



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	<b>9813</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Ukraine</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Integrated Natural Resources Management in Degraded Landscapes in the Forest-Steppe and Steppe Zones of Ukraine</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>FAO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>LD-3 Program 4; CCM-2 Program 4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$50,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,776,484</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$10,323,267</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$12,099,751</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ulrich Apel</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Avetik Nersisyan</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	04/05/2017 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	04/05/2017 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments	04/05/2017 UA: Yes.  However, the GEF approval request mentions that the project will contribute	

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	under relevant conventions?	to the implementation of LDN. Please elaborate how this will be achieved.  05/10/2017 UA: Has been addressed.  Cleared	
<b>Project Design</b>	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	04/05/2017 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	04/05/2017 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBS?	04/05/2017 UA: Not fully.  1. The project objective would be more concise without stating the quantitative targets, which may anyway change during project implementation.  2. It is unclear if the project targets in total 33,000 ha or in total 230,000 ha. If the upscaling is part of the project, please enter the total figure into Table E.  3. If the project addresses LDN target implementation, please enter an outcome/output respectively.  05/10/2017 UA: Has been addressed.	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		Cleared	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	04/05/2017 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	04/05/2017 UA: Not fully.  The budget table includes procurement of a vehicle out of GEF grants. Please note that procurement of vehicles out of GEF grants is usually not accepted.  05/10/2017 UA: Vehicle has been removed from GEF budget.  Cleared	
	9. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	04/05/2017 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	04/05/2017 UA: Clarification requested.  The co-financing table includes a figure of \$590,000, for which no letter was included in the submission.	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	04/05/2017 UA: Clarification requested.  Please double check your assumptions for the carbon benefits estimate. The estimate for the shelterbelt component (351,000 tCO <sub>2</sub> e) to be achieved on a small area of 3,600 ha seems quite high? In case the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>estimate is reduced, please revise Table E and the tracking tools accordingly.</p> <p>If the carbon benefits are all entered into the CC tracking tool, we assume that they are achieved with CC funding, which is fine. However, carbon benefits would then need to be removed from the LD tracking tool to avoid double counting.</p> <p>05/10/2017 UA: Has been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	12. <i>Only for Non-grant Instrument</i> : Has a reflow calendar been presented?	n/a	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	04/05/2017 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	04/05/2017 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	04/05/2017 UA: Yes.  Cleared	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	04/05/2017 UA: Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>04/05/2017 UA: Yes.</p> <p>Resources are available. Ukraine has utilized 0% of LD and 0% of CC STAR so far.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	n/a	
<b>Recommendations</b>	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	<p>04/05/2017 UA: No.</p> <p>Please address comments. Please also submit a clean version of the project document in the next submission.</p> <p>05/10/2017 UA: The project is technically cleared by the Program Manager. In order to recommend the one-step MSP for CEO approval, please provide us with an updated OFP endorsement letter that reflects the requested amounts.</p> <p>05/31/2017 UA: OFP endorsement letter has been submitted. Program Manager recommends the project for CEO approval.</p>	
<b>Review Dates</b>	First Review	April 05, 2017	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 10, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 31, 2017	