



Land Restoration and Ecosystem Service Improvement through Use of Fruit and Nut Tree Biodiversity in Armenia

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11140

Countries

Armenia

Project Name

Land Restoration and Ecosystem Service Improvement through Use of Fruit and Nut Tree Biodiversity in Armenia

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/30/2024

Review completed by PM

6/20/2024

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

MSP

PIF

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?

b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve

the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2024: Not fully.

d) PMC is not proportionally co-financed.

06/20/2024: Addressed.

Agency Response

17/05/2024

PMC co-finance is re-adjusted.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

- 5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?
- b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?
- c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?
- d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or

associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) **Other Benefits:** Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

i) **Gender:** Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

k) **Policy Coherence:** Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

l) **Transformation and/or innovation:** Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2024: No.

Reviewer could not find entries for core indicators at CEO endorsement stage in the core indicator table. Please provide.

06/20/2024: Has been provided.

Cleared

Agency Response

17/05/2024.

This has now been provided.

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request^{n/a}

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
05/14/2024: Please clarify.

Reviewer could only locate a gender assessment, which states that this will provide the bases for the gender action plan.

06/20/2024: Addressed. However, please also ensure under M&E that gender-related results are monitored and reported on thoroughly, and gender experts are engaged in all steps.

07/09/2024: Addressed.

Agency Response

Gender action plan and gender assessment are provided as Annex 5a and Annex 5b respectively in the document depository section.

07/08/2024 Agency Response: We added the following text under the M&E Budget table:
?Gender-related results will be thoroughly monitored and reported, and the gender experts
will be engaged in all steps.?

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2024: Yes.

06/20/2024: Please address inconsistency:

We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and and UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form. However, the environmental and social risk of the Key Risk section in the Portal said low risk. Please make these risks consistent and revise.

07/09/2024: Addressed.

Agency Response

07/08/2024 Agency Response: We adjusted the ES risk rating in the Key Risks section to
Moderate:

Key Risks ⓘ

	Rating	Explanation of risk and mitigation measures
CONTEXT		
Climate	Moderate ▾	Climate change or other environmental events can remove diversity and lead to expansion of desert and arid zones in
Environmental and Social	Moderate ▾	Commitment to the use of local fruit and tree varieties for restoration to all gender age groups for farmers and forest dwellers

Environmental and Social Safeguards ⓘ

We confirm that we have provided information regarding Environmental and Social risks associated with the proposed project or program, including risk screenings/ assessments and, if applicable, mitigation measures or other measures to address identified risks and impacts (this information should be provided in the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment Report)

Yes No

Please provide overall Project/Program Risk Classification

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification*

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
Medium/Moderate	Medium/Moderate ▾		

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 05/14/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2024: Clarification question:

The co-financing commitment letters have been uploaded in the documents section. Can they be linked individually to the co-financing amounts in the respective table?

06/20/2024: Addressed.

Agency Response

17/05/2024.

All co financing letters have been uploaded individually in the respective table.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Cleared

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestCleared

Agency Response

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestCleared

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2024: Not fully.

a) in the absence of core-indicators provided, this could not be checked. Please provide in both tables, the core indicator table and the logframe.

c) please double-check.

06/20/2024: Addressed.

Agency Response

17/05/2024.

Please note that all core indicators information has been provided in the respective tables. Annex C Project Results Framework table.

Yes all relevant indicators reflect that women's participation will be at least 50%

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2024: Yes.

06/20/2024: However, please consider inserting the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated data entry field in the portal.
















07/09/2024: Addressed.

Agency Response

07/08/2024 Agency response: Geographic locattions are added to dedicated location:

ANNEX E: PROJECT MAP AND COORDINATES

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Automated Validation Check	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description
<input type="text" value="Yerevan"/>	<input type="text" value="40.1709"/>	<input type="text" value="44.5320"/>	Yerevan, Armenia 	<input type="text"/>	 
<input type="text" value="Tavush"/>	<input type="text" value="40.8016"/>	<input type="text" value="45.1138"/>	Bardidzor, Tavushi Marz, Armenia 	<input type="text"/>	 
<input type="text" value="Lori"/>	<input type="text" value="40.8555"/>	<input type="text" value="44.6197"/>	Sisiberd, Lorr Marz, Armenia 	<input type="text"/>	 
<input type="text" value="Geghark"/>	<input type="text" value="40.6772"/>	<input type="text" value="45.1457"/>	Dprabak, Gegharkunik, Armenia 	<input type="text"/>	 
<input type="text" value="Shirak"/>	<input type="text" value="40.8764"/>	<input type="text" value="43.9862"/>	Krashen, Shiraki Marz, Armenia 	<input type="text"/>	 

[Add New](#)

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified

sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2024: No.

The budget table in GEF format has not been provided / inserted into the portal field in the Annex. Only a detailed budget is uploaded under documents, which doesn't provide the information per the required categories.

06/20/2024: Addressed.

However, office supplies and office equipment should be charged 100% to PMC but not to project components.

07/09/2024: Addressed.

Agency Response

The budget has been included in Annex F and budget categories has been clarified in the first column.

07/08/2024 Agency Response: both the office supplies and equipment costs have been reduced and move to PMC

Ependiture Category		1 Policy & Institutions	2 Agro Bio	3 Capacity Building	Subtotal	Monitorin g and Evaluatio n (M&E)	Project Manage ment Cost (PMC)	Total	2024	2025	2026	Total
Salary and benefits / Staff costs: Project personnel	PERSONNEL COMPONENT											
	1100 Salary and benefits / Staff costs: Project personnel											
Office Supplies	3305 National partners meetings	0	10,000	0	10,000	0	0	10,000	3,000	3,000	4,000	10,000
	3306 Conferences to share lessons learnt	0	10,000	0	10,000	0	0	10,000	0	0	10,000	10,000
	3307 Farmers' Fairs	0	22,000	0	22,000	0	0	22,000	0	11,000	11,000	22,000
	3308 Awareness Raising Events	15,000	15,000	10,000	40,000	0	0	40,000	10,000	20,000	10,000	40,000
	3399 Sub-total	42,000	62,000	16,000	120,000	0	4,700	124,700	28,800	46,700	49,200	124,700
Office Supplies	EQUIPMENT AND PREMISES COMPONENT											
	4100 Expendable equipment											
	4101 Office supplies	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	0	1,000
Office Supplies	4102 Tools for field work in the project sites	3,000	13,000	2,000	18,000	0	0	18,000	8,000	8,000	2,000	18,000
	4399 Sub-total	3,000	13,000	2,000	18,000	0	1,000	19,000	9,000	8,000	2,000	19,000
Goods	4200 Non-expendable equipment											
	4201 Computer equipment	0	10,000	0	10,000	0	0	10,000	23,000	23,000	0	23,000
	4202 Office equipment	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	0	1,000
	4203 Field equipment	52,400	43,100	0	95,500	0	0	95,500	95,500	0	0	95,500
4399 Sub-total	58,400	58,100	0	116,500	0	3,000	119,500	119,500	0	0	119,500	
Works	MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT											
	5200 Works: Reporting costs											
	5201 Technical publications	25,500	35,500	20,500	81,500	0	0	81,500	16,500	45,000	20,000	81,500
	5202 Public awareness materials and media publications	17,000	15,000	0	32,000	0	0	32,000	10,000	17,000	5,000	32,000
	5203 Education materials	12,500	2,500	27,500	42,500	0	0	42,500	12,500	15,000	15,000	42,500
5199 Sub-total	55,000	53,000	48,000	156,000	0	0	156,000	39,000	77,000	40,000	156,000	
Other Operating Costs	5300 Other Operating Costs: Sundry											
	5301 Communication (Internet, phone)	0	0	0	0	0	7,500	7,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	7,500
	5302 Bank Charges	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	1,500	500	500	500	1,500
	5199 Sub-total	0	0	0	0	0	9,000	9,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	9,000
GRAND TOTAL		534,900	724,540	478,000	1,737,440	55,000	179,150	1,971,590	671,050	737,050	563,490	1,971,590

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

05/14/2024: No. Please complete the submission with the missing information as requested in the review sheet. The project could only be partially reviewed due to missing information.

06/20/2024: No. Please address comments made in this consolidated review.

07/09/2024: Yes. Comments by Operations have been addressed. Program manager recommends CEO endorsement.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	5/14/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/20/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/9/2024	

**CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)