



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2020 – Revised Template

Period covered: 01 July 2019 to 30 June 2020



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	Burundi
Project Title:	Natural landscapes rehabilitation and Climate Change Adaptation in the provinces of Bujumbura and Bujumbura Mayor through a Farmer Field School approach
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/BDI/037/LDF
GEF ID:	8010
GEF Focal Area(s):	CCA
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (DGA, DGE, DGMAVA, BPEAE Bujumbura, OBPE & ISABU)
Project Duration:	• 4 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	March 01, 2019
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	January 01, 2019
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	December 31, 2022
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	NA
Actual Implementation End Date³:	NA

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 5,877,397
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	USD 17,499,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as	USD 299,269.26

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

of June 30, 2020 (USD):	
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2020⁵	USD 3.000.000

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	The first Steering Committee meeting is planned before the end of September 2020
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	No
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	N/A
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2020 – June 2021):	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2020 – June 2021).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	NA
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	No

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	MS	
Overall implementation progress rating:	MS	
Overall risk rating:	M	

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	1 st PIR
--	---------------------

Project Contacts

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	NIBASUMBA Désiré	Desire.Nibasumba@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Stefano Mondovi, FAO NSP	Stefano.Mondovi@fao.org
Budget Holder	Isaias ANGUE OBAMA, FAOR Burundi	Isaias.AngueObama@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Paola Palestini, FAO OCB	Paola.Palestini@fao.org

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s): To address the root causes of landscape degradation due to climate change and unsustainable land uses by rehabilitating degraded land and adapting integrated farming and natural resources systems to climate change in the provinces of Bujumbura and Bujumbura Mayor						
Component 1: Strengthening institutional and technical capacity for mainstreaming climate change adaptation into policies, strategies and plans						
Outcome 1.1: Strengthened capacity to implement climate change adaptation priorities of the PNCC and the SNPACC at communal, provincial and national level.	AMAT Indicator 9: Number of people trained to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation strategies and measures (disaggregated by gender)	None trained	50 staff members at regional and national levels and 2 per commune	At least 150 staff members in Regional and national governments and 20 communal staff have received training	The Project is in the process of recruiting Consultants to carry out the training of staff members	MS
	AMAT Indicator 6: Risk and vulnerability assessments and other relevant technical assessments carried	0 at commune level in project area	5 vulnerability and restoration opportunity assessments (mapping of natural resources,	5 assessments	2 assessments were carried out by two National Consultants on PPG (Project Preparation Grant),	S

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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.

⁹ 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).

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating ⁹
	out and updated		description of agrarian systems and their vulnerability, 15 national best practices, 10 local CCA best practices, and agrobiodiversity assessments)		natural resources were mapped, agrarian systems and their vulnerability were described, 16 national best practices were recommended based on CCA best practices	
	Level of institutionalization of the FFS approach	Strategy only implemented in 2 communes	Operational guidelines prepared	Level of institutionalization of the FFS approach	Terms of reference were prepared to recruit an international FFS Expert to support the institutionalisation of the FFS approach; however, the recruitment of the international FFS Expert was hampered by the restriction of travelling in the COVID-19 pandemic context.	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating ⁹
	Institutional arrangements to lead, coordinate and support the integration of climate change adaptation into relevant policies, plans and associated processes	No coordination mechanism for ecosystem-based development or for FFS harmonization	2 mechanisms partly operational (for FFS harmonization and CCA coordination)	2 mechanisms fully operational	Terms of reference were prepared to recruit a part-time FFS national Consultant specialist in climate change adaptation	MS
	Number of Communal development plans integrating CCA practices	No communal development plans integrate CCA practices	2	4	40%: Land use, vulnerability, agrarian systems and agro-biodiversity assessments vis-à-vis to climate change were carried out by 2 Consultants; based on their findings, the Consultant prepared 4 communal development plans to be implemented in the 04 Communes of the Bujumbura Province and 15 watershed action plans were	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating ⁹
					developed to be implemented in the 15 hills of the Project intervention area	
Component 2: Enhancing climate-resilience of agro-ecosystems						
Outcome 2.1: Improved resilience of agro-ecosystems and populations through enhanced capacity to implement CCA/CSA	AMAT Indicator 4: Extent of adoption of climate-resilient technologies/practice s: Number of people, % female	3% of households adapt their behaviour or practices to climate change	40% of target households (30% women) adopt adaptation practices.	80 % of target groups adopting adaptation technologies by technology type (disaggregated by gender)	The adoption of climate-resilient technologies / practices will start with the implementation of 150 FFS planned for the coming agricultural season (2021 A) following the training of 75 Facilitators by three (03) Master Trainers from the Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock scheduled from the August 17 to September 05, 2020; 150 FFS target groups were identified on the 15 hills of the Project	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating ⁹
					area including 2,797 women (61%) and 1,774 men (39%).	
	Number of FFS, number of program managers, master trainers, and facilitators trained in project site. Number of farmers trained, Output indicators from FFS M&E system	None	300 FFS 20 master trainers 75 facilitators (30% women) 0 existing master trainers refreshed 75 existing facilitators refreshed 3000 farmers trained (30% women) TBD FFS Outputs	300 FFS 20 master trainers 75 facilitators (30% women) 40 master trainers refreshed (20 existing and 20 new) 150 facilitators refreshed (75 existing and 75 new) 10.000 farmers trained (30% women) TBD FFS Outputs	Terms of reference were prepared to recruit a part-time international FFS Consultant to train 20 master trainers for 66 days (September to December 2020). However, the recruitment of the international FFS Consultant was hampered by the restriction of travelling in the COVID-19 pandemic context. The Project is planning to train 75 Facilitators from the August 17 to September 05, 2020 who will start implementing 150 first FFS starting with the coming	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating ⁹
					2021 A cropping season (September 2020 to January 2021). In addition, terms of reference were prepared to recruit 4 national FFS Consultants specialists in crop production, livestock, integrated natural resource management and climate change adaptation. These Consultants will provide the Facilitators and Master Trainers with training on cross-cutting themes	
Outcome 2.2: Climate risks are mitigated through decision support tools and sustainable landscape	AMAT Indicator 2: Type and extent of assets strengthened and/or better managed to withstand the effects of climate change	0	2.000 ha of degraded woodlands and 100 km of river banks	At least 5.000 ha of degraded woodlands and 300 km of river banks	Preparation for Collect Earth Assessment is underway in order to identify degraded areas and the	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating ⁹
management					subsequent monitoring of project progress	
	AMAT Indicator 7: Number of people/geographical area with access to improved climate information services	62% People are regularly getting updated climate information from the Burundi Geographical Institute (IGEBU) through televisions and radios. Also, there is a meteorological station in the Nyabiraba commune and another at the Bujumbura Airport	75%	90%	0% (this activity is planned in year 2)	MU
	Existence of a forest co-management regulations application text	None exists	1 application text	1 application text	The project has conducted a review of existing regulatory frameworks for the subsequent development of the application	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating ⁹
					text. National Legislation documents available include the Environment Code and the Forest Code. These two documents will provide foundation for the application text which is under preparation.	
	Level of implementation of agrobiodiversity strategy	None	Agrobiodiversity strategy created and partially implemented	Agrobiodiversity strategy fully implemented	The Project is preparing a LoA to be signed with Biodiversity International so as to develop the agrobiodiversity strategy in the first half of 2021.	MS
Component 3: Improving the livelihoods of communities by strengthening and diversifying rural value chains						
Outcome 3.1: Communities deploy a diversified set of resilient livelihood strategies in the project areas	AMAT Indicator 3: Population benefiting from the adoption of diversified, climate-resilient livelihood options	Resilience score related to agricultural practices: 9.61/20 (women-led households: 10.62) Overall resilience	Medium resilience level (12/20) (for both indicators)	High resilience level (14/20) (for both indicators)	A SHARP report was produced during the Baseline study carried out by an International Expert and two National Consultants in order to measure	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating ⁹
		score: 8.43/20 (women-led households: 8.43)			the project's progress. The latter is closely interlinked with the establishment of the FFS – which is in preparation (Outcome 2.1)	
	Number of new value chains developed and number of existing value chains strengthened	None	2 existing value chains strengthened	1 new value chain and 3 existing value chains strengthened	Procedures are underway for the recruitment of a full-time Value chain Expert for the Project who will support in the identification and development of potential existing and new value chains	MS
	Number of cooperatives or pre-cooperatives with strengthened capacities to access markets	None	5 cooperatives or pre-cooperatives	10 cooperatives or pre-cooperatives	According to the Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock, there is one cooperative per hill of the Project area. This means that the Project has 15 cooperatives to be	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating ⁹
					strengthened; the Bujumbura Provincial Directorate for Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (BPEAE Bujumbura) has already identified 55 potential Producer's Organizations / Cooperatives	
Component 4: Project monitoring and dissemination of results						
Outcome 4.1: Project implementation based on results-based management and application of project lessons learned in future operations facilitated	Number and types of documents and tools developed to monitor and evaluate the project and share knowledge	None	M&E framework developed Mid-term evaluation conducted Project newsletter published annually SHARP assessment conducted at mid and end term Collect-Earth assessment conducted	M&E framework developed Mid-term evaluation conducted Project newsletter published Final evaluation conducted SHARP assessment conducted Collect-Earth assessment conducted	One PPR (Project Progress Report) from July 1, 2019 to December 2019 and one PIR (Project Implementation Review) from July 1 2019 to June 2020 were prepared; Prepared a newsletter on training of FFS Facilitators and lessons learned.	S


Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2020	Progress rating ⁹
				Document on project best practices and lessons learned developed		

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating¹⁰

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1.1: Strengthened capacity to implement climate change adaptation priorities of the PNCC and the SNPACC at communal, provincial and national level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify 50 staff members at regional and national levels and 2 per commune to be trained next year - Recruit an international Expert for the institutionalisation of the FFS approach - Recruit a part-time national FFS Consultant specialist in climate change adaptation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock - CLA (FAOBI Local Purchasing Committee) - CLA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 31/12/2020 - 31/12/2020 - 31/12/2020
Outcome 2.1: Improved resilience of agro-ecosystems and populations through enhanced capacity to implement CCA/CSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Train 75 Facilitators - Implement 150 FFS (4571 beneficiaries) - Recruit an international FFS Consultant to train 20 Master Trainers - Recruit 2 local NGO to support the implementation of 150 FFS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3 Master Trainers - 75 Facilitators - CLA - CLA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 05/09/2020 - 15/09/2020 - 31/12/2020 - 30/09/2020
Outcome 2.2: Climate risks are mitigated through decision support tools and sustainable landscape management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finalize Collect Earth Assessment based on the results; identify 2.000 ha of degraded areas and 100 km of river banks - Sign a LoA with the Provincial Directorate of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project Coordination Unit to liaise with LTO and relevant department within FAO. BPEAE Bujumbura + Administration - CLA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 30/09/2020 - 31/12/2020
Outcome 3.1: Communities deploy a diversified set of resilient livelihood strategies in the project areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify 1 new value chain and 3 existing value chains 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BPEAE Bujumbura, 2 local NGO and 75 Facilitators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 31/12/2020

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1. Natural resources and ecosystem services, climate change vulnerability of agrarian systems and land uses are fully mapped and assessed in the province of Bujumbura using an integrated landscape approach	Q2 Y1	<i>Natural resources were assessed and mapped during a study carried out by two National Consultants on the 15 hills of the Project area</i>  Plans Action BV Rapport définitif.doc					80%	According to the 037/LDF 2020 annual and budget work plan, a National Consultant will be recruited to identify 5000 ha of degraded landscapes and 300 km of river banks requiring rehabilitation
Output 1.1.2. An action plan for agrobiodiversity enhancement and restoration is prepared	Q2 Y1	<i>Land use, vulnerability, agrarian systems and agro-biodiversity assessments vis-à-vis</i>					40%	

¹¹ 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.

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

¹³ 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)

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

		<i>to climate change were carried out by 2 Consultants; based on their findings, the Consultant prepared 4 communal development plans to be implemented in the 04 Communes of the Bujumbura Province and 15 watershed action plans were developed to be implemented in the 15 hills of the Project intervention area</i>						
Output 1.1.3. Awareness raising activities and trainings on CCA and IRNM are carried out with MINEAGRIE staff from the national, provincial and communal levels	Q4 Y3	<i>No activity implemented so far</i>					0%	
Output 1.1.4. The FFS harmonization strategy is implemented at the national level and operationalized by a coordination unit within the MINEAGRIE	Q3 Y4	<i>No activity implemented so far</i>					0%	
Output 1.1.5. A cross-sectoral coordination mechanism for CCA action is supporting coordinated CCA at the national and communal levels	Q2Y3	<i>No activity implemented so far</i>					0%	

Output 2.1.1. Gender-responsive training materials integrating CCA and INRM practices are specifically developed to accommodate FFS needs	Q4Y1	<i>Training materials integrating CCA and INRM are available in FAO</i>					0%	
Output 2.1.2 A core group of program managers, master trainers, extension officers and facilitators trained in locally adapted CCA and NRM practices as well as in methods to resolve CCA related conflicts	Q1Y2	<i>The training of 75 Facilitators is planned for August 2020 whilst the training of 20 Master Trainers is planned for September to December 2020. The Project is in the process of recruiting the Consultants to carry out the trainings</i>					20%	The recruitment of the international FFS Consultant to train 20 Master Trainers was hampered by the restriction of travelling in the COVID-19 pandemic context.
Output 2.1.3 A total of 300 FFS are established covering 15 collines in 4 communes	Q4Y4	<i>The Project is planning to start implementing 150 FFS with the coming agricultural season</i>					20%	The 150 FFS target group members have been already identified totalling 4571 members amongst them 2,797 women (61%) and 1,774 men (39%).
Output 2.2.1 Participatory decision support tools for climate change analysis developed to reduce risks	Q4Y2	<i>No activity implemented so far</i>					0%	

Output 2.2.2 5000 ha of degraded woodland and 300 km of river banks are identified and rehabilitated	Q2Y4	<i>No activity implemented so far</i>					0%	
Output 2.2.3 Appropriate legislation and procedures are in place for community forest co-management	Q4Y2	<i>No activity implemented so far</i>					0%	
Output 2.2.4 Community management groups and incentive mechanisms are established for forest co-management and stabilization and management of river banks	Q3Y4	<i>No activity implemented so far</i>					0%	
Output 2.2.5 Agrobiodiversity action plan prepared in 1.2 implemented and monitored	Q3Y4	<i>No activity implemented so far</i>					0%	
Output 3.1.1 Value chain diversification and strengthening strategies are developed	Q4Y3	<i>No activity implemented so far</i>					0%	
Output 3.1.2 Twenty-four interventions in four communes implemented to support value chain diversification and strengthening	Q2Y4	<i>16 interventions were identified by the 2 national Consultants</i>					20%	
Output 3.1.3 New and existing value chains structured and organized around FFS groups	Q3Y4	<i>The process is underway to recruit a full-time Value Chain Expert for the Project who will support in the identification of new and existing</i>					20%	<i>The applications were posted on the FAO site by the candidates on April 15, 2020 and the procedures are</i>

		<i>value chains</i>						<i>underway to select the suitable candidate</i>
Output 4.1.1 Operational system for collection of field-based data to monitor project outcome indicators	Q4Y4	<i>No activity implemented so far</i>					0%	
Output 4.1.2 Midterm and final evaluation conducted	Q1Y3	<i>No activity implemented so far</i>					0%	
Output 4.1.3 Project-related “best-practices” and “lessons-learned” disseminated via publications and other means	Q4Y4	<i>No activity implemented so far</i>					0%	

4. 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:

- Four sub-catchment action plans were developed at communal level and 15 sub-catchment action plans were developed in the 15 hills of the project. The Project FFS Expert was recruited in April 2020 and the Project Value Chain Expert is being recruited.
- The counterpart staff (Secretary and Caretaker) and Project offices were provided by the MINEAGRIE.
- The MINEAGRIE is in the process of putting in place the Project Steering Committee.
- Terms of reference were prepared for the recruitment of the FFS International Consultant for training 20 Master Trainers and National Consultants specialists in crop production, livestock development, integrated natural resource management and communication for strategic development.
- An International Consultant was recruited to translate the Project Document from English to French.

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

Max 200 words:

- The outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic virus has significantly affected the activities which were put on hold in the field.
- The MINEAGRIE took too much time to put in place the Project Steering Committee members owing to elections.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating ¹⁵	FY2020 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2020 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	The Project Coordinator is well assuming his responsibilities assigned to him according to his contract
Budget Holder	S	S	<i>The COVID-19 context, with its restrictions on filed missions, greatly disrupted the Project activities that were at the start. Even if the situation has not completely recovered, activities are gradually restarting and efforts are being made in this regard</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	MS	MS	<p>Even though the project started recently (August 2019) and the COVID-19 pandemic slowed down all processes and didn't allow to start activities in the field, it should be remarked that very few activities have been realized so far. Apart of the study on the 4 communal Development plans integrate CCA practices and the recruitment of the project team and the preparation of some ToRs for the recruitment of consultants for activities in the field, the project has not produced any result. The inception workshop has been organized in December 2019, with the presence of the LTO.</p> <p>It is crucial to organize immediately the Steering Committee meeting and to speed up activities, at least what can be done remotely due to the Covid-19 situation and following the restriction measures established by the Government.</p>

¹⁵ **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.

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

¹⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	MS	<p><i>The project experienced a very slow start (late inception workshop, delay in setting up PSC with first meeting still pending, finalizing of TORs and recruitment of experts is still on-going). The COVID 19 pandemic has aggravated this situation but should not prevent the PCU from completing preparatory and baseline related activities that can be conducted remotely and will essentially form the foundation of this project (in particular for Comp 2). For example the identification of best agro-sylvo-pastoral practices by e.g. reviewing of the SHARP survey and other available national data (also from past and current projects/programmes including the GEF-6 IAP project) for subsequent testing/inclusion in FFS curricula and mainstreaming support, the Collect Earth assessment to identify suitable areas for restoration (forest, riverbanks) and monitoring of project's progress etc..</i></p> <p><i>It will be important that the project team identifies additional (COVID 19) mitigating actions where possible jointly with the FAO PTF to prevent further delays (e.g. feasibility to conduct virtual meetings and trainings). Project activities relevant to value chain development should be reviewed carefully in view of possible COVID 19 limitations. The project team can further explore the possibility of introducing FAO's resource handbook on running FFS under COVID-19.</i></p> <p><i>Last but not least, it is highly recommended that the project is linked up early to other FAO LDCF (APFS) projects in the region and beyond in order to benefit from lessons learned and evidence based good CCA practices.</i></p>
GEF OFP	MS	MS	<p><i>The Project implementation should focus mainly on cooperatives at hill level, i.e on the 15 hills of the Project area</i></p> <p><i>I suggest to accelerate the implementation of the Project's activities in the field especially regarding FFS implementation, the setting of tree nurseries and water and soil conservation</i></p> <p><i>The 2 NGO to be recruited must work closely with existing cooperatives and Producers' Associations</i></p> <p><i>If possible, the Project interventions should include small scale hillside irrigation scheme</i></p>

5. Risks

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

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
L/M	Yes it is still valid

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 Project Document and reflects also any new risks 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, as relevant.</i>

¹⁸ **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.

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	The prevalence of the COVID-19 pandemic	Medium	Monitoring of the situation and mass screening	Prevention measures are being implemented (regular washing of hands, measuring of temperature, wearing of masks and distancing) and, messages are widely disseminated from various media (radio and television), NGO and United Nations Organizations (pamphlets, posters, etc.)	Good progress. Additional mitigating measures (including virtual trainings and meetings) as well as the selection/implementation of "COVID 19 proof value chains" should be looked into (see FLO comments).
2	Political instability and civil disturbances (force majeure)	Medium	Monitoring of political situation and planning ahead for contingency	The political situation is overall stable following the May 20, 2020 Presidential and Legislative elections despite the prevalence of the COVID-19 pandemic	
3	Weakening of political support for the project at any level (from colline to national)	Low	Proactive and continuous efforts must be made to maintain this support or strengthen it if it begins to weaken	The Ministerial Order number 710/1290 was lately signed on August 17, 2020; it took a very long process for stakeholders to designate their respective PSC members owing to elections' preparation	

¹⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁰ 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 ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Lack of receptiveness and interest from communities to the project	Low	This should also be addressed proactively, as communities should be engaged in a way that builds their interest for the project. Should this risk materialize, the project could count on demonstration effect from similar projects in the country to showcase the benefits to the communities and build interest.	The PCU had planned 4 concertation meetings in the 4 communes of the Bujumbura Province from March 31 to April 03, 2020 and Security Clearance was granted by UNDSS. These meetings couldn't take place owing to the declaration of the prevalence of the COVID-19 pandemic. The PCU organized concertation meetings with Provincial and Communal authorities from August 19 to 28, 2020. The Administration has shown a good receptiveness of the Project and promised its good support and involvement at all levels	

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
5	Destruction of roads by extreme weather events limits accessibility to project sites	Medium	Plan for alternate communication means to avoid having to use damaged roads. Value chain development efforts will take into account risks related to road accessibility	In its co-financing letter, the National Program for Food Security and Sustainable Development of Imbo and Moso (PNSADR-IM) intends to develop rural infrastructures through road rehabilitation for USD 2,288,558; but due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the rehabilitation work has not yet started	

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

FY2019 rating	FY2020 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2020 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
N/A	M	The risk rate remains the same due to the fact that the project is just started and general conditions remained very similar apart of the COVID-19 emergency, which slowed down the actual start of the project activities in the field.

6. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²¹

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

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
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: 31/12/2022 Revised NTE: tbd</p> <p>The Project start-up was delayed by almost one year. The first expenditure was recorded in June 2019. Also, it took a long time to put in place the Project Coordination Team.</p> <p>The continued prevalence of the COVID-19 pandemic virus in Burundi is delaying some field activities. Due to the delay, the project might need an extension, to be determined by the independent mid-term review.</p>

²¹ 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.

7. Gender Mainstreaming

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

Gender-responsive measures will be taken into account during all phases of the Project implementation process.

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender results and impacts?

The M&E system is still being put in place in FAO Burundi and has gender-disaggregated data. The Project is tracking gender results and impacts by using gender sensitive tracking tools. For example, the 75 Facilitators who are being trained include 23 women (31%) and 22 youth (30%). This information is found on the attendance list. At the same time, the 4,571 target 150 FFS group members include 2,797 women (61%) and 1,774 men (39%). The indicators of products, results and impacts of the Project will be disaggregated taking into account gender sensitive tracking tools such as attendance lists in FFS activities, agroecosystem analysis sessions and data collecting forms.

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

The Project staff doesn't have gender expertise. However, the FAO Representation in Burundi has a gender Focal Point supporting this project.

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

The Project is expected to contribute to gender equality taking into account sex, age, and indigenous people without taking into account ethnic, religious and political considerations in the following areas:

- improving women's participation and decision making; and
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women, youth and marginalized indigenous people.

8. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

- An FPIC study is planned for July 2020.

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))

9. Stakeholders Engagement

This section will be reported once the Project Steering Committee will be fully operating.

10. Knowledge Management Activities

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

Nothing to report at this moment – knowledge management and communication strategy under review.
To be reported on in next PIR.

11. Innovative Approaches

Please provide a brief description of an innovative²² approach in the project / programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.

Innovative approaches that will be part of the implementation of the GCP / BDI / 037 / LDF Project are the following:

1. The institutionalization of FFS will allow the harmonization of FFS approaches at national level;

The harmonization and institutionalization of the FFS approach is one of the main innovation of this project which will ensure the political/financial/institutional sustainability of the intervention as the FFS methodology will be mainstreamed into national policies and programmes and harmonized to ensure quality of the FFS learning processes. Through the involvement of the extension services at different administrative levels each of Burundi's province will be equipped with experts on FFS methodology (Master Trainers and Facilitators), with training curricula and all needed material and tools to conduct quality FFS, beyond the duration of the project. In 2015 a national FFS strategy to harmonize and institutionalize the FFS approach was validated by several stakeholders and the Ministry of Agriculture. Extension services, NGOs, producer organizations, private sector participated in this process. This project will play a key role on the operationalization of the FFS strategy.

2. The Project will encourage FFS members to adhere to the "Resilience Fund" approach to promote

²² Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

savings and credit among community members;

A second innovative approach, strictly related to the first one, will be the Resilient Fund. The project will ensure also the establishment and operationalization of a mechanism to fund resilient projects proposed by farmer organizations and/or cooperatives. Through a support system able to select quality project proposals prepared by farmers, which will be accompanied by local decentralized officers, farmers will receive funds to implement adaptation/resilient action plans.

3. The restoration of natural landscapes and the protection of riverbanks will help in increasing resilience and in flood protection in order to save human lives (details to be provided during next PIR report);

4. Producers organized in cooperatives will significantly increase the sustainable production and help fight food insecurity (details to be provided during next PIR report).

12. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval (\$US)	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2020-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
GEF Agency	IFAD/PNSADR-IM	In Kind	6,166,859	0		6,166,859
GEF Agency	WB/PRDAIGL	In Kind	4,068,000	0		4,068,000
Government	MINEAGRIE	In Kind	7,265,141	USD 3,000,000 offices + Secretary + Caretaker from MINEAGRIE as from April 2020)		7,265,141
		TOTAL	17,499,000	3,000,000 USD		17,499,000

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

The Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock has made available the offices and the support staff (Secretary and Caretaker).

²³ 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.

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.