant spices selection for shelterbelt	- Guideline on plant species selection was prepared. - The methodological approaches to improve the shelterbelt inventory applying the remote sensing monitoring and GIS information on mobile devices developed. - Identification and mapping of land including shelterbelts using Earth remote sensing and GIS was performed.	
Output 2.2.2	**Number of shelterbelt best management practices implemented**	• Implementation of the shelterbelt inventory in Kherson and Mykolaiv oblast • Inventory of Kharkiv oblast shelterbelts • Distributing the seedlings for the shelterbelt establishment and reconstruction in Kherson and Mykolaiv oblast	- 3 FFS on the best Shelterbelt practices (2 field trips and 1 online event) in Kyiv, Kherson, and Kharkiv oblasts were conducted. - The course "Development of effective shelterbelts management models in Ukraine" was developed and presented. - Guidelines on Implementation of Efficient Shelterbelt Management Models was developed	

		• Improving equipment for seedlings production in Kherson region	- 2 shelterbelts inventories were conducted in Byshiv and Dmytrivka village council	
Output 3.1.1	**Mid-term and final evaluation reports**		Planned for the second semester 2022	
Output 3.1.2	**Resilience assessment**		-Due to the war,we suggest to cancel this output	
Output 3.1.3	**Project website and social media pages** **X number of project newsletters** **X number of awareness/ outreach events organized**		FAO Ukraine Twitter account: https://twitter.com/FAOUkraine UaSP website: https://uasp.com.ua/ Events organized: - Practical part of FFS on 2 July 2021 - Practical part of FFS on 23 July 2021 - Briefing dedicated to World Soil Day (2 December) Theoretical part of FFS on 18 February 2022	

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.

Progress:

The ALDN (agricultural land degradation neutrality) monitoring platform was established. In collaboration with the 'State institution 'Soils protection institute of Ukraine', they are working on the data import of the soil profiles data, monitoring sites, and agrochemical soil passports. The recommendations development for harmonizing the data exchange between GLOSIS and the National Agriculture Land Degradation Neutrality (ALDN) monitoring platform and the recommendations for mapping carbon sequestration for different land-use scenarios (agro-technology applications) have started (Output 1.1.4).

The World Soil Day event on 'Productivity of agricultural land in the context of state policy was conducted on the 2nd of December 2021,using the event, the Memorandum of cooperation between the Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Food of Ukraine and UaSP was signed.

With an aim to establish the Coordination Center of Sustainable Agriculture 12 different meetings were held with agronomy experts from various scientific institutions in Ukraine and farmers; documents to describe the main goal and objectives of the center, methods of work, and a roadmap for further cooperation on the sustainable practices were developed. (Output 1.1.1).

The project, together with the National Scientific Centre 'Institute for Soil Science and Agrochemistry Research named after O.N. Sokolovsky', has undertaken the following scientific work regarding soils:
- Development of the methodological approach to standardize soil profile data;
- Development of the Guidelines on matching national soil classification with WRB 2014;
- Development of a systematized topical dictionary for the unambiguous translation of the terms of the Ukrainian soil classification into English (at the design stage);
- Development of the digital soil maps in the resolution 1:200 000 for Kharkiv and Kherson Oblasts of Ukraine tying in the relevant land map provided by State Geo Cadastr and in correspondence with WGS84 standards;
- Inclusion of soil data into the international soil monitoring system developing the correlation between Ukrainian and international soil classification systems continued (Outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4).

Action Plan to the Strategy on Land Degradation Neutrality was validated. The Recommendation on improving national legislation on land tenure, and the Methodological approach to soil information collection including the harmonization of indicators on LDN monitoring were developed to strengthen the policy in the sphere of protection and sustainable use of lands and other natural resources, protection of soils and rehabilitation of their fertility. (Outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4).

In cooperation with the Ukraine Research Institute of Forestry and Forest Melioration named after G.M.Vysotskyi the project aimed at assessing land suitability potentials for development of integrated land-use management plans using a remote sensing and GIS based approach on the example of Krasnokutsk and Rogan amalgamated territorial communities in Kharkiv region through:
- identification and mapping of land including shelterbelts using Earth remote sensing and GIS (on the example of Krasnokutsk and Rogan amalgamated territorial communities),
- creation of integrated land resources management maps including shelterbelts (on the example of Krasnokutsk and Rogan amalgamated territorial communities),
- creation of vector layers of shelterbelts, self-forested areas, wetlands on Krasnokutsk and Rogan amalgamated territorial communities in the format of shapefiles,
- identification of the area covered by shelterbelts of Kharkiv region, creation of a vector layer of shelterbelts in geojson and shape formats. (Output 1.1.5.)

Effective shelterbelts management models in Ukraine" was developed and presented on the remote platform of the All-Ukrainian Association of village councils and amalgamated communities (ASSOGU) (Output 2.2.2), and the consultation at Kyiv regional council was conducted (21 attendees - representatives of regional authorities, deputies of the regional council, heads of communities, heads, and specialists of land relations departments in communities) (Output 1.2.1). In addition, the guideline on plant species selection was prepared and the methodological approaches to improve the shelterbelt inventory applying the remote sensing monitoring and GIS information on mobile devices developed (Output 2.2.1).

With the aim to share the expertise on the Conservation Agriculture, it has prepared the Digest of the best CA practices (The practices of 14 farmers were described: their successful cases, the manufacturer's philosophy, technology, technical capabilities, and recommendations for further development)., FAO Textbook on No-till and Strip-till farming systems (two sections have been developed - "Management of crop residues", "Cover crops as a basic element of the No-till and Strip-till system".) (Output 2.1.2).

Challenges:

Due to the restructuring of the project's key partners - State institution «Soils protection institute of Ukraine», Institute of Water Problems and Land Reclamation, and the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources the implementation and performance of the planned activities described within the signed Letters of Agreements were significantly postponed.

Moreover, the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic persistently made a huge impact on the timely and successful implementation of the project activities.

Furthermore, the escalation of conflict in Ukraine on February 24th significantly led to the suspension of certain project's activities for 4 months. This situation has become the major constraint to the effective project implementation due to the FAO staff relocation, key partners' suspension of activity (that had a direct impact on the LoA implementation), ongoing hostilities within the project sites, etc.

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	FY2022 Development Objective rating[15]	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating[16]	Comments/reasons[17] justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	**S**	**S**	*The first eight months of the reporting period (June 2021–February 2022) were going rather smoothly following the COVID restrictions. A number of the SPs demonstrated qualitative results and performed all deliverables on time (UaSP, ASSOGU, Sokolovskogo Institute, and Vysotskogo Institute). Two state institutes, such as the IWPLR and the Institute of Soil Protection, faced internal problems such as reorganization processes and changes in the top management. As of now, the situation has stabilized; the no-cost extension amendments have been signed, and the cooperation is ongoing. Following the beginning of the war, the activities were put on hold for several months, but now all stakeholders and partners have resumed work and are ready for further tasks. Our CA experts have finalized the Digest of the best CA practices and are now working on educational and online courses on CA technologies. The project's experts and partners' staff are safe and can continue working. Considering all the above, the project's no-cost extension is strictly required at least for 6 months to implement the remaining activities and finalize the project.*
Budget Holder	**S**	**S**	*Concur with LTO and FLO*

[15] **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.
For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.
[16] **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.
[17] Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

GEF Operational Focal Point[18]			*Comments and ratings from OFP were not received within the set deadline for PIR final submission.*
Lead Technical Officer[19]	**S**	**S**	*Although some activities were paused due to the war. The project team continued working and implementing online activities related to the CSA, such as the Digest of the best CA practices; a Textbook on No-till and Strip-till farming systems (two sections have been developed: "Management of crop residues" and "Cover crops as a basic element of the No-till and Strip-till systems." All the baseline information for the ALDN system was prepared. It is very relevant to do a no-cost extension to be able to finalize the remaining activities and close the project by achieving all the outlined outcomes.*
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	**S**	**S**	*Despite the various challenges that the project had to overcome (COVID-19 restrictions, war in the country), project objectives and outcomes are on track, and expected results are qualitatively attained. Some major milestones have been achieved during this reporting period on the topic areas of LDN (such as the ALDN (agricultural land degradation neutrality) monitoring platform), CA (the Digest of the best CA practices) and shelterbelt management (improvement of the shelterbelt inventory). The activities related to the awareness raising, outreach and communication of the project are excellent.*

[18] In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.
[19] The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan **at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social (ESS) Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain**.

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	**Current ESS risk classification** Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid[20]. If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low risk	High risk (due to the war)

Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.

[20] **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

	Type of risk	Risk rating[21]	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	The suspension of the several project's activities due to the ongoing hostilities in Ukraine, especially in the project's sites.	High	No	The reprograming of the project for the last six months to achieve the best possible results. The risk will be mitigated through the adjustments of the workplan to the current situation in line with the project's requirements.	- Project's activities reactivation - New workplan development considering available resources.	

[21] Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating[21]	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	The unpredictability in the project implementation caused by the reorganization of major national beneficiaries	Moderate	No	This risk will be mitigated under Component 1 of the project that will strengthen the intersectoral coordination mechanism/Coordinating Council for Land Degradation and Desertification to enhance cooperation.	- Strengthen cooperation with the middle-level management of the top governmental organizations. - Engaging more members on the government level into the CC-LDD. - Increasing project partnerships and stakeholder involvement considering the degree of ownership of project results by stakeholders.	
3	Unclear responsibilities of institutions at national and local level	Low	Yes	This will also be addressed under component 1of the project that will provide support to improve institutional structures and legislation for INRM, including roles and responsibilities at national and sub-national levels.	- The land degradation monitoring system was developed and established.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating[21]	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	Low technical capacity at national and local level halting the project's progress	Low	Yes	Capacity development in conservation agriculture and shelterbelt management will be provided under Component 2, which will mitigate this risk.	- 3 FFS (2 field trips and 1 online event) were conducted. - A number of Guidelines, Recommendations, and Methodological approaches on LDN monitoring were developed. - The best CA practices Digest was developed. - The optional course on No-till and Strip-till was approved in NUBIP at the agro faculty. The syllabus was developed and approved. The work on the Textbook is ongoing. - Documents to describe the main goal and objectives, methods of work of the Coordination Center of Sustainable Agriculture, and a roadmap for further cooperation were developed. - The online course "Development of effective shelterbelts management models in Ukraine" was developed and presented.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating[21]	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
5	Natural changes in agro-ecological zones due to gradual changes in climate and extreme weather events	Low	Yes	INRM practices to be demonstrated and scaled up by the project are proven to enhance resilience to climate change, such as CA, and multi-purpose agroforestry/shelterbelt management.	All the guidelines and practical recommendations on agroforestry and CA developed provide inputs on increasing resilience to climate change.	

Project overall risk rating (Low, Moderate, Substantial or High):

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Substantial	The rating for the 2022 is substantial as the current situation can rapidly change due to the ongoing war in Ukraine.

7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented during this Fiscal Year
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	**Not yet**

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines[22]. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework	**N/a**		
Components and cost	**N/a**		
Institutional and implementation arrangements	**N/a**		
Financial management	**N/a**		
Implementation schedule	**N/a**		
Executing Entity	**N/a**		
Executing Entity Category	**N/a**		
Minor project objective change	**N/a**		
Safeguards	**N/a**		
Risk analysis	**N/a**		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	**N/a**		
Co-financing	**N/a**		
Location of project activity	**N/a**		
Other	**N/a**		

22 Source: https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Food of Ukraine	Key (leading) stakeholder	- The Memorandum between the Ministry and UaSP was signed. - Coordination of joint work on the ALDN monitoring system development	The internal reorganizational process led to postponing activities implementation.
Ministry of environmental protection and natural resources of ukraine	Key (leading) stakeholder	- Coordination of work on shelterbelt inventory - Collaboration with communities within the LoA implementation with ASSOGU.	The internal reorganizational process led to postponing activities implementation.
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
All-Ukrainian association village councils and amalgamated communities	Implementing partner	LoA for provision of 'The scaling-up the best shelterbelt management practices with further development of integrated land management plans engaging the abandoned lands in Kyiv oblast' - finished	The new LoA was planned regarding the INRM, but due to the war, it was canceled.
Association "Ukrainian Soil Partnership"	Implementing partner	LoA for provision of "Setting up the national Agriculture Land Degradation Neutrality (ALDN) monitoring platform" - finalizing	The UaSP didn't fully perform the outlined activities, as the Soil Protection Institute didn't provide the whole data stated in the LoA for further processing.
Private sector entities			
N/A			

Others[1] State Institutions			
National Scientific Center «Institute for Soil Science and Agrochemistry Research Named After O.N. Sokolovsky»	Implementing partner	LoA for provision of "Reconciliation the national system of soil classifiers with WRB 2014"	The NCC provided a part of the out-of-date data. The NCC staff had fled and were working online, leading to some complications in the performance of the activities.
State Institution "Soil Protection Institute" of Ukraine	Implementing partner	LoA for provision of "Strengthening capacity on the agrochemical soil data collection and harmonization for further automatic processing: case for forest-steppe zone in Ukraine"	The Soil Protection Institute didn't provide the whole data stated in the LoA, and the prolonged negotiations process led to the third LoA amendment initiation.
Institute of Water Problem and Reclamation	Implementing partner	LoA for provision of "The strengthening capacity on the land degradation neutrality monitoring system development: reclamation and drainage land data collection and mapping"	The prolonged negotiations process led to the second LoA amendment initiation.
Institute of Agroecology and Environmental Management of National Academy of Agrarian Sciences of Ukraine	Stakeholder	- Expertise and organizational support in conducting 2 FFS in Kyiv and Kharkiv oblast.	N/a
New stakeholders identified/engaged			

[1] They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women's groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then.

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	No	N/A
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	Output 2.1.3 aimed at identification and support to the special needs of rural women at project sites to ensure that their important role in agriculture. A field trip to Kherson oblast was conducted on 'The role of rural women in ecosystem services promoting' (22 participants – 17 women and 5 men). And 1 webinar in Izium, Kharkiv oblast on '"Cultivation of medicinal and honey herbs in Steppe zone of Ukraine and women's leadership" (55 participants – 41 women, 14 men)
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	Within the trainings we cover the next topics: - The role of women in, agriculture, environmental conservation, and the promotion of ecosystem services.
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	Within the trainings we cover the next topics: - The role of rural women in ecosystem services promotion. - Women's leadership, knowledge, roles and responsibilities in cultivation of medicinal and honey herbs
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	- Assessing women's needs in medicinal and honey plants growing, plant management. - The gender aspects in the promotion of ecosystem services and particularly shelterbelt reconstruction in local communities considered and the local female leaders identified and incorporated into the professional network.

M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	Data from the field training are disaggregated by gender and reports are prepared for each activity.
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	Project assistant is an acting AAP&Gender Focal Point.
Any other good practices on gender		

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval during this reporting period.

Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	During the covered period (July 2021 – June 2022), communication support was provided on the following events: • 3 practical sessions of the Field Farmer School: on 2 and 23 July 2021, on 18 February 2022; • Press conference on the World Soil Day with the Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Food (December 2021) - https://youtu.be/LeCvPcnxHqA (UKR), https://youtu.be/QHWojhCq8Ec (ENG) The Press Conference dedicated to World Soil Day (December 5, 2020) "The establishment of soil information systems for sustainable food production" was held on December 2, 2021, with the participation of Head of FAO Ukraine Office, Deputy Minister on digital transformation and digitalization of MAPF, representatives from Ukrainian Soil Partnership.
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.	Mostivska Amalgamated Territorial Community is located in Mykolaivska oblast and includes 18 localities. The land fund of the Community reaches almost 1 000 ha including a big number of the lands with shelterbelts. According to Nadiia Babanska, Head of Mostivska Amalgamated Territorial Community, shelterbelts cause additional difficulties for farming, because the large width of it and partial arable land affect income and yields. "Our villages are not gasified and due to the fact that the income is very low and people do not have work, the only opportunity for them to heat homes is to get some wood. Therefore, shelterbelts have been destroyed massively and there are few old trees that were planted many years ago," said Nadiia Babanska. "We understood the importance of conducting an inventory of shelterbelts, but we were not able to find such money. We are very thankful to FAO that our dream makes true."

	In February 2020, the Community joined the project implemented by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The main objective of the project is to promote the restoration of degraded landscapes in the steppe and forest-steppe zones of Ukraine. Thanks to participation in this project, the Community received essential funds to provide inventory activities. In addition, FAO representatives conducted several seminars and field trips. They informed participants about the impact of forest strips and their location on yields. "FAO funded 80 percent of the inventory of land and shelterbelts; the rest was covered through the local budget. It was a great opportunity for us to be a part of this project," highlighted Nadiia. "We chose two widest shelterbelts for inventory and contacted a farm that has agricultural land near them and was interested in leasing this land. The farm planned to plant new trees but, unfortunately, the war began, and we did not manage to complete the planned activities." Integrated land usage management is the planning, organization, motivation, and control that generally contribute to the coordination of land development and its effective management, so it is possible to achieve maximum socio-economic well-being on a fair basis without compromising the sustainability of vital ecosystems.
Please provide links to related website, social media account	https://twitter.com/FAOUkraine https://uasp.com.ua/
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	Publications in media: https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-economy/3369122-ak-ukraini-ne-vtratiti-roduci-cornozemi.html https://superagronom.com/articles/589-problema-degradatsiyi-gruntiv-suchasniy-stan-riziki-ta-sposobi-podolannya https://superagronom.com/news/14879-do-2050-roku-chastka-degradovanih-gruntiv-moje-syagnuti-90--dumka https://www.growhow.in.ua/dehradatsiia-gruntiv-naukovi-obgruntuvannia-ta-prohnozy/ https://agrotimes.ua/article/yak-zupynyty-degradacziyu-gruntiv/ https://agroexpert.ua/21700-2/ http://agro-business.com.ua/2017-09-29-05-56-43/item/23897-natsionalnyi-vyklyk-nauka-biznes-i-derzhava-hurtuiutsia-zarady-vidnovlennia-rodiuchosti-gruntiv.html

	https://www.seeds.org.ua/shkola-dlya-fermeriv-yak-vidnovlyuvati-ta-utrimuvati-polezaxisni-lisosmugi/ http://www.naas.gov.ua/newsukraine/?ELEMENT_ID=7025 https://uasp.com.ua/2021/12/05/vsesvitnij-den-gruntiv/ Event dedicated to World Soil Day https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-presshall/3358075-produktivnist-zemel-silskogospodarskogo-priznacenna-u-konteksti-politiki-derzavi.html https://youtu.be/LeCvPcnxHqA https://youtu.be/QHWojhCq8Ec https://uasp.com.ua/2021/11/26/produktyvnist-zemel-silskogospodarskogo-pryznachennya-u-konteksti-polityky-derzhavy/
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	Viktoriia Mykhalchuk, Communication Specialist Viktoriia.Mykhalchuk@fao.org

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.
If applicable, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities. Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how. N/a

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing[23]	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	Ministry of Environmental protection and Natural Resources	Cash/in kind	$ 6 000 000	N/A		$ 6 000 000
National Government	Ministry for Development of Economy, Trade and Agriculture of Ukraine; Ministry of Agriculture	Cash/in kind	$ 590 000	$ 365 500		$ 607 000
State Organization	State Ecological Academy of Post-Graduate Education	In kind	$ 80 000	$ 0		$ 0
Private Sector	LLC “Agrogeneration”	Cash/In kind	$ 2 188 267	$ 327 207		$ 451 074
Private Sector	Center of Soil Ecology	Cash/In kind	$ 400 000	$ 7 200		$ 14 400
UN Agency	FAO	Cash/In kind	$1 065 000	$421 561		$1 065 000
State Organization	Institute of Water Problems and Land Reclamation	In kind	$ 0	$63 020		$ 81168
	National Academy of Agriculture Sciences	In kind	$ 0	$ 3 400		$ 3 400

[23] Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

	Institute of irrigated agriculture, Kherson	In kind	$ 0	$ 9 800		$ 20 000
	Ukrainian Research Institute of Forestry and Agroforestry	In kind	$ 0	$ 5 670		$ 5 670
	Institute of Soil Protection	In kind	$ 0			
	Institute of Agroecology	In kind	$ 0			
	Institute of Soil Science and Agrochemistry	In kind	$ 0			
Governmental authorities	StateGeoCadastre	In kind	$ 0	$ 7 430		$ 7 430
	State Forest Planning Agency	In kind	$ 0	$ 2 250		$ 2 250
Local government	Kherson oblast state administration	Cash/In kind	$ 0	$ 4 900		$ 300 000
Local communities	Mostivska amalgamated territorial community, Mykolaiv Oblast	Cash/In kind	$ 0	$9500		$15000
	Vynohradivska amalgamated territorial community, Kherson Oblast	Cash/In kind	$ 0	$9500		$15000
	Pustovarivska amalgamated territorial community, Kyiv oblast	Cash/In kind	$ 0	$4355		$10000
	Byshivska Amalgamated territorial community, Kyiv Oblast	Cash	$ 0	$570		$570
	Makarivksa Amalgamated territorial community, Kyiv Oblast	Cash	$ 0	$1263		$1263
	Dmytrivska Amalgamated territorial community, Kyiv Oblast	Cash	$ 0	$754		$754
NGO	UaSP	Cash/In kind	$ 0	$6000		$61000
Private Sector	PLAE "Burlutske" Velykyi Burluk city, Kharkiv Oblast	Cash/In kind	$ 0	$4000		$15000

	FE "Tellus-Ug", v.Tavriiske, Kherson Oblast	Cash/In kind	$ 0	$ 2500		$2500
	Yugran Ltd, v.Fedorivka, Kharkiv Oblast	Cash/In kind	$ 0	$4000		$4000
	"FE ""Arcadia"", v.Ivanivka, Mykolaiv oblast	Cash/In kind	$ 0	$5700		$5700
	LLC "AP Zorya-Yug", v.Kucheryavovolodymyrivka, Kherson Oblast	Cash/In kind	$ 0	$5000		$5000
	PAE named after Frunze, v. Berdyanka, Kharkiv Oblast	Cash/In kind	$ 0	$3 500		$3 500
	Agro-survivor, LLC, c. Cherkasy,Cherkaska oblast	Cash/In kind	$ 0	$1 500		$2 500
	Agrofirma Kolos LLC., v.Pustovarivka, Kyiv Oblast	Cash/In kind	$ 0	$8000		$15000
	AF "Dodola", v, Novoraisk, Kherson Oblast	Cash/In kind	$ 0	$1300		$1300
	To add all private organisations which has supported project over the last year					
		TOTAL	$ 10 323 267	$ 1,275,880	n/a	$8,715,479

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as "good practice"
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives)
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits)
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the project's approved implementation plan.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of **all** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as "good practice
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of **most** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of **some** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of **some** components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of **most** components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk rating. It should access the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than **75%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between **51%** and **75%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between **26%** and **50%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to **25%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.

Annex 2. Project coordinates

46.736382, 32.706852 - GCP/UKR/004/GFF project field office
50.437624, 30.520343 - GCP/UKR/004/GFF project office
N 48°54'44.7" E 37°00'53.6" - Agricultural farm "Podolivska", v.Barvinkove, Kharkiv oblast
N 47°25'01.1" E 30°59'19.2" - "Ukraina" agricultural LLC, v. Mostove, Mykolaiv oblast
N 46°22'01.1" E 33°06'21.8" - SE "Brylivske" farm, v.Pryvitne, Kherson oblast
N 49°55'20.7" E 30°09'01.5" - L. Pogorilyi UkrNDIVVT, v. Doslidnytske, Kyiv oblast"
N 46°19'51.7" E 32°36'35.4" - SERS "Velyki Klyny", v. Velyki Klyny, Kherson oblast
N 50°00'03.6" E 37°20'21.9" - PLAE "Burlutske" Velykyi Burluk city, Kharkiv Oblast
46.377692, 32.569634 - FE "Tellus-Ug", v.Tavriiske, Kherson Oblast
49.282429, 37.295097 - Yugran Ltd, v.Fedorivka, Kharkiv Oblast
47.796710, 31.669942 - "FE ""Arcadia"", v.Ivanivka, Mykolaivska oblast
46.500130, 33.537649 - LLC "AP Zorya-Yug", v.Kucheryavovolodymyrivka, Kherson Oblast
49.103155, 35.453192 - PAE named after Frunze, v. Berdyanka, Kharkiv Oblast
49.698974, 29.821147 - Agrofirma Kolos LLC., v.Pustovarivka, Kyiv Oblast
47.415966, 30.987384 - Mostivska amalgamated territorial community, Mykolaiv Oblast
46.363481, 32.922116 - Vynohradivska amalgamated territorial community, Kherson Oblast
49.696123, 29.810497 - Pustovarivska amalgamated territorial community, Kyiv oblast
47.429861, 31.180750 - Sukha Balka village, Voznesensky district, Mykolaiv oblast
49.725356, 30.098369 - Bila Tserkva Research and Breeding Station of the Institute of Bioenergy Crops and Sugar Beets of NAAS of Ukraine, Kyiv oblast
49.641161, 34.557283 - Experimental Station of Medicinal Plants, Institute of Agroecology and Environmental Management of NAAS of Ukraine, v. Berezotocha, Poltava oblast
46.623628, 32.720865 - State enterprise "Steps branch named after Vynohradov of the Ukrainian Research Institute of Forestry and Forest Melioration named after G. M. Vysotsky", v.Oleshky, Kherson Oblast
50.263571, 29.889945 - Byshivska Amalgamated territorial community, Kyiv Oblast
50.446704, 29.817243 - Makarivksa Amalgamated territorial community, Kyiv Oblast
50.465211, 30.160127 - Dmytrivska Amalgamated territorial community, Kyiv Oblast
49.77618, 30.32640 – PLC "Mriia", v.Bloshchyntsi, Kyiv oblast
49.86824, 30.48367 – PC "Mykhaylivskyy lan", v. Mykhaylivka, Kyiv oblast
50.10633, 28.95388 – PLC 'Zhyva Nyva", v.Stara Kotelnia, Zhytomyr oblast
48.72637, 29.83436 – Farm 'Dona Oleksiia Petrovycha', v.Komarivka, Vinnytska oblast
49.96748, 34.14638 – PC 'Agroecologiia', v. Mykhaylyky, Poltavska oblast
49.59689, 33.18820 – Farm 'Doslidne', v.Semenivka, Poltavska oblast

49.35978, 36.81353 – PLC 'Husarivka', v.Husarivka, Kharkivska oblast
47.00938, 33.48740 – PP 'Agrofirma-Dodola', v. Novoraisk, Khersonska oblast
47.79670, 31.66793 – Farms 'Vidrodzhennia-100', v. Ivanivka, Mykolaivska oblast
47.90799, 30.78555 – Farm 'Annushka', v. Kamýanyi Mist, Mykolaivska oblast
46.97161, 31.99230 – Farm 'Argument', Mykolaiv, Mykolaivska oblast
46.77110, 31.30789 – PLC 'VVI-AGRO', v. Novofedorivka, Mykolaivska oblast
48.39142, 35.54312 – Farm 'Anastasiia', v.Vilne, Dnipropetrovska oblast
48.48033, 35.61022 – PLC 'Soiuz-Spetstekhnika', v. Maiske, Dnipropetrovska oblast
50.06285, 35.16666 – Krasnokutska Amalgamated territorial community, Kharkiv oblast
49.90311, 36.49085 – Roganska Amalgamated territorial community, Kharkiv oblast
50.04542, 30.21703 – v. Ksaverivka, Kyiv oblast
46.55297, 33.82293 – Tavrychanska Amalgamated territorial community, Kherson oblast