



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review 2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



### 1. Basic Project Data

#### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Europe (FAO)
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Ukraine
<b>Project Title:</b>	Integrated Natural Resources Management in Degraded Landscapes in the Forest-Steppe and Steppe Zones of Ukraine
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/UKR/004/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	9813
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Climate Change Mitigation, Land Degradation, MFA
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources in cooperation with Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Food
<b>Project Duration:</b>	04 Oct 2017 - 31 Jul 2020

#### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	5 May 2017
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	04/10/2017
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	31/07/2020
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	N/A
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	N/A

#### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	1 776 484	
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	MENR	USD 6 000 000
	MAPF – L.Pogorilyy Institute	USD 590 000
	Agrogeneration	USD 2 188 267
	SEAPG	USD 80 000
	Center for Soil Ecology	USD 400 000
	FAO	USD 1 065 000

<sup>1</sup> as per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> In case of a project extension.

<sup>3</sup> Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

<sup>4</sup> This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):</b>	USD 435,928
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019<sup>5</sup></b>	USD 664 418

### Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	22 May 2019
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	Second semester 2019
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	N/A
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	<b>Yes</b> or <b>No</b>
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	<b>Yes</b> or <b>No</b>
<b>Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:</b>	N/A
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>Yes</b> or <b>No</b>

### Ratings

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	Satisfactory (S)	
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	Satisfactory (S)	
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	Medium	

### Status

<b>Implementation Status (1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</b>	<b>1st PIR</b>
--	----------------

<sup>5</sup> Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

<sup>6</sup> Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

## Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Oksana Ryabchenko, National Project Coordinator (FAOUA)	Oksana.Ryabchenko@fao.org
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Tania Santivañez, Agricultural Officer (REUTD)	Tania.Santivanez@fao.org
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Raimund Jehle, Regional Programme Leader (REUTD)	Raimund.Jehle@fao.org
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division</b>	Hernan Gonzalez, Technical Officer (CBC)	Hernan.Gonzalez@fao.org

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Objective(s):</b>						
<b>Outcome 1.1</b>	<b>INRM principles integrated into environment, agriculture and forest sector frameworks, policies and programs</b>	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	National Soil Partnership established with the purpose to strength national policy for INRM and creation of systematic monitoring platform based on the principles United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD).	S
<b>Output 1.1.1</b> Strengthening of the Coordinating Council to combat land degradation and desertification (CC-LDD) to support intersectoral	<b>The CC-LDD provides a platform for coordination and information sharing on INRM</b>	The NAP recommends the establishment of the CC-LDD for enhanced coordination and information sharing, but the recommendations have not been	The CC-LDD strengthened with participation from all relevant sectors	Enhanced coordination and information sharing on INRM across sectors	The CC-LDD has been established; First Annual Steering Committee Meeting has been carried out. Online Information Sharing Platform launched: <a href="https://healthy-">https://healthy-</a>	S

<sup>7</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
coordination for INRM at national and sub-national level	<b>Number of ministries and agencies that become members of the CC-LDD</b>	operationalised.			<a href="http://soils.org.ua/en/">soils.org.ua/en/</a>  5	
<b>Output 1.1.2</b> Improved institutional structures and legislation for sustainable land and shelterbelt management	<b>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)</b>	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	Two draft laws on the Environmental Protection were developed and provided to the Government for their consideration and further adoption.	S
<b>Output 1.1.3</b> Strengthened national environmental monitoring systems and spatial planning on land and shelterbelt resources and land degradation control	<b>System in place for environmental monitoring and spatial planning</b>  <b>Number of persons in key institutions at national and sub-national level using the system</b>	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	Project included into the process of national environmental monitoring system development.  National Soil Partnership (NSP) established by the leading relevant state institutes (seven institutes) that represents top Governmental units (ministries and agency). NSP is represented by Association and aim at	HS

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					developing unified national standards on SLM and making them available for all interested stakeholders.	
<b>Output 1.1.4</b> Establishment of a Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) monitoring system.	<b>System in place for monitoring of LDN indicators at demonstration sites (land cover, land productivity, soil organic carbon)</b>	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	Technical specifications and approaches for the soil monitoring system and shelterbelt inventory were discussed during the meeting with leading national experts. As a result, list of soil monitoring indicators suggested for use was developed.	MS
<b>Output 1.1.5</b> Integrated land-use management plans at administrative region level	<b>Number of integrated land-use plans</b>	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	The implementation of this activity is planned to start in the fourth quarter of 2019	N/A
<b>Outcome 1.2</b> Financial and incentive mechanisms for INRM in place at national and sub-national levels	<b>Number and types of state-led and market-led incentive mechanisms supporting INRM</b>	Incentives mechanisms for INRM are generally weak in Ukraine due to unclear ownership of resources, and lack of knowledge	Ownership rights of shelterbelts clarified and suitable incentive mechanisms, such as Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) and opportunities for certification of	At least two incentive mechanisms in place	N/A	N/A

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
			value-chains, identified in the three participating oblasts			
<b>Output 1.2.1</b> Ownership rights, procedures of inventory and standards for management and planting of shelterbelts	<b>Ownership rights, procedures of inventory and standards for planting shelterbelts defined</b>	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	Recommendations for setting-up the procedure of establishment, restoration, reconstruction and maintenance of shelterbelts developed; Manual for elaboration of the national standards of shelterbelts planting based on the purpose, landscape, and types of soil typologies is being developed;	S
<b>Output 1.2.2</b> Clear criteria and indicators developed for establishment of Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) schemes for INRM	<b>Criteria and indicators developed for establishment of PES schemes</b>	Ukraine has very limited experience with mechanisms for scaling up of INRM, such as PES, and there is a need to establish 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	N/A	N/A

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Output 1.2.3</b> Inclusive and green food and feed value-chains strengthened	<b>Number of inclusive and green food and feed value-chains strengthened</b>	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 environmentally friendly	Assessment to select and strengthen two value-chains to become more inclusive and environmentally friendly will start in the third quarter of 2019 and it is expected to last 6 months	N/A
<b>Outcome 2.1</b> Upscaling of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and climate-smart agricultural (CSA) practices in production landscapes in the forest-steppe zone	<b>SLM and CSA technologies/best practices applied on X ha of land sequestering Y mton CO2</b>	SLM and CSA technologies are applied in isolated locations in Ukraine promoted by research institutes and agro-enterprises that are not connected to higher level planning and decision-making processes	10 000 ha	29 400 ha 277 675 mton CO2eq.	SLM and CSA technologies/best practices applied on 135 ha in both Kharkiv (115 ha) and Kherson (20 ha) oblasts on the project plots. CSA and SLM technologies are being disseminated through research institutes and farmers in the rural areas of Kherson, Kharkiv and Mykolaiv Oblasts. More than 90 farmers were involved who are cultivating around 98,000 ha.	HS
<b>Output 2.1.1</b> Capacity to implement CA in the forest-steppe zone developed and strengthened	<b>Number of conservation agriculture (CA) training events and workshops support by the project</b>	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	30 agricultural service providers trained in CA  3 FFS established, and 3 exchange visits	Around 200 agricultural service providers trained in CA through FFS approach  4 FFS organized in the	HS

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
	<p><b>Farmers Field Schools (FFS) established</b></p> <p><b>Number of farmer-to-farmer exchange visits</b></p>		service providers in total	organized	<p>form of farm-to farm exchange visits;</p> <p>The FFS are being implementing according the FAO recommendations and curriculum for FFS designed</p>	
<b>Output 2.1.2</b> CA practices demonstrated and upscaled	<b>Number of CA practices implemented in selected production landscapes</b>	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 CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	<p>Development of CA management practices in the arid conditions launched;</p> <p>Field testing of the SLM and CA practices at project site in Kharkiv and Kherson regions started.</p> <p>2 CSA practices (“Conservation agriculture in combination with irrigation”; “climate smart agriculture approaches based on the IMP”) developed and implemented on the project plots (Kharkiv 130 ha; Kherson 20ha);</p> <p>8 CSA practices improved and</p>	HS

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					implemented under the supervision of project team in collaboration with local farmers (on the total area of arable land around 16K ha).	
<b>Output 2.1.3</b> Identification and support to the special needs of rural women at project sites	<b>Number of training events and workshops organized for women's groups, young women entrepreneurs, etc.</b>  <b>Number of women-to-women exchange visits</b>	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	Assessment of gender related risks for women and men working in agriculture has been developed as a baseline for the further gender trainings in gender issues and the special needs of rural women. Recommendation presented on the national level.	MS
<b>Outcome 2.2</b> Rehabilitation and sustainable management of shelterbelts	<b>Best practices for shelterbelt management applied on X ha of land sequestering Y mton CO2</b>	Shelterbelts have been allowed to degrade since independence due to unclear ownership	1 000 ha	3 600 ha 87 821 mton CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	The best practices for shelterbelt management applied on 24 ha of the project plots in Kherson oblast (6 km x 40m plot under the shelterbelt reconstruction; 2km X 40 m plot under newly established shelterbelt).	S

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Output 2.2.1</b> Guidelines and capacity for inventory and management of shelterbelts developed	<b>Number of guidelines for inventory and management of shelterbelts</b>	No guidelines exists	Guidelines developed and published	Guidelines applied at project demonstration sites	Two guidelines for shelterbelt establishment and reconstruction developed. Parameters for the shelterbelt inventory are being developed.	S
<b>Output 2.2.2</b> Rehabilitation and multipurpose shelterbelt management demonstrated and improved	<b>Number of shelterbelt best management practices implemented</b>	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 3600 ha of land leading to sequestration of 87 821 mton CO <sub>2</sub> eq.	Two shelterbelt planting projects were developed to be implemented; Parameters for the selection and application of agroforestry practices on shelterbelt in different zones of Ukraine developed. Sustainable shelterbelt management practices implemented on 20 ha of Kherson region.	S
<b>Outcome 3.1</b> Adaptive management ensured and key lessons shared	<b>M&amp;E system is in place to support adaptive results-based management and monitoring of upscaling resulting from the project.</b>	No system in place	Implemented project based on adaptive results based-management	Project delivers expected results and shares best practices	Detailed work plan has been updated; M&E matrix is timely monitored. All M&E activities conducted as per schedule.	S

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Output 3.1.1</b> Project progress continually monitored, mid-term review/evaluation and final evaluation conducted	<b>Mid-term and final evaluation reports</b>	0	Mid-term review recommendations implemented		MTR planned for second semester of 2019	N/A
<b>Output 3.1.2</b> Assessment of resilience of tested INRM approaches and feeding back of lessons to field level	<b>Resilience assessment</b>	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	Upscaled INRM approaches are resilient to climate change and other external stressors	N/A	N/A
<b>Output 3.1.3</b> Project achievements, results and innovative approaches recorded and disseminated	<b>Project website and social media pages</b> <b>X number of project newsletters</b> <b>X number of awareness/ outreach events organized</b>	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	The knowledge information platform developed under this project was published and shared among stakeholders. One poster published together with Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources for further distribution among all Ukrainian authorities;	HS

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					115 web-publication and post;3 international publications (FAO; Asahy Shimbune Globe, Japan; conference thesis Uzbekistan); 1 – national TV translation; 1 – national radio translation <sup>4</sup> 1 – national monography; 10 outreach events organized.	

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating <sup>10</sup>

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		

---

<sup>10</sup> To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

## 2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs <sup>11</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>12</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>13</sup>					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
Output 1.1.1 Strengthening of the CC-LDD	Q1 Y2	100% The CC-LDD has been established; Project Steering Committee has been appointed and regular meeting schedule agreed; Online Information sharing platform developed and launched.					N/A	
Output 1.1.2 Improved institutional structures and legislation for SLM and shelterbelt management	Q3 Y3	34% National Soil Partnership (NSP) has been established; Drafts of law on national monitoring system was proposed with project support					N/A	
Output 1.1.3 Strengthened national environmental monitoring systems and	Q4 Y3	33% Project was included into the process of national environmental monitoring					N/A	

<sup>11</sup> Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

<sup>12</sup> As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

<sup>13</sup> Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

<sup>14</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

spatial planning on land and shelterbelt resources and land degradation control		system development. National Soil Partnership (NSP) established by the leading relevant state institutes						
Output 1.1.4 Establishment of a Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) monitoring system	Q4 Y3	List of LDN monitoring indicators (28) was developed and approved by relevant national experts for further integration into national system					N/A	
Output 1.1.5 Integrated land-use management plans at administrative region level	Q4 Y2	Planned at the further stages of the project implementation					N/A	
Output 1.2.1 Ownership rights, procedures of inventory and standards for management and planting of shelterbelts based on types of soils and natural zones defined	Q1 Y3	45%  Two guidelines for shelterbelt establishment and reconstruction developed and one in a progress					N/A	
Output 1.2.2 Clear criteria and indicators developed for establishment of Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) schemes for INRM	Q2 Y3	Planned at the further stages of the project implementation					N/A	
Output 1.2.3 Inclusive and green food and feed value-chains strengthened (e.g. cereals, oil seeds, selected non-timber forest products (NTFPs))	Q3 Y3	Planned at the further stages of the project implementation					N/A	

Output 2.1.1 Capacity to implement CA in the forest-steppe zone developed and strengthened	Q4 Y2	80% 4 farmer field schools established on 4 pilot sites and 1 in progress; around 200 agricultural service providers trained;  More than 90 farmers participated in 4 farmer-to-farmer visits					N/A	
Output 2.1.2: CA practices demonstrated and upscaled	Q3 Y2	70% Two field testing of the SLM and CA practices at project sites: 130 ha in Kharkov; 20 ha in Kherson; 8 SLM and CA practices demonstrated and disseminated on 16K ha					N/A	
Output 2.1.3: Identification and support to the special needs of rural women at project sites to ensure that their important role in agriculture is recognized and that they reap the benefits of investments in climate-smart agriculture	Q3 Y2	30% Assessment of gender related risks for women and men working in agriculture has been developed as a baseline for the further trainings in gender issues and the special needs of rural women.					N/A	
Output 2.2.1: Guidelines and capacity for inventory and management of shelterbelts developed	Q3 Y3	Two guidelines for shelterbelt establishment and reconstruction developed. Parameters for the shelterbelt inventory are being developed.					N/A	

Output 2.2.2: Rehabilitation and multipurpose shelterbelt management demonstrated and improved	Q3 Y3	<p>34% Sustainable shelterbelt management practices implemented on 24 ha of Kherson oblast (6 km x 40m plot under the shelterbelt reconstruction; 2km X 40 m plot under newly established shelterbelt).</p> <p>Two guidelines for shelterbelt establishing and reconstruction developed.</p> <p>Two shelterbelt planting projects were developed and implemented</p>					N/A	
Output 3.1.1: Project progress continually monitored, mid-term and final evaluation conducted	Q4 Y3	Mid-term evaluation should take place in the second quarter of 2019					N/A	
Output 3.1.2 Assessment of resilience of tested INRM approaches and feeding back of lessons to field level	Q3 Y3	Planned at the latest stages of the project implementation					N/A	
Output 3.1.3 Project achievement, results and innovative approaches recorded and disseminated	Q4 Y3	<p>33%</p> <p>One poster published;  118 web-publications and posts;  3 international publications;  1 – national TV translation;  1 – national radio translation  1 – book;  10 outreach events organized.</p>					N/A	

## Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

**Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):**

Max 200 words:

The communication platform between all key national stakeholders involved has been developed based on the regular meetings of CC-LDD and SC members.

The Project has been included in the national working group contributing to the processes of the reformation of the national environmental monitoring system.

This was followed by the establishment of the National Expert Working Group for integrated land management and National Soil Partnership for soil monitoring system. The National Soil Partnership was established under the umbrella of Global Soil Partnership in the collaboration with HQ.

The project facilitated the conduction of the farmers' survey including 305 practicing farmers. Based on the survey results, the curriculum for FFS was developed. 4 FFS have been organized in different regions of Ukraine and 4 more planned till the end of the year. More than 90 farmers were involved who are cultivating around 98 000 ha. In result, farmers approved their intention to extend the application of CA on an area of approximately 16 000 ha.

The methodological approach to shelterbelt establishing and reconstruction, as well as two relevant planting project, were developed for the further implementation on the pilot sites and creation of recommendations as a part of the national strategy of agriculture adaptation to climate change.

The project launched the testing process of 2 CSA practices developed and implemented on the project plots (Kharkiv 130 ha; Kherson 20ha). 8 CSA practices improved and performed under the supervision of project team in collaboration with local farmers (on the total area of arable land around 16 000 ha. The methodological approach on the application of drip irrigation in combination with conservation agriculture practices was developed for the further implementation of the pilot sites.

Project Steering Committee was established and the first meeting held in May 2019. In the result of a Steering Committee meeting, the first-year project implementation was recognized as a satisfactory and annual working plan was approved.

**What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?**

Max 200 words:

- While holding the consultation process with the key stakeholders it became clear that for sustainability of the Project results procedure of stakeholders rotation should be established and agreed ;
- The clear majority of the issues faced by the practicing farmers can be solved with establishment of the communication network among them;
- Since the Project had delay in implementation of the activities at the start, further no-cost extension will be needed;
- Due to cross-cutting complexity of the project that includes several fields of expertise (agriculture, forestry, legislation) and in order to ensure that all documents and contracts issued are technically compliant, the implementation of activities may be delayed.
- There is a risk of stakeholder change in the project. In that case, support from the Steering Committee to review the list of the project stakeholders and modify them as necessary will be requested. It is also necessary to understand how to keep project indicators and achievements if stakeholder leaves the project.

**Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment**

	<b>FY2019 Development Objective rating<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>FY2019 Implementation Progress rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	<i>The average rating of the project can be recognized as satisfactory. Around 33% of the final project's targets were fully covered, in the first year of implementation. However, considering the late start with project implementation, the no-cost extension of the project is strictly required to maximize project efficiency.</i>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	<i>Due to the late inception of the project, the implementation was delayed as well as the achievement of the mid-term targets for some outputs. However, all efforts are being put in place in order to move forward in the achievement of the agreed targets and progress in the last six-month period of implementation was visible. The cross-cutting nature of the activities planned under this project requires the involvement of different technical expertise to ensure the highest technical quality and this might further contribute in delays in implementation. It is essential to redefine the work plan and budget in the light of the results achieved so far and the challenges faced and propose a sound and realistic budget revision and no-cost extension of at least one year to ensure the successful achievement of the final outputs. A mid-term evaluation should be organized in the second quarter of 2019. The need of extension will be evaluated during the MTR and discussed with project steering committee. The timeframe for the MTE should be decided in consultation with the Project Manager and the LTO.</i>

<sup>15</sup> **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>16</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	<i>Project implementation is on track in this first period, highlighting that Steering Committee recognized that project implementation is satisfactory. To ensure the achievement of the remaining outputs, it is proposed a non-cost extension of the project.</i>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	<i>The project has strong government ownership and is on track to achieve its objectives. It has reached important results like providing key information for the reform of the national environmental monitoring system, developing an agreed methodological approach to re-establish shelterbelts, and field testing CSA practices. These are the basis to achieve global environmental benefits. A mid-term review is scheduled for the second semester of 2019. Disbursements amount to 39% of total budget, validating that the project is on track. Nonetheless, given the fact that the project had a delayed start, the need of an extension will be evaluated during the MTR and discussed with the project steering committee.</i>

---

<sup>17</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

### 3. Risks

#### Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

<b>Overall Project Risk classification</b> (at project submission)	<b>Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid<sup>18</sup>.</b> If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low risk	Yes

*Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.*

#### Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the <b>Project Document</b> and reflects also <b>any new risks</b> identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, <b>as relevant</b>.</i>

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
--	------	---------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------------

<sup>18</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

<sup>19</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

<sup>20</sup> If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period”.

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Lack of close and collaborative cooperation between key institutional stakeholders	High	This risk will be mitigated under Component 1 of the project that will strengthen the intersectoral coordination mechanism to enhance cooperation.	National Soil Monitoring Platform developed and established based on the principles United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD); The CC-LDD has been established; First Annual Steering Committee Meeting has been carried out. Online Information Sharing Platform launched: <a href="https://healthy-soils.org.ua/en/">https://healthy-soils.org.ua/en/</a>	
2	Unclear responsibilities of institutions at national and local level	High	This will also be addressed under component 1 of 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 CC-LDD has been established;  Mechanism for establishment of shelterbelt ownership is being developed.	
3	Low technical capacity at national and local level halting the project's progress	Moderately-low	Capacity development in conservation agriculture and shelterbelt management will be provided under Component 2, which will mitigate this risk.	Testing of SLM and CSA technologies/best practices started on 135 ha in both Kharkiv (115 ha) and Kherson (20 ha) regions;  Around 200 agricultural service providers trained in CA through FFS approach.	

	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Risk rating<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>Mitigation Action</b>	<b>Progress on mitigation actions<sup>20</sup></b>	<b>Notes from the Project Task Force</b>
4	Lack of political support to integration of environmental considerations into agriculture and shelterbelt management	Moderately-high	Political support is high in Ukraine to shift to environmentally sustainable natural resources management practices, which is demonstrated by policy reform processes initiated both in the agriculture and forest sector with support from EU, FAO, etc. This project will provide an opportunity to further integrate global environmental considerations and to demonstrate good practices in the field.	The Project was included into Working Group on Reforming of the National System of State Control, Monitoring and Responsibility in the Field of Environmental Protection, facilitated by the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources. As a result of the working group operation, two draft laws on Environmental Protection were developed and provided to the Government for their consideration and further adoption. National Project Coordinator participated at the meeting of the Bureau of the Presidium NAAS devoted to the topic "Current state and prospects of No-till farming system development on the south of Ukraine", hosted by NAAS on June 19th, 2019.	

	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Risk rating<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>Mitigation Action</b>	<b>Progress on mitigation actions<sup>20</sup></b>	<b>Notes from the Project Task Force</b>
5	Natural changes in agro-ecological zones due to gradual changes in climate and extreme weather events	Moderately-low	Climate-smart 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.	<p>Development of CA management practices in the arid conditions launched; Field testing of the SLM and CA practices at project site in Kharkiv and Kherson regions started.</p> <p>2 CSA practices developed and implemented on the project's plots (Kharkiv 130 ha; Kherson 20 ha);</p> <p>8 CSA practices improved and implemented under the supervision of project team in collaboration with local farmers (total area of arable land is around 8400 ha).</p> <p>The best practices for shelterbelt management applied on 24 ha of the project plots in Kherson oblast (6 km x 40m plot under the shelterbelt reconstruction; 2km X 40 m plot under newly established shelterbelt)</p>	

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	Medium	

## 4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months<sup>21</sup>

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project Outcomes</b>	<b>No</b>	
<b>Project Outputs</b>	<b>No</b>	

### Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project extension</b>	<p>Original NTE: 04/10/2017                      Revised NTE: 31/07/2020</p> <p>An evaluation of the need for a project extension will be conducted during the mid-term review planned for the second quarter of 2019. This request will be considered given the late inception of the project and seasonality of the project activities such as: (i) the project was started with a delay in May 2018 with Inception meeting; (ii) pre-project developing took time between October 2017 and May 2018; (ii) as a result, one season was lost for the implementation of field activities; (iii) one pilot site in Kherson oblast was added extra following to the recommendations of the national beneficiary.</p>

---

<sup>21</sup> Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

## 5. Gender Mainstreaming

### Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?

In compliance with the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming (PL/SD/02. May 1, 2012) and FAO Gender Equality Policy, the Project should develop and implement gender mainstreaming strategies. These strategies should be informed by gender analysis of the sector and cover the following directions:

- Promote equal participation of rural women in decision-making by providing support to rural women's groups and associations, identifying, supporting and strengthening the role of women-leaders in rural communities and rural institutions as village councils, and actively engaging them in the Project activities as participants and beneficiaries;
- Promote rural women's equal access to and control over decent employment and income, land, forestry and other productive resources, by taking into account their status, responsibilities and daily practices which will be assessed with respect to the sustainable land management and sustainable forest management practices addressed by the Project;
- Encourage rural women's equal access to goods and services for agricultural development and to markets by actively engaging women in the value-chains for selected agricultural and forest products;
- Contribute to the reduction of rural women's work burden, by facilitating their improved access to new technologies, services and infrastructure, as well as knowledge and information.

First step in this regard is to conduct gender analysis of integrated natural resources management in degraded landscapes – in particular, identify possible imbalances between men and women in awareness of environmental risks in degraded land, insecure farming in conditions of climate change, access to finance, readiness to act accordingly, access to information and tools, practices of agriculture that might affect the climate change or be affected by degraded land and climate change, etc. In addition to sector analysis, gender impact analysis will be also conducted to assess, how the Project activities will impact the situation of men and women in the target regions. These analytical exercises will inform specific approaches and interventions to be taken to ensure that women and men equally participate in and benefit from the Project activities on integrated natural resources management in degraded landscapes.

that might affect the climate change or be affected by degraded land and climate change, etc. In addition to sector analysis, gender impact analysis will be also conducted to assess, how the Project activities will impact the situation of men and women in the target regions. These analytical exercises will inform specific approaches and interventions to be taken to ensure that women and men equally participate in and benefit from the Project activities on integrated natural resources management in degraded landscapes.

Project Gender Expert developed a report that provides preliminary gender analysis of risks related to integrated natural resource management based on available secondary data. The next step will be conduction of survey to test the set of hypotheses indicated in the report.

According to State Statistics Service, the average land area of the household headed by men is 1.49 ha, by women, 0.98 ha (data for 2017). This difference is significant. When it comes to agricultural land structure of rural households in 2017, 90.9% and 87.4% lands owned by men and women, respectively, are arable lands, while 7.3% and 9.8%, respectively, are hayfields and pastures.

Under the output 2.1.3. the support will be provided to sensitization on gender of agricultural advisory/extension services linked to agricultural cooperative development, establishment of networks of rural women and “women to women” visits, and training of young women entrepreneurs in computer skills, business management and basic accounting. The project will also support public advocacy for rural women’s rights in the selected oblasts.

Project M&E Officer is an FAO Ukraine Gender Focal Point who facilitates the project, tracking gender specific results and ensuring gender mainstreaming through all Project interventions.

## 6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

**Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.**

N/A

## 7. Stakeholders Engagement

**Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))**

Over the project implementation, the level of the stakeholders, engagement can be estimated as highly satisfactory. There is country ownership of the project and local authorities, state institutes, NGOs, public and private organizations are actively participating. Country ownership is represented by Ministry of Ecology, Ministry of Agriculture policy, Forestry State Agency, National Academy of Agriculture Sciences and National Academy of Science of Ukraine.

In general, 12 meetings were held with the top leaders of these organizations. Also, representatives of these organizations participated in 6 national events within the project. The project team was included in 3 national working groups and presented the project at five national-level events at the invitation of top governmental organization. Country ownerships representative created the core of Steering Comity.

To develop strong and constant networking, a standard information platform was launched.

The nine leading national institutes in the field of soil sciences were joint in the collective working group to develop a national soil monitoring system. Two key stakeholders have a LoA with FAO supporting the development and dissemination of sustainable agriculture practices among farmers. More than 250 farmers have been involved in the process of implementation of the CA practices on the field based on the study cases obtained from the best area. The farms with the best CA practices were selected, following the criteria recommended by national experts and FAO Guideline for CA. Two institutes are involved in the implementation of the pilot of shelterbelt development and reconstruction. With this purpose, public land was used. Representatives of local authorities are constant part of all activities implemented under the project. Statistical data about stakeholder engagement is collected during each event and data is further processed and analysed in the narrative reports.

At this stage, 84 percent of stakeholders defined by the project document is actively involved in the implementation.

## 8. Knowledge Management Activities

### Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval

The project implementation resulted in raising of interest on the national level to the problem of sustainable natural resource management. As an example, the number of national experts and relevant institutes participating in the project activities and events of the Global Soil Partnership has increased in three times. Recently the National Academy of Agrarian Science recognized necessity to continue studies in the fields of CSA and CA practices implementation. The result of conducted survey among 305 farmers demonstrated both the high interest in implementation of sustainable agriculture practices and lack of knowledge for their application. Currently, more than 250 participants joined the field farms school (FFS) training from eight oblasts of Ukraine. Around 200 agricultural service providers trained in CA through FFS approach. 4 FFS organized in the form of farm-to farm exchange visits. The FFS are being implementing according the FAO recommendations and curriculum for FFS designed .

It is preliminary agreed to develop an online study program with further incorporation of it into the study process in the most prominent national agriculture universities such as Mykolaiv Agriculture University, Bila Tserkva Agriculture University and the National University of Life and Environmental Science. Field Officers, Project Technical Experts, and Service Providers that implement their activities in rural areas, directly work with local people. Using this approach, we will be to increase the level of trust and raise awareness of importance of sustainable natural resource management considering modern challenges such as climate change or internal migration.

GEF project information platform has been launched online (<https://healthy-soils.org.ua/en/>). It is being populated with articles on topics directly linked to the project operations as well as global FAO commitments. Besides, content of the website includes information on the recent developments of the project, articles on the key project related fields (e.g. conservation agriculture, integrated natural resource management practices, farmer field school etc.) scheduled events, links to agriculture-related information resources, project vocabulary, integration of the SDGs into the project implementation and other thematic.

Thus, leading national experts and relevant governmental actors were supported to attend international events exchanging the knowledge and experience in collaboration with Global Soil Partnership.

Set of national and international publications were published to generate public awareness on INMR, deliver relevant national knowledge and experience obtained. The information and knowledge were disseminated through the leading national TV channel, magazines, and radio as well as the different web-

## 9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>22</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources	Cash/in kind	\$ 6 000 000	N/A	N/A	\$ 6 000 000
National Government	Leonid Pogorilyi Ukrainian Scientific Research Institute on behalf of the Ministry of Agrarian Policy and Food	Cash/in kind	\$ 590 000	\$ 241 500	N/A	\$ 590 000
Private Sector	LLC "Agrogeneration"	Cash/In kind	\$ 2 188 267	\$ 123 867	N/A	\$ 1200 000
State Organization	State Ecological Academy of Post-Graduate Education	In kind	\$ 80 000	\$ 0	N/A	\$ 80 000
Private Sector	Center of Soil Ecology	Cash/In kind	\$ 400 000	\$ 7 200	N/A	\$ 400 000
UN Agency	FAO	Cash/In	\$1 065 000	\$ 383 961	N/A	\$1 065 000

<sup>22</sup> 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.

		kind				
State Organization	State Institute of Water Problem and Reclamation	In kind	\$ 0	\$ 17 890	N/A	\$ 45 000
		<b>TOTAL</b>	\$ 10 323 267	\$ 664 418		\$ 9 380 000

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

The pilot sites in Kherson oblast were added following to the recommendation of the main Beneficiary. The primary purpose such kind of extension caused by interest to the implementation of SLM on the droughted (precipitation level lower than 150 mm) and irrigated lands. Currently, the comprehensive environmentally friendly practice is being tested on the fields of the service provider in village Veliky Klin, Kherson Oblast in terms of the agreement signed. The service provider is the State Institute of Water Problem and Reclamation.

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

**Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **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** – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **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.