

Promoting sustainable livestock management and ecosystem conservation in Northern Ukraine

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10264

Countries

Ukraine

Project Name

Promoting sustainable livestock management and ecosystem conservation in Northern Ukraine

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/12/2020

Review completed by PM

4/21/2021

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

04/08/2021: ADDITIONAL ISSUE ENCOUNTERED:

On Project Information: kindly note that the Expected Implementation Start should be corrected as the date has already passed. The implementation start date should be changed to 10/01/2021 in order to meet the 60 months duration.

04/21/2021: Addressed as per agency response below. The expected implementation start date has been changed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response to GEF Sec comments from 04/08/2021:

Note - the expected duration is 66 months. We have changed the expected implementation start, but also changed the expected completion date, to correspond to the 66 month implementation period. Expected implementation start changed to July 1, 2021. Expected completion date changed to December 31, 2026. However, the Portal

does not allow us to make any changes to the section ?Duration? from 60 months to 66 months, which can only be changed by GEF Sec IT Unit

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Not fully.

- The ratio of PMC is not proportional to the overall ratio of co-financing. This is a GEF policy requirement, please allocate a proportional amount of co-financing to the PMC.

- Several co-financing commitment letter do not explicitly indicate whether the co-financing is in "grant" or "in kind". However, all con-financing has been listed as "grant" in Table C. Please clarify if these are indeed grants and report all co-financing as usual in line with GEF policies and guidelines.

04/08/2021: Not fully addressed.

- first comment: addressed.

- second comment: After carefully reviewing the information provided in the letters, and given the large number of co-financing partners, The GEF reviewer accepts the provided documentation, but on an exceptional basis. Please acknowledge that this is on exceptional basis and may not be accommodated in the future. In the future, and in line with our guidelines, we request that co-financing letters clearly indicate the type of co-financing.

ADDITIONAL ISSUES ENCOUNTERED:

- i. Co-financing letter from UkrMilkInvest indicates that US\$ 3M of the US\$ 6M co-financing has been already spent. Only co-financing taking place during the project implementation can be considered, and this should be discounted from the table C.
- ii. Similarly, for co-financing from "Rivne Regional State Administration" , "VOLYN REGIONAL STATE ADMINISTRATION" and "Zhytomyr Regional State Administration?". Please discount the amounts already spent.

04/21/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response to GEF Sec comments from 04/08/2021:

i. OK, agreed. These co-financing letters were reviewed, and amounts adjusted as appropriate. The UkrMilkInvest co-financing amount was reduced to \$3 million. Corresponding co-financing total figures were revised throughout the CEO ER and Prodoc.

ii. OK, agreed. These co-financing letters were reviewed, and amounts adjusted as appropriate. The Rivne Regional State Administration co-financing amount was not changed, as the figure given is the amount indicated for the project implementation period, regardless of the other portions of the letter that refer to previously spent amounts. The Volyn and Zhytomyr Regional State Administration co-financing amounts were removed, as the co-financing letters appear to refer to amounts that have already been disbursed as of April 2021. Corresponding co-financing total figures were revised throughout the CEO ER and Prodoc.

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

- Ok. PMC co-financing adjusted to correspond to overall project co-financing ratio of ~11 : 1. Co-financing amounts for components adjusted correspondingly.

- Ok. Co-financing amounts indicated as grants in the table are expected to be grant co-financing. The GEF co-financing guidelines (June 26, 2018) were re-reviewed, and all co-financing is indicated in-line with GEF co-financing requirements. The co-financing committed in the table in the CEO Endorsement Request is all expected in the form of grant co-financing. It is anticipated that additional in-kind co-financing will be received during project implementation, and this will be documented by the project. Note added below Table C in CEO Endorsement Request template: "Note: Although not all co-financing letters indicate whether co-financing will be grant or in-kind, co-financing letters have been reviewed in relation to GEF co-financing guidelines, and it has been confirmed that co-financing amounts are grant co-financing, as indicated in Table C above."

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

04/08/2021: ADDITIONAL ISSUES ENCOUNTERED IN BUDGET:

- a. Audits have been charged to the M&E Budget. Please charge these costs to the PMC.
- b. Some numbers in the totals are broken due to formatting issues. Please amend the totals in the table.
- c. Miscellaneous expenses including bank charges for \$7,715 - Please either eliminate the budget line ?Miscellaneous? as this is not eligible for the GEF portion of the PMC or charge this to the co-financing portion of the PMC.

04/21/2021: Not fully addressed.

Apparently, Miscellaneous (Bank costs) are still charged to the GEF portion of the PMC ? (At least that is what I can see in Annex E, the project budget table. Please double check and address).

04/27/2021: Addressed.

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response to GEF Sec comments from 04/21/2021:

Done. It was revised in TBWP however, not reflected in GEF budget table. It is corrected in Annex E now.

UNDP Response to GEF Sec comments from 04/08/2021:

a. OK. Audit costs have been shifted to the PMC, to be financed through UNDP TRAC co-financing. Corresponding changes made to Total Budget table in Prodoc.

b. We revised the table's format.

e. OK. Misc. expenses removed from PMC, and corresponding amount re-allocated to other PMC budget lines. Corresponding changes made to Total Budget table.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Yes.

However, the amount spent to date plus the amount committed does not add up to the total. Please clarify if there is unutilized PPG funding and how this will be spend? Please note that GEF guidelines include eligibility criteria for spending of unused PPG funds in the first year of project implementation, which must be adhered to or otherwise the funds must be returned to the GEF trust fund.

04/08/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

The figures in Annex C have been updated. A PPG balance of \$24,061.48 remains. A note has been added that these funds will be returned to the GEF.

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Not fully.

Clarification requests:

- Restoration of 36,100 ha of grasslands: is this the correct category? I have noted the explanation provided under section 6) Global Environmental Benefits, however, peatlands can be considered a type of wetlands. Is a part of the restoration wetland restoration?

- Number of beneficiaries: this appears a very low, especially in context that the project targets 2.75 million ha of production systems under improved management. Please clarify how many beneficiaries will benefit from these large scale improvements.

04/08/2021: Addressed/clarified.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

- Degraded peatlands are often typically currently grasslands or shrublands, while restored peatlands may still be partially grasslands, but can be classified as wetlands, as there are seasonal variations in the groundwater level. We can shift this figure to indicator 3.4 of the core indicators worksheet if it is more appropriate. In CEO ER, area of "restored peatlands" in core indicators worksheet shifted from indicator 3.3 to indicator 3.4. Total hectares unchanged. Clarification added to the CEO ER core indicator summary table.

- It cannot necessarily be assumed that the geographic coverage of the project corresponds to a calculation of direct beneficiaries. The number of beneficiaries has been estimated conservatively, reflecting only the direct project beneficiaries that will be actually involved in project activities and receive direct benefits from project activities, not the number of indirect beneficiaries that will benefit from the project activities in the region in general. The total population of the Northern Ukraine region targeted under the project is 9.01 million people. The total area is 17.1 million ha, indicating a population density of 0.51 person/ha. There are 299 Amalgamated Territorial Communities (ATCs), which cover 8.21 million ha of the total region. The project is targeting 100 ATCs, estimated to cover 2.75 million ha. If the population of the region were evenly distributed throughout the region, and if there were a direct correspondence between area targeted and population benefiting, this would equate to 1.40 million project beneficiaries. However, based on the types of project activities, these cannot be

considered direct beneficiaries. If we extend the calculation of direct beneficiaries to the full families and relatives of the direct beneficiaries (who are also consumers of livestock products), the number could be calculated as 54,000 people (based on an average household of 6 people). This is also the closest social circle of the project beneficiaries, in which the dissemination of knowledge and skills from ecologically balanced livestock products with high multiplicative potential will take place. To extend the calculation further, the total number of indirect beneficiaries involved in the consumption of project products - namely consumers of final products of sustainable livestock - is estimated as 130,000 people (1.4-1.5% of the population of the regions covered by the project). The total number could be higher if the entire population of potential livestock product consumers within the country is considered. Notes clarifying the calculation of beneficiaries have been added to the CEO ER template below the Core Indicators summary table (section F), and to Annex 6 of the Prodoc. The actual number of project beneficiaries will be closely tracked during project implementation.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Not fully

- The CEO endorsement request template states in many sections of part II that "there have been no changes as compared to the approved PIF". Please note that this child project is part of a program and a PIF was never submitted or approved. Therefore, please elaborate in each section a brief summary of what is being referred to in the project document and do not refer to an approved PIF, which may create confusion for the reader.

- Secondly, please note that the CEO endorsement request will be circulated to Council for 4-week period. A summary should be included in each section so that the reader can understand the project. Further, the project document must be uploaded as a "public" document to allow for circulation to Council.

- Please check the project summary page of the prodoc. Please correct the name of the parent program as "Food Systems, Land Use, and Restoration (FOLUR)".

04/08/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

- OK, references to the "approved PIF" have been modified to references to the "Expression of Interest and Child Project Outline Document approved by GEF".

- It is understood that the Prodoc will be uploaded as a public document for circulation to council. Summary sections added to respective sections of CEO ER.

- OK, reference to FOLUR program name corrected.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Not fully.

Please see above comment.

04/08/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

Summary of baseline scenario added to respective CEO ER section.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

03/22/2021: Not fully.

Please see above comment.

04/08/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

Description of project objective and main components added to respective CEO ER section.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Not fully.

Please see above comment.

04/08/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

Summary on project's theory of change, and alignment with FOLUR impact program objectives and GEF objectives added to respective CEO ER section.

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Not fully.

Please see above comment.

04/08/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

OK. Table on incremental cost reasoning by each FOLUR component added to section 5 of CEO ER. As part of the FOLUR impact program, which applies integrated approaches, the project is not assigned a GEF focal area, so the incremental reasoning is organized by FOLUR component.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Not fully.

Please see above comment.

04/08/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

Please clarify as necessary. The current draft CEO ER includes a full summary of the expected contribution to global environmental benefits.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Not fully.

Please see above comment.

04/08/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

Added brief sections from Prodoc on innovativeness, sustainability, and upscaling to respective CEO ER section.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Not fully.

The section on gender in the project document is written in a somewhat generic way. For example, the write up is describing more the general situation in Ukraine (as not specifically to the project) and it also uses some generic statements, referring to "widespread hypotheses". It would be clearer to state what the results of the gender analysis during PPG were and how the project incorporates these results into its design.

Please revise /elaborate the section in line with above guidance "Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?"

04/08/2021: One issue remaining:

Response is accepted and it is noted that gender assessments, carried out during the PPG stage, has informed project outputs, activities and the development of an Gender Action Plan. The project Strategic Results Framework includes gender-disaggregated indicator.

However, it seems that the relevant box in the portal section on gender has not been ticked. Please amend.

04/21/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Response to GEF Sec comments from 04/08/2021:
Will be resolved in portal.

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

OK, elaborated. Focus in section increased to incorporate more specific information related to the project thematic areas and geography, reducing focus on sections that discussed just Ukraine in general. Added bullet points summarizing examples from Gender Action Plan for each project component.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Not fully.

While the section in the CEO endorsement template is providing a summary of private sector engagement in the project, a reference to the project document is missing here. Further, while the term private sector is mentioned many times throughout the project

document, there seems to be no short section in which that is explained in a concise way.

04/08/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

OK. In the Prodoc private sector engagement is addressed at multiple points, but particularly in the sections on partnerships and stakeholder engagement, as well as the description of project activities. A brief summary paragraph has been added to the Prodoc, and references to info on private sector engagement in the Prodoc have been added to the CEO ER.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: No.

- The risk table needs to be provided as a summary overview in the CEO endorsement template in the portal.
- As usual, the risk table must consider climate change and mitigation measures - as per prompt in the template.
- Finally, the risks of the COVID-19 pandemic and the opportunities for building back better, if any, need to be discussed as per guidance shared by GEFSEC with all agencies. So far there appears to be no single mention in the portal template or in the project document.

04/08/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

- OK, will add - the risk table is 3 pages of landscape format. Summary risk table added to CEO ER template.

- The risk table is included as Annex 4 to the Prodoc, and includes climate change risks, and mitigation measures. Summary risk table, including climate change risks, added to CEO ER template.

- OK. Information on Covid-19 related risks and potential for green recovery has been added to the CEO ER in the risks section. The same content has been added to the Prodoc in the risks section, and under a new section on opportunities for green recovery. In addition, a risk on potential Covid-19 impacts to project implementation has been added to the risk table in both the Prodoc and CEO ER.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Not fully - clarification requested.

- The implementation / execution arrangements with regard to the requested exception are not described in a way that the reviewer can assess. The request seems to indicate there there may be some support provided by UNDP but not exactly to what extent and with what budget implications?

- Part I of the CEO portal entries do not list UNDP as executing agency. If UNDP provides execution support, it would need to be listed alongside the ministry.

- The submitted budget does not indicated any funding going to UNDP for providing execution support, the responsible party listed is always the ministry, please clarify.

04/08/2021: Addressed.

Program Manager approves the exception request for UNDP to provide execution support for this project as requested by the OFP and filed in the portal documents section.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

- OK, additional information and clarifications added. UNDP will provide all execution support services, as outlined in the letter from the GEF Focal Point and the

Fiduciary Checklist submitted to the GEF. There will be no additional costs ("Direct Project Costs") to the GEF/project for UNDP to provide the requested execution support services (waiver issued by UNDP Country Office Senior management).

- Additions made to CEO ER template, section 6. on Institutional Arrangements and Coordination. Additions made to Prodoc Section VI on Governance and Management Arrangements. Additional documentation included in Annex 28 of the Prodoc. Further details are contained in the Fiduciary Checklist submitted to the GEF.

- No project funding will be charged by UNDP for providing execution support. Documentation provided in Annex 28 of the Prodoc confirms this. Additions made to CEO ER template, section 6. on Institutional Arrangements and Coordination. Additions made to Prodoc Section VI on Governance and Management Arrangements. Additional documentation included in Annex 28 of the Prodoc.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Not fully clear.

Please further elaborate on this point. Please also refers to the question above on the comparably low number of project beneficiaries. This question could also be addressed in the considerations of opportunities for green recovery.

04/08/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

OK. A brief summary analysis of the generation of socio-economic and local benefits, and their contribution to the expected GEBs, has been added to both the CEO ER and Prodoc. In the CEO ER template this has been added to section 10, on "Benefits". In the Prodoc, this has been added to section 3.2 on partnerships, stakeholder engagement, and coordination.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Yes.

Please correct a typo in the TOR for the Project Manager, which includes knowledge of the "Indonesian" PA system as a requirement.

04/08/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

Thank you, corrected.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Upstream comments by GEFSEC were adequately considered.

Cleared

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Will be responded to if comments are made during the 4-week Council period.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

OK, no change required.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a - no specific comments received for this child project under the program.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a - no specific comments received

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a - no specific comments received

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a - no specific comments received

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: See question above on the amount that is not accounted for in the Table provided.

04/08/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 03/22/2021:

OK, annex C of the CEO ER updated.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/22/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/04/2021: Please resubmit and include the agreed Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this project.

03/22/2021: No. Please address comments made in review sheet.

Note: The agreed checklist has been submitted and reviewed.

04/08/2021: No. Please address outstanding issues as noted in the review sheet.

04/21/2021: No. Please check comment box 5 - Miscellaneous costs still appear in Annex E - budget table under the GEF portion of the PMC.

04/27/2021: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/4/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/22/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/8/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/21/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/27/2021	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The child project in Ukraine under the GEF Impact Program on Food Systems, Land Use, and Restoration (FOLUR), this project will catalyze a transition to sustainable livestock farming in the Northern Ukraine Landscape, which is dominated by peatlands, while combating land degradation and restoring key areas for maintenance of ecosystem services to support vibrant livestock agriculture, sustainable land management, GHG mitigation, and biodiversity.

The project's Theory of Change is directly based on the overall Theory of Change for the FOLUR IP. The project aims to generate multiple global environmental benefits on 3.3 million ha of landscapes, as well as local benefits, by demonstrating restoration, improved conservation and sustainable management of degraded agricultural and other lands in the northern part of Ukraine, and strengthening the national land inventory and land planning framework governing agricultural and other land management. The project objective is ?To promote sustainable livestock management and conserve

ecosystems in the Northern Ukraine landscape.? The project aims to transform the current system of planning and managing livestock in the Northern Ukraine Landscape. By stopping degradation of ecosystems the project will contribute to ensuring food security by providing pastures and feeding crops for cattle, diversifying agriculture away from annual arable crops. The long-term solution proposed by this project is an integrated approach to decision-making on ecosystem use that considers ecological as well as economic criteria, and considers carbon and biodiversity benefits.

COVID-19 risks and opportunities have been considered. On May 27, 2020, the Government of Ukraine approved the Economic Stimulus Program for overcoming the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. The project is fully aligned with the post COVID-19 recovery opportunities by supporting communities' recovery through the development and implementation of sustainable livestock production in Northern Ukraine. This objective includes the development of sustainable jobs, knowledge sharing and capacity development, strengthening the economic viability of sustainable livestock production, securing critical ecosystems and the key ecosystem services that they provide, stakeholder coordination and M&E activities. The project will potentially be able to link into multiple national strategic post-COVID opportunities.