



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4634		
Country/Region:	Ukraine		
Project Title:	<b>Conserving, Enhancing and Managing Carbon Stocks and Biodiversity while Promoting Sustainable Development in the Chernobyl Exclusion Zone through the Establishment of a Research and Environmental Protection Centre and Protected Area</b>		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF	Objective (s):	BD-1; CCM-5; LD-2; Project Mana;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$181,818	Project Grant:	\$4,863,955
Co-financing:	\$28,340,000	Total Project Cost:	\$33,385,773
PIF Approval:	September 22, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	November 09, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Marieta Sakalian

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	09-12-2011 UA: Yes.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	09-12-2011 UA: Yes, letter dated Augsut 31, 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	09-12-2011 UA: UNEP's comparative advantage for this project is clearly supported and described.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	n/a

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	09-12-2011 UA: Yes. UNEP's ongoing programmes in Ukraine are acknowledged.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	09-12-2011 UA: Yes.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	09-12-2011 UA: Yes.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	n/a
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	n/a
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	n/a
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	09-12-2011 UA: Yes. The project is aligned with the framework (see Table A). However, the project framework (see Table B) clearly indicates a focus of the project on the establishment of the Research and Environmental Protection Center. In view of this focus, please consider and discuss with the OFP whether the BD-STAR contribution could be increased and the CC-M STAR contribution decreased accordingly.  09/16/2011 UA: Question (1) above has been clarified. It is understood that Ukraine has allocated its entire remaining BD-STAR resources to this project. Please see additional comment below.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>12 Sep 2011/LH: The linkage between the focal area strategies (Table A) and project components (Table B) is not clear. The project framework (Table B) in component B lists mostly biodiversity benefits, and component A heavily leans toward biodiversity benefits. Please list out in Table B for each component the amount of funds that each focal area is contributing toward the component. Please either reconsider the objectives or the funding amounts to better align the objectives with the appropriate focal area funding.</p> <p>16 Sept 2011/LH: Table A and Table B matches a bit better but more work is needed. This more work is described in the response to question 14.</p> <p>21 Sept 2011/LH: Ensure Table A and Table B matches at time of CEO endorsement. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	09-12-2011 UA: BD-1 CCM-5 LD-2	12/08/2014 UA: BD-1 CCM-5 LD-3
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	09-12-2011 UA: Yes. The proposed project mainly supports the implementation of the NBSAP (2010). This is another reason, why increase of BD-STAR contribution should be considered.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the	09-12-2011 UA: Yes. Capacity building through the Research Center will contribute to the	12/08/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	sustainability of project outcomes?	long-term sustainability of the project outcomes.	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>09-12-2011 UA: Yes. The work of the GoU in the Chernobyl Exclusion Zone (ChEZ) with all the described elements is a solid baseline on which the GEF can provide incremental support. The assumptions are sound and supported by scientific evidence.</p> <p>12 Sep 2011/LH: The text in Part II, section A.1.1. describes the CCM-5 activities as Good practice through the establishment of monitoring and sustainable management systems for large areas of forests and wetlands. The description indicates there are over 110,000 ha of protected forest and major areas of wetlands. a) Please add a few more sentences describing the vegetation types, including approximate area of unprotected forests if there are any, area is in wetlands or perhaps forested wetlands. This is important because a carbon and other greenhouse gas monitoring system for wetlands is usually quite different (may cost more) than for forests. b) Please list any other major land uses in the ChEZ, and the approximate area. c) Please describe if this area is currently considered unmanaged in the national GHG inventory.</p>	<p>12/08/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage. The carbon benefits have been described. The project will directly lead to sequestration of 8 million t of CO<sub>2</sub>eq in the project's lifetime.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>16 Sep 2011/LH: This information will need to be included by CEO endorsement. We expect the PPG to include activities that will obtain, analyze, and interpret the needed data for project design, as indicated in the response to comments.</p> <p>21 Sept 2011/LH: No response was expected at PIF stage. We expect above information to be listed at CEO endorsement. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		12/08/2014 UA: Yes.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	09-12-2011 UA: Yes. Incremental reasoning has been applied.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>09-12-2011 UA: Please insert investment category 'INV' into the second column of Table B as appropriate and if both 'TA' and 'INV' apply, please estimate the proportion.</p> <p>12 Sep 2011/LH: a) Please indicate in Table B how much funding is being contributed by focal area for each component. b) In component 3, output 3.1.3 is not clearly related to any of the focal areas. Please clarify which focal area this is benefitting. c) In component 1, output 1.3.1 mentions forest habitats but not</p>	12/08/2014 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>wetlands. Please clarify in the text why forests are listed in this output but forests and wetlands are listed in output 1.3.4 in component 1.</p> <p>d) Output 2.1.5 in component 2 indicates a collaborative transboundary effort will be occurring in Belarus. Please briefly describe this effort. It would be customary to include the collaborating agency or agencies in Table C, perhaps with in-kind support.</p> <p>e) The text mentions 15,000 hectares of abandoned agricultural land could be planted based on a previous feasibility study. Please describe in the text how this project will build on that previous feasibility study. Please clarify in the text and if appropriate in Table B whether activities like tree planting will be undertaken as proposed in the previous feasibility study or just studied perhaps in pilot areas.</p> <p>16 Sep 2011/LH: a) The revised information is better, however, the constant ratio of funding between the focal areas across components needs to be reconsidered and modified appropriately. The funding ratios should better reflect the mix of focal areas of the outputs and outcomes. For instance, component 3 seems more like more LD and BD funding and very little CC funding. Clarify which outputs or outcomes are being financed with CCM-5 funds.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>b-d) Thank you for your responses. Cleared.</p> <p>e) The outcomes and outputs for CCM-5 funding in terms of good practice are meant to be focused more on Investments and concrete activities, not TA. Furthermore, some of the expected outputs listed read as though they are investments. For instance, outputs 1.1.1 Essential networking, surveys and lab equipment is in place. 1.3.3, a fire monitoring system can be a investment. Outcome 1.2 indicates field experiments are not only designed but launched. Many field experiments are investments. Please reconsider the listed outputs and if they are correct then label them INV as appropriate, or if they are not to be INV then please modify to ensure they are clearly TA.</p> <p>20 Sep 2011 LH: a) Accurate funding by focal area objective by component is expected at CEO endorsement. Cleared for PIF. e) Response to GEFSEC clarifies that regardless of description, items are all TA. Cleared.</p> <p>09-16-2011 UA: First comment from 09/12 has not been addressed: Please insert investment category 'INV' into the second column of Table B as appropriate and if both 'TA' and 'INV' apply, please estimate the proportion.</p> <p>09-21-2011 UA:</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Has been clarified.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>09-12-2011 UA: For BD and LD, yes.</p> <p>12 Sep 2011/LH/CC: Carbon benefits are relative to a baseline. The baseline situation seems to be that, with the exception of fire, the vegetation has been left alone and is growing. It may be quite difficult to increase carbon sequestration above the baseline with activities, unless restoration of wetlands or afforestation is considered. Ongoing national carbon sinks probably would not count unless they are under threat of loss. Reducing forest fire risk may also produce carbon benefits, but sometimes not depending on productivity of the site, and fire return rates. Please provide some preliminary estimates of possible sequestration, such as area that could be available for tree planting or other possible major activity. Using a tier 1 approach such as multiplying area by default carbon emission or sequestration factors is fine, but please note the source of the default factors. One possible source is the National Communications or GHG inventories for Ukraine.</p> <p>16-Sept-2011: Thank you for your responses. Please take a look at the CC tracking tool, at the CCM-5 section. What accomplishments (name of row) is going to be reported on in the LULUCF (CCM-5 section)? With a better</p>	<p>12/08/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage. CO2 benefit estimations have been provided.</p>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>description of or understanding of what incremental benefits are being produced here, then it may become clear what methodology and assumptions are needed at the PIF stage.</p> <p>21 Sep 2011/LH: The inserted table indicates activities that will result in CO2 benefits. Since these are only TA activities it is unclear how any CO2 benefits will directly result from the project. Clarify at CEO endorsement. Cleared.</p>	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?	09-12-2011 UA: Yes, given the special circumstances of the project.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	09-12-2011 UA: Yes. Sufficient at this stage. More details will be required at CEO endorsement stage, in particular on the involvement of national and international NGOs into the project.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage. National and international NGOs have been involved at PPG stage and will play a role in its implementation.
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>09-12-2011 UA: Please discuss climate change risk, in particular in view of fire hazards/risks.</p> <p>09-16-2011 UA: Has been addressed.</p>	12/08/2014 UA: Yes.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	09-12-2011 UA: Yes. A number of related ongoing initiatives are listed and co-operation outlined.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	09-12-2011 UA: Yes.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		12/08/2014 UA: Yes. The project is fully in line with what was approved at PIF stage.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	09-12-2011 UA: Yes, 5%.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	09-12-2011 UA: Not fully. For objective 3 with its focus on learning, field testing and dissemination a higher co-financing could be considered.  09-16-2011 UA: Above comment has been addressed.  12 Sep 2011/LH: It is difficult to respond fully to this question until more information is provided as requested on what the climate mitigation funds are being spent on. This will be revisited in the revision. 16 Sep 2011/LH: This will be revisited. 21 Sep 2011/LH: At CEO endorsement, the funding and co-financing per objective will be scrutinized. CCM funds must produce CCM related outcomes and outputs. Cleared at PIF stage.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if	09-12-2011 UA: Please consider to increase co-financing to at least a ratio of 1:3. An earlier	12/08/2014 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage. An adequate level of co-financing has

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	confirmed co-financing is provided.	concept of the Operational Focal Point included a higher co-financing, please re-discuss with the OFP. GEF would also welcome some co-financing in cash (presently all co-financing is in kind or unknown at this stage).  09-16-2011 UA: Above comment has been addressed.	been confirmed.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	09-12-2011 UA: UNEP contributes \$300,000 in kind.	12/08/2014 UA: Yes.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		12/08/2014 UA: Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		12/08/2014 UA: Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		12/08/2014 UA: Yes. STAPs comments were adequately responded to and taken into account during project preparation.
	• Convention Secretariat?		n/a
	• Council comments?		12/08/2014 UA: Council comments were responded to at WP inclusion.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		n/a
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	09-12-2011 UA: No. Please address issues raised in this review.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>09-16-2011 UA: No. Some further refinements of the PIF are necessary as outlined above.</p> <p>Please also note the changes required on the PGG request (see below). If more time is required to revise the PPG request, please consider re-submitting the PIF request ahead of the PPG request.</p> <p>09-21-2011 UA: Yes. Recommended for CEO clearance for WPI.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>16 Sep 2011/LH: At CEO endorsement the cost-effectiveness of the CCM-5 funds in producing CCM-5 related benefits needs to be shown.</p> <p>21 Sep 2011/LH: At time of CEO endorsement, we expect: a) Table A and Table B match; b) We expect the items listed in the review of question 11 to be addressed or included; c) funding ratios by component to be refined;, and d) clarification as to how any CO2 benefits can result from a project that is not an investment, but instead TA. In addition, please address the comment just above in this cell dated 16 Sept.</p> <p>21 Sep 2011/UA: At CEO endorsement, the project proponent has also to submit a concept on how the GEF support to the Research and Environment Protection Center will be clearly visible for wider public awareness.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		12/08/2014 UA: Yes.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		12/08/2014 UA: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 12, 2011	December 08, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 16, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 21, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	<p>09-12-2011 UA: Not fully. While the general need for a PPG is acknowledged, the list of proposed activities is very generic and mostly covers activities that GEF considers baseline activities to be financed by the project proponent (e.g. collection/review of existing baseline information; workshops; preparation of documentation; PPG management costs). Please focus on activities that are necessary to prepare the GEF project clearly in view of achieving the identified objectives. What appears to be missing is the establishment of a monitoring system and baseline indicators for the project.</p> <p>12 Sep 2011/LH: Given the issues with radioactive contamination, please explain why none of the econsultants appear to be experts for dealing with radioactive issues. 16 Sep 2011/LH: Thank you, expert issue addressed.</p> <p>01-20-2012 UA:</p>

		Please address earlier comment on component 4: "PPG management costs". Management costs and administrative arrangements should be covered by co-financing.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>09-12-2011 UA: Not fully. The PPG appears to be overfunded with GEF resources. \$227,000 is comparably high for a \$4.8 million project. Moreover, the co-financing should be in line with the underlying project (roughly 1:3). The project proponent might want to consider to reduce the GEF funding for the PPG and at the same time increase the co-funding.</p> <p>09-15-2011: Co-financing has been adequately increased. (1) Please correct the typo in Table C: The total amount for the PPG is \$944,273. (2) Do international consultant rates contain travel costs? Please reduce international consultant rates to a maximum of \$3,500/week by excluding travel costs.</p> <p>01-20-2012 UA: The reduced GEF amount for the PPG and co-financing is now considered appropriate. However, please note that GEF does not fund "management costs" in a PPG. Component 4 still includes "PPG management cost". This point was raised already in the first review (09-12-11).</p> <p>01-24-2012 UA: Has been adequately addressed.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>09-12-2011 UA: No. Please revise PPG request in line with above comments.</p> <p>09-15-2011 UA: No. Co-financing has been increased but the proposed activities still need to be revised in line with comments.</p> <p>09-21-2011 UA: No. The project proponent might want to consider reducing the amount of GEF funding. GEF funding of \$227,00 and the total budget of \$944,000 appears too high and is not the common standard for GEF funded PPGs.</p> <p>01-20-2012 UA: No. The revised budget is acceptable but there are some minor changes required that had been requested in the first review. Please make the requested changes and</p>

		re-submit.  01-24-2012 UA: Yes. PM recommends the PPG for CEO approval.
	4. Other comments	01-20-2012 UA: In response to UNEP & partners comments of 09 Jan 2012, the PM would like to record the following points:  1) The GEF funds deducted from the PPG of \$50,000 can be requested for project implementation at the time of CEO endorsement. The basis for such a request are GEF project cycle procedures stated in GEF council document C.39.Inf_3: "When minor amendments are proposed for a full-sized project after Council approval, but prior to CEO endorsement, such changes are reflected in the project documentation submitted for CEO endorsement. In endorsing the project, the CEO has the flexibility to increase up to 5% the amount of GEF project grant approved at work program inclusion, as long as the increase is within the STAR allocation of the country. Increases of more than 5% are treated as major amendments."  2) Concerning the possible delay of the PPG start, GEF expects that CEO endorsement for the project will be sought by the project proponents within 18 months after Council approval of the PIF as stipulated in the GEF project cycle regulations. Please also note that in GEF-5 milestone extensions are only granted in 'force majeure' cases.
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 12, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 24, 2012

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.