



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1.	BASIC PROJECT DATA
2.	PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)
3.	IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)17
4.	SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS
5.	ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)
6.	RISKS
7.	FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION
8.	MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS
9.	STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT
10.	GENDER MAINSTREAMING
11.	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES
12.	INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT
13.	CO-FINANCING TABLE

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):	Natural Landscapes Rehabilitation and Climate Change Adaptation
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (DGA, DGE,
	DGMAVAE, BPEAE Bujumbura, CMSMF, IGEBU, OBPE & ISABU)
Initial project duration (years):	Four years
Project coordinates:	[Projects in a) and b) categories should indicate YES here and provide the geocoded data in
This section should be completed ONLY by:	Annex 2]
a) Projects with 1st PIR;b) In case the geographic coverage of project	
activities has changed since last reporting	
period.	

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	March 01, 2019
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01-Jan-2019
Project Implementation End Date/NTE ¹ :	30-Dec-2022
Revised project implementation End date (if approved) ²	30-June-2024

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 5,877,397
Total Co-financing amount (USD) ³ :	USD 17,500,000
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June	USD 3,213,759
30, 2023 (USD):	
Total GEF grant actual expenditures	USD 2,669,606
(excluding commitments) as of June	
30, 2023 (USD) ⁴ :	
Total estimated co-financing	USD 3,000,000
materialized as of June 30, 2023 ⁵	

¹ As per FPMIS

² If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit.

³ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO Document/Project Document.

 $^{^{4}}$ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

⁵ Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	The last Steering Committee meeting was held on November 22 to 24, 2022
Expected Mid-term Review date ⁶ :	')
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	December 2022
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date ⁷ :	30 January 2024
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	YES Core_Indicators_GCP_ BDL_037_LDF_Final.xlsx

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards	Moderately Satisfactory (MS).
achieving objectives/ outcomes	Despite some coordination difficulties encountered during the
(cumulative):	period under review, the level of progress towards achieving the
	objectives and results of the project is moderately satisfactory
	because the rate of delivery, both financial and technical, has
	improved during the period under evaluation. Indeed, the team has
	been completed, the contracts with the PMOs have been signed and
	for others the process is being finalized, a number of achievements
	have been recorded during the reporting period. Steps have been
	taken to improve Project coordination and foster collaboration and
	contributions from all stakeholders.
Overall implementation progress	Moderately Satisfactory (MS).
rating:	Despite the difficulties encountered during the implementation of
	certain activities, the level of achievement is at a moderately
	satisfactory level because the rate of delivery, both physical and
	technical, has improved during the under-evaluation period.
	Indeed, the team has been completed, the contracts with the PMOs
	have been signed and for others the process is being finalized.
	Finally, measures aimed at improving the coordination of Project
	activities have been taken by management.
Overall risk rating:	Moderate

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Moderate
----------------------------------	----------

Status

Implementation Status (1 st PIR, 2 nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	4 th PIR
--	---------------------

⁶ The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

⁷ The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Désiré Nibasumba, Coordinator	Desire.Nibasumba@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Pissang Tchangaï Dadémanao, FAO Burundi Representative	Dademanao.PissangTchangai@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Prosper DODIKO, Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock	doprosper 2002@yahoo.fr
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Stefano Mondovi	Stefano.Mondovi@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Sandra Corsi	Sandra.Corsi@fao.org

Project Contacts

2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)

(All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual)

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term TargetMid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
To address the root causes of landscape degradation due to climate change and unsustainable land uses by rehabilitating degraded	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 has recruited an International consultant to carry out the training of staff members and the training is planned to start in August 2023	MS
land and adapting integrated farming and		AMAT Indicator 6: Risk and vulnerability assessments and other relevant technical	0 at commune level in project area	5 vulnerability and restoration opportunity assessments	5 assessments	2 assessments were carried out by two National Consultants, natural resources were	HS

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic co-benefits as well.

¹¹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Moderately Satisfactory** (MS), **Moderately Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU). Refer to Annex 1.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term TargetMid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
natural resources systems to climate change in the provinces of Bujumbura and Bujumbura Mayor		assessments carried out and updated		(mapping of natural resources, description of agrarian systems and their vulnerability, 15 national best practices, 10 local CCA best practices, and agrobiodiversity assessments)		mapped, agrarian systems and their vulnerability were described, 16 national best practices were recommended based on CCA best practices; A 15 days' workshop was carried out by a team of six (06) Experts to map land uses by using the Collect Earth tool and a 5 days' workshop was organized from June 21 to June 25, 2021 to present the results of the 2 studies to different stakeholders at communal level	
		Level of institutionalization of the FFS approach	Strategy only implemented in 2 communes	Operational guidelines prepared	Level of institutionalization of the FFS approach	The strategy and the roadmap for the institutionalization of the FFS approach was validated in April 2023 with the participation of relevant institutions from the Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock	S

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term TargetMid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
						Stratégie harmonisation CEP Va	
		Institutional arrangements to lead, coordinate and support the integration of climate change adaptation (CCA) 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	The Project is planning to support the agriculture and rural development inter sectoral group (GSADR) provincial quarterly meetings with a focus on climate change adaptation	U
		Number of Communal development plans integrating CCA practices	No communal development plans integrate CCA practices	2	4	Fourinvestmentcommunalactionplanshavebeenrevisedtoincorporateclimatechangeadaptationpractices24_05_Rapport_Actual	HS
	Outcome 2.1: Improved resilience of agro-ecosystems and populations through enhanced	AMAT Indicator 4: Extent of adoption of climate-resilient technologies/practices: 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 Mid-term SHARP evaluation was conducted to determine the extent of adoption of climate- resilient technologies / practices implemented by 330 FFS group members;	S

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term TargetMid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
	capacity to implement CCA/CSA					the final report was shared by the international Consultant Ms Sirine Johnston to the Project Coordination Scores de résilience.docx	
		Number of FFS, number of program managers, master trainers, and facilitators trained in project site. Number of farmers trained	None	300 FFS 20 master trainers 75 facilitators (30% women) 0 existing master trainers refreshed 75 existing facilitators refreshed 3000 farmers trained (30% women)	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)	1. Although an international FFS Consultant was recruited to train 20 master trainers,the LTO (co- facilitator of the FFS global platform) recommends replacing this activity by providing an extended, more comprehensive training for 25-30 of our top-performing facilitators. This extended training spanning 3-4 weeks aims to reinforce the expertise of facilitators who had brief training experiences and lacked consistent guidance throughout the FFS implementation. The Project has trained	MS

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term TargetMid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
						implementing 330 FFS out of which 40% are women A total number of 330 FFS target groups are currently operational in the Project area totaling 11,856 beneficiaries among them 7,412 women (63%) and 4,444 men (37%)	
	Outcome 2.2: Climate risks are mitigated through decision support tools and sustainable landscape management	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	7.158 ha of degraded woodlands and 270 km of river banks were rehabilitated whilst 780.5 km of contour lines have been established on the 15 hills of the Project area in the Bujumbura Province	HS
		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	75%	90%	A first consignment of 5 rain gauges and 21 limnimetric scales was acquired while the acquisition of an additional consignment of 185 rain gauges is underway; IGEBU will support in installing rain gauges and limnimetric scales and collect climate information	MS

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term TargetMid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
		Existence of a forest co-	radios. Also, there is a meteorological station in the Nyabiraba commune and another at the Bujumbura Airport None exists	1 application	1 application text	on a regular basis as from September 2021 The activity will be carried	MU
		regulations application text		text		out with the support of the General Directorate of the Environment, Water Resources and Sanitation (DGEREA). The legislation and procedures for community forest co- management are enforced under the Law N ° 1/07 of July 15, 2016 revising the Forest Code.	
		Level of implementation of agrobiodiversity strategy	None	Agrobiodiversity strategy created and partially implemented	Agrobiodiversity strategy fully implemented	A LoA was signed with ISABU in April 2023 to develop the agrobiodiversity strategy.	MS

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term TargetMid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
	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 score: 8.43/20 (women-led households: 8.43)	Medium resilience level (12/20) (for both indicators)	High resilience level (14/20) (for both indicators)	The following link shows the resilience score as shown in the mid-term SHARP evaluation draft report Scores de résilience.docx	MS
		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	Among the seven value chains that had been identified, prioritized and categorized, i.e. maize , cassava, beans, potatoes, bananas, vegetables and the fruit value chain, during the period under review, only 3 value chains, including maize, beans and vegetables, were strengthened by the organization of training courses on:	S

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term TargetMid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
						 ✓ Disease and pest control; ✓ Techniques for improving production; ✓ Quality seed multiplication techniques; ✓ Techniques for group sales and marketing of agricultural products; ✓ Stock management techniques; ✓ Drawing up business plans and providing inputs, in particular quality seeds and technical support for beneficiaries. 	
						In addition, during the period under review, two other new value chains were identified, namely soya and white sorghum,	

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term TargetMid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
						and only the soya value chain is currently being developed.	
						Stratégie dévéloppement des C Cartograhie des chaînes de valeur 037 Priorisation des chaînes de valeur 037	
		Number of cooperatives or pre- cooperatives with strengthened capacities to access markets	None	5 cooperatives or pre- cooperatives	10 cooperatives or pre-cooperatives	In the province of Bujumbura, the capacities of the members of the committees of the 15 cooperatives have been strengthened in various areas mentioned above (pest and disease control, techniques for improving production, techniques for multiplying quality seeds, techniques for group sales and marketing of	HS

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term TargetMid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
						stock management techniques).	
	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 Document on project best practices and lessons learned developed	The Project M&E framework is in place and indicators are updated in FPMIS; The Mid-term evaluation was carried out from May to August 2022 and the Mid-term SHARP evaluation was conducted in April 2023; The FAO Communication Expert prepares newsletters and tweets on lessons learned; A 15 days' workshop was carried out by a team of six (06) Experts to map land uses by using the Collect Earth tool	S

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
	Carry out the training of 75 staff members in regional and national governments and 20 communal staff and ensure that they are equipped with the necessary knowledge and tools to effectively address climate change challenges.	International Consultant ACC	August 2023
Outcome 1.1: Strengthened capacity to implement climate change adaptation priorities of the PNCC and the SNPACC at communal, provincial and national level	Support GSADR quarterly meetings. These meetings serve as a platform for discussing climate change adaptation priorities, sharing information, and making informed decisions to address climate-related challenges. The Project will provide the required logistical assistance to enhance the GSADR smooth functioning on a quarterly basis including the hiring of meeting rooms, DSA, and transport costs for participants from various government institutions involved.	FAO	July 2023
Outcome 2.1: Improved resilience of agro-ecosystems and populations through enhanced capacity to implement CCA/CSA	Train 20 FFS master trainers to conduct training programs for farmers, enabling them to implement climate-resilient agricultural techniques and practices. The LTO (co-facilitator of the FFS global platform) recommends replacing this activity by providing an extended, more comprehensive training for 25-30 of our top- performing facilitators. This extended training spanning 3-4 weeks aims to reinforce the expertise of facilitators who had brief training experiences and lacked consistent guidance throughout the FFS implementation.	FFS International Consultant	August 2023
Outcome 2.2: Climate risks are mitigated through decision support tools and sustainable landscape management	Acquire 185 rain gauges in an effort to improve data collection and enhance the understanding	FAO	August 2023

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
	of local rainfall patterns. This data is valuable		
	for climate risk assessment, flood prediction,		
	and water resource management, thereby		
	aiding in effective decision-making and		
	mitigation strategies.		
	Review the legislation and procedures for		
	community forest co-management. A thorough		
	examination of existing laws and procedures		
	will allow to assess their effectiveness, identify		
	gaps or shortcomings, and propose necessary	DGEREA	July 2023
	revisions or improvements. Strengthening		,
	community forest co-management practices		
	will promote sustainable land use, biodiversity		
	conservation, and resilience against climate		
	change impacts.		
	Develop the agrobiodiversity strategy to		
	introduce measures to protect local seed		
	varieties, diversify crop species, and integrate		
	traditional knowledge into agricultural		
	practices. The focus on agrobiodiversity aims to	ISABU	November 2023
	enhance the resilience of agroecosystems and		
	populations by ensuring a diverse range of		
	crops and genetic resources that can better		
	withstand climate-related challenges.		

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Workplan)

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1: Strengthened capacity Strategy and Action Plan (SNPACC) at		-	nal Climate Change Policy (PNCC)	and the Climate Change National
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	5 vulnerability and restoration opportunity assessments (mapping of natural resources, description of agrarian systems and their vulnerability, 15 national best practices, 10 local CCA best practices, and agrobiodiversity assessments)	Agrobiodiversity assessments carried out	Agrobiodiversity assessments are being carried out by ISABU	
Output 1.1.2: An action plan for agrobiodiversity enhancement and restoration is prepared	An action plan is prepared	An action plan is prepared for agrobiodiversity enhancement and restoration	The action plan is set to be prepared by ISABU	
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	At least 150 staff members in regional and national governments and 20 communal staff have received training	75 staff members are trained	Recruitment of international and national Consultants to carry out the training	The training will be carried out in August 2023 by the international consultant Alejandro MORENO recruited on June 19, 2023

sentence with main achievements)

¹² Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹³ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Output 1.1.4: The FFS harmonization strategy is implemented at the national level and operationalized by a coordination unit within the MINEAGRIE	The FFS harmonized strategy is operational	A FFS coordination unit within the MINEAGRIE is operational	The strategy and the roadmap for the institutionalization of the FFS approach was validated in April 2023	The strategy was submitted to the Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock for endorsement
Output 1.1.5: A cross-sectoral coordination mechanism for CCA action is supporting coordinated CCA at the national and communal levels	The agriculture and rural development inter-sectoral group (GSADR) is operational at provincial level	2 meetings are supported by the Project at provincial level	The meetings were not organized	The Bujumbura provincial GSADR which actually is not operational needs to be strengthened; the Project has planned to organize GSADR meetings as from June 2023
Outcome 2.1: Improved resilience of a	agro-ecosystems and populations th	rough enhanced capacity to in	mplement CCA/CSA	
Output 2.1.1: Gender-responsive training materials integrating CCA and INRM practices are specifically developed to accommodate FFS needs	14 training modules	Training modules are developed	Training modules are available and were updated by a national Consultant specialist in climate change adaptation	
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	40 Master Trainers and 150 FFS Facilitators are trained and/or refreshed	20 Master Trainers and 75 FFS Facilitators trained	75 FFS Facilitators were refreshed	The training of 20 Master Trainers should be carried out in August 2023 by the international consultant, Ms Marie Assumpta ADUSABIRE, recruited on June 19, 2023 The LTO (co-facilitator of the FFS global platform) recommends replacing this activity by providing an extended, more comprehensive training for 25-30 of our top-performing facilitators. This extended training spanning 3-4 weeks aims to reinforce the

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
				expertise of facilitators who had brief training experiences and lacked consistent guidance throughout the FFS implementation.
Output 2.1.3: A total of 300 FFS are established covering 15 hills in 4 communes	300 FFS	180 FFS	330 FFS groups established (300 FFS in the Bujumbura Province and 30 FFS groups in Bujumbura Mayor)	
Outcome 2.2: Climate risks are mitigate	ted through decision support tools a	and sustainable landscape ma	nagement	
Output 2.2.1: Participatory decision support tools for climate change analysis developed to reduce risks	Rainfall data are collected and rain calendars are developed	A LoA is signed with the Burundi Geographical Institute (IGEBU)	The LoA with IGEBU was signed	The procurement procedures are still ongoing to purchase 5 rainfall gauges and 21 limnimetric scales in accordance with the recommendations from IGEBU Experts
Output 2.2.2: 5000 ha of degraded woodland and 300 km of river banks are identified and rehabilitated	5,000 ha of degraded land and 300 km of riverbanks	3,000 ha of degraded land and 200 km	4,769 ha of degraded land and 168 km of riverbanks were rehabilitated with 2,295,741 forest trees, 4,534,293 agro- forest trees and 558,988 bamboo cuttings whilst 780.5 km of contour lines have been established on the 15 hills of the Project area in the Bujumbura Province	A total 7.158 ha of degraded lands and 270 km of river banks were rehabilitated

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Output 2.2.3: Appropriate legislation and procedures are in place for community forest co-management	The Forest Code is enforced	A forest co-management regulations application text	Nothing to report	The application text will be prepared with the support of the General Directorate of the Environment, Water Resources and Sanitation (DGEREA)
Output 2.2.4: Community management groups and incentive mechanisms are established for forest co-management and stabilization and management of riverbanks	Community sub-catchment management groups are established	15 sub-catchment management groups are established on the 15 hills in the Bujumbura Province	15 sub-management committees are in place and are involved in forest co- management and riverbanks stabilization	The new LoA with BPEAE Bujumbura is not yet signed by the Minister of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock
Output 2.2.5: Agrobiodiversity action plan prepared in 1.2 implemented and monitored	Agrobiodiversity action plan	A LoA is signed with the Burundi Institute for Agricultural Sciences (ISABU) to develop the agrobiodiversity action plan	The LoA was signed in April 2023 by the Minister of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock	The agrobiodiversity action plan is set to be prepared by ISABU
Outcome 3.1: Communities deploy a c	liversified set of resilient livelihood	strategies in the project areas	;	
Output 3.1.1: Value chain diversification and strengthening strategies are developed	A strategy is developed	A value chain strategy is developed	The strategy was developed by the Project Value Chain Expert	The strategy is being operationalized
Output 3.1.2: Twenty-four interventions in four communes implemented to support value chain diversification and strengthening	24 interventions are identified	24 interventions (6 per commune) were identified: 4 storage sheds, mushroom production, beekeeping, livestock rearing (pigs), improved wood saving cooking stoves and small processing facilities (grinding mills)	600 pigs were distributed in the Mutambu and Nyabiraba communes and procedures are underway for the construction of 4 storage sheds and acquisition of the material for beekeeping and mushroom production	The request of clearance was submitted for the development of small scale hillside irrigation scheme in the Kabezi commune

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Output 3.1.3: New and existing value chains structured and organized around FFS groups	10 Pre-cooperatives are structured and organized around FFS groups	15 pre-cooperatives (1 cooperative per hill) are structured and organized in the Bujumbura Province	The training of 15 pre- cooperatives was carried out by the Project Value Chain Expert from August 8, 2022 to September 2, 2022 037 LDF TDR_Dvpt CV+structuration des	
Outcome 4.1: Project implementation	based on results-based manageme	nt and application of project l	lessons learned in future operation	s facilitated
Output 4.1.1: Operational system for collection of field-based data to monitor project outcome indicators	The Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Plan is prepared	Progress reports are produced including Project Progress Reports (PPR) and Project Implementation Reports (PIR)	The Project reports are produced on a regular basis	The new Project M&E Expert was recruited in May 2023
Output 4.1.2: Midterm and final evaluation conducted	The MTR is conducted	The MTR is conducted	The Mid-term evaluation was carried out from May to August 2022 and the Mid-term SHARP evaluation was conducted in April 2023	
Output 4.1.3: Project-related "best- practices" and "lessons-learned" disseminated via publications and other means	Publication of monthly newsletters	Newsletters and tweets are published	Newsletters and tweets are published specifically during the training of FFS Facilitators, the Steering Committee meetings and other fieldworks; best- practices and lessons-learned are documented	Provided that a communication Expert is aligned to the Project, newsletters and tweets are published on a regular basis

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)

- The Project has established 330 Farmer Field Schools (FFS) with the help of two NGOs, "Empowering Response Burundi" and "Réseau Burundi 2000 Plus." These NGOs have been instrumental in supporting FFS facilitators and 47 cooperatives in implementing various project activities in the Provinces of Bujumbura and Bujumbura Mayor. They have also promoted Villages Savings and Lending Associations (VSLA) to empower the community. A remarkable total of 11,856 FFS group members participate in diverse activities, including crop production and the rehabilitation of natural landscapes such as forests, agroforests, fruit tree nurseries, tree planting, and riverbank protection. Through their efforts, 4,769 hectares of degraded land and 168 kilometers of riverbanks have been restored, with the planting of 2,295,741 forest trees, 4,534,293 agroforestry trees, and 558,988 bamboo cuttings. Additionally, 780.5 kilometers of contour lines have been established across 15 hills in the Bujumbura Province.
- However, based on the feedback of some international missions realized in 2023, the FFS quality is still weak, mostly due to the very short training sessions of the Training of Facilitators and the lack of the coaching of facilitators. In addition, the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system is not yet established. However, an assessment realized by an international team in April 2023 provided recommendations to set up the M&E system and improve the FFS quality
- Letters of Agreements (LoA) were signed with various institutions relevant to the Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock including the Burundi Office for the Protection of the Environment (OBPE) and the Burundi Agricultural Sciences Institute (ISABU);
- Despite encountering challenges, such as a delayed project start of more than 22 months and delays in the recruitment of International Consultants for training purposes, the Project implementation has persevered.
- The procurement of various goods and services has experienced delays. Efforts are being made to address these issues and streamline the procurement procedures for smoother operations.
- In order to ensure the achievement of Project results, a No Cost Extension was granted for a period of 18 months as from January 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024. For this purpose, an Annual Work and Budget Plan was prepared and is being implemented.



Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

_	FY2023 Development Objective rating ¹⁵	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁶	Comments/reasons ¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	The Project being granted an NCE phase, the delivery has improved and is estimated at 60% on June 30, 2023. For this purpose, a budget revision was submitted for approval to enable the Project to achieve expected results by June 30, 2024. The Project implementation is on good track with the recruitment of two international Consultants specialists in climate change adaptation and in farmer field schools to carry out trainings. Moreover, the signing of letters of Agreements with the Burundi Institute for Agricultural Sciences (ISABU), the Burundi Office for the Protection of Environment (OBPE), the Vegetable and Fruit Seed Multiplication Center (CMSMF), the Burundi Geographical Institute (IGEBU) and two local NGOs "Empowering Response Burundi" and "Réseau Burundi 2000 Plus" will enhance the achievement of Project expected results during this NCE phase
Budget Holder	MS	MS	In the period under review, and six months after the start of the extension period at zero additional cost, the project's technical and financial delivery has improved due to the involvement of the entire project task force team, the BH, LTO, the programme and administration team and the steering committee. In fact, the project team has been completed by the recruitment of two international consultants, one specialist in climate change (CC) and the other in farmer field schools (CEP), Letters of agreement have been signed with a number of key implementing partners, such as ISABU and OBPE, and others are in the process of being signed, such as IGEBU and BPEAE Bujumbura.

¹⁵ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

			In addition, the infrastructure planned by the Project is progressing well and will soon be completed to support the cooperatives supported by the Project. The deployment of the activities listed above will help to strengthen the farmers' field schools and value chains, as well as achieving other results, the implementation of which depends on these activities. We can affirm that the development objective and the progress of the implementation of the project are at a level between moderately satisfactory and satisfactory if we refer to the period under review.
GEF Operational Focal Point18	MS	MS	The level of implementation of the Project is moderately satisfactory because the rate of both physical and technical delivery improved during the under-evaluation period. Indeed, the team has been completed, the contracts with the implementing partners have been signed and for others the process is being finalized. Measures aimed at improving the coordination of the Project have been taken by the management.
Lead Technical Officer19	MS	MS	Both the development objective and the implementation progress have been improved. The signature of some LoAs and the recruitment of consultants provided an important support to the project. Nevertheless, there is still ample room for improvement. In particular, the overall project implementation strategy needs to better integrate project components. The project team, and in particular the coordinator, is therefore invited to make a further effort to strengthen the intervention strategy in order to link all the project activities in a coherent way. The quality of FFS is still very weak, due to poor training and accompaniment of facilitators and an almost non-existent supervision and monitoring system. The analysis of the agro ecosystem, the adoption of the principles of agroecology, the IPM approach and the adoption of specific measure to face with climate change are still very weak. Also the planning of FFS activities is not well organized. An international FFS Consultant was engaged to train 20 master trainers. Building on this, the LTO (co-facilitator of the FFS global platform) recommends replacing this activity by providing an extended, more comprehensive training for 25-30 of our top-performing facilitators. This extended training spanning 3-4 weeks aims to reinforce the expertise of facilitators who had brief training experiences and lacked consistent guidance throughout the FFS implementation.

 ¹⁸ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.
 ¹⁹ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

			The LTO also suggest strengthening the political component, including the institutionalization of the FFS approach which has had some progress but need to create conditions for implementing the FFS strategy a national level. Finally, the strengthening of value chains, focused on the transformation of FFS groups into cooperatives, should show clear and concrete results on the ground. Although a collaboration with other ongoing projects has been established, the project team is invited to further strengthen this collaboration in order to achieve the project outcomes.
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	S	S	Despite some delays, the project demonstrates promising progress. The team is fully aware of the situation and is actively working to expedite the implementation of the delayed activities. They are committed to making up for lost time and ensuring that the project stays on track as per workplan.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made to comply with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with <u>moderate</u> or <u>high</u> Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to <u>low</u> risk projects. Please indicate if new risks have emerged during this FY.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
The lack of appropriate forest, agro-forest and fruit seeds for the establishment of tree nurseries within local communities under the FFS activities	Revert to seeds locally adapted and obtain clearance from LTO or HQ Technical Officer for technical specifications regarding the trees to be used for reforestation	Technical specifications form cleared by LTO or HQ unit	None	LTO/PCU
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Ha	bitats			
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and A	griculture			
To provide seeds to local communities under the FFS activities. Seeds may not be adapted to the local agro-ecological region	Revert to seeds locally adapted and obtain clearance from LTO or HQ Technical Officer for technical specifications of seed to be purchased	Technical specifications form cleared by LTO or HQ unit	None	LTO/PCU
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic	Resources for Food and Agriculture			
Animal losses during the distribution to local communities	Improve the transport conditions and provide stock feeds	Transport conditions were improved and stock feeds were provided	None	PCU
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
Only under specific condition where no alternatives are available, the project will	Use low risk pesticide and obtain clearance from LTO or HQ Technical	FFS member groups are using bio pesticides	None	LTO/PCU

supply low-risk pesticides to local communities under the FFS activities.	Officer for technical specifications regarding the pesticide procurement	Technical specifications form cleared by LTO or HQ unit		
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacer	nent			
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage	;e			
A small number of Batwa ethnic group people is living in the intervention zone	Carry out FPIC throughout the implementation of the project, i.e. reach consent (step 1-4) prior to start of activities and ensure monitoring/ document lessons learned (step 5-6) during implementation	FPIC has been carried out yet in December 2022	None	LTO/PCU
New ESS risks that have emerged during this F	Y			

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate:

Initial ESS Risk classification	Current ESS risk classification
(At project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Μ	Yes, the Environmental and Social Risk classification still valid.

Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.	

N/A

²⁰ Important: please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (<u>Esm-unit@fao.org</u>) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf)

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified during the project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Political instability and civil disturbances (force majeure)	Low	Y	Monitoring of political situation and planning ahead for contingency	The political situation is well monitored	No political instability was reported so far
2	Weakening of political support for the project at any level (from colline to national)	Low	Y	Proactive and continuous efforts must be made to maintain this support or strengthen it if it begins to weaken	There is no weakening of political support	The administration is supporting the Project interventions through the mobilization of communities
3	Lack of receptiveness and interest from communities to the project	Low	Y	This should also be addressed proactively, as communities should be engaged in a way that builds their interest for the project	There is no lack of receptiveness and interest from communities	The communities are very involved the implementation of Project's activities

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

FY2022	FY2023	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous rep			
rating	rating	period			
Moderate	Moderate	ate No changes recorded since the previous reporting period			

should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

²¹ Risk ratings means a rating of the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects

7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented during this Fiscal Year
A. Relevance and strategic importance	
Recommendation A1: Adopt the more detailed formulation of the results proposed in the logical framework by referring to the proposal made in the annexes	Include the Result 1.2 in the Logical Framework
Recommendation A2: Reinforce the activation and valorization of tools for demonstrating evidence on the achievements of the project (Purchase plan, Dashboards. Review of the implementation process, etc.	Update the Annual Work Plan and Budget, the Procurement Plan and the M&E core indicators' tool
Recommendation A3: Strengthen the involvement of women in project activities in the commune of Ntahangwa	Women represent more than 80% in the Ntahangwa commune
Recommendation A4: Provide training for producers in the safe use of pesticides as an alternative measure and at the same time a project activity	Priority is accorded to the integrated mechanical and biological pest control through the use of natural bio pesticides to protect the environment from pollution
B. Effectiveness	
Recommendation B1: Ensure the mobilization of skills and the necessary complementary technical and managerial capacities (M&E and full-time administrative assistant) to improve the effectiveness of project implementation	The Project M&E Officer was recruited in May 2023 and FAOBI Administrative Assistants are usually supporting the Project implementation (procurement, financial management, logistics, etc.)
Recommendation B2: Expedite the recruitment of additional staff (Consultants and Support Experts) for the technical and financial execution of ongoing activities and those not yet started with regard to the time spent	The recruitment of international consultants specialists in farmers field schools (FFS), in climate change adaptation (CCA) and integrated natural resources management (INRM) was concluded whilst the Anthropologist is being recruited
C. Efficiency	

Recommendation C1: Improve the performance of the formulation, scheduling and supply approval chain to execute planned tasks on time	Speed up the procurement process of goods, services and works (Purchase Requisition, Purchase Orders, Tender submission, bid analysis, Contract awards and respect delivery deadlines)
D. Factors affecting performance	
Recommendation D1: Empower the steering committee for the mobilization of co-financing planned and due mainly by the government of Burundi through MINEAGRIE projects	The PNSADR-IM Project has reached his planned NTE while the PRDAIGL NTE was expected by the end of 2022
Recommendation D2: Accelerate the contracting and execution of planned project services and strengthen the monitoring of pending contract files and agreements with implementing partners (OBPE, ISABU, etc. and grassroots organization (UNIPROBA)	Signature of Letters of Agreement with ISABU, OBPE, BPEAE Bujumbura, ERB and RBU 2000 + prepared in conformity with the new template (MS 507/LoA); A grassroots organization (ADRSEPAL) is currently carrying out the FPIC study
Recommendation D3: Complete the process of recruiting a technical assistant to support project coordination	The Senior Project Technical Assistant (SPTA) was not recruited
Recommendation D4: Ensure that the skills mobilized are in line with the needs of implementation by taking the decisions of encouragement and dismissal resulting from the tools for monitoring the performance of project staff	Prioritize the capacity building of Project staff to enhance their performance
Recommendation D5: Facilitate and lead a sustained managerial synergy between the teams of experts from the GCP/BDI/037/LDF project and those of the experts from the GCP/BDI/040/GFF project which have taken up similar challenges	The recommendation was implemented through 2 experience exchange visits organized in the GCP/BDI/040/GFF project intervention area; Experts of both projects are reinforcing mutual collaboration
E. Measures to extend the project objectives and/or	scaling up their results
Recommendation E1: Extend the project NTE for a period of 18 months	Provided the delay encountered in starting the project for a period of 22 months, the Non Cost Extension of 18 months was granted. However, the Project Steering Committee has recommended to extend the project NTE for a period of 24 months so as to achieve the Project objectives and expected results

Has the project developed an Exit	No
Strategy? If yes, please summarize	Νο

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management	A budget revision was carried out in order to cover the NCE phase Révision_Budgétaire_ GCP_BDI_037_LDF_NCE	The budget revision was submitted in December 2022 and is still to be approved	FAO GEF
Implementation schedule			
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other minor project amendment (define)			

²² Source: https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval <u>during this reporting period</u>.

Stakeholder name	Type of partnership	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government institutions			
The Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (MINEAGRIE)	The MINEAGRIE is the main implementing partner	 The Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (MINEAGRIE) has signed a co- financing engagement amounting to USD 7,265,141 to support the implementation of the Project activities; The Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (MINEAGRIE) provided the Project Management Team with Offices based in Rohero, INSS Suburb, 13, Makamba Avenue; The Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (MINEAGRIE) provided the Project Coordination Unit with counterpart staff including a Secretary and a Caretaker; The Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (MINEAGRIE) has put in place a Project Steering Committee to monitor the implementation of the Project activities; The Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (MINEAGRIE) has put in place a Project Steering Committee to monitor the implementation of the Project activities; The Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (MINEAGRIE) signed Letters of Agreements with FAO and implemented by the Provincial Directorate for Environment, Agriculture and Livestock in the Bujumbura Province; The Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock in the Bujumbura Province; 	 The Project Steering Committee was put in place in August 2020 whilst the Project start was planned for January 1, 2019; Sometimes, the MINEAGRIE takes too much time to sign Letters of Agreements

-			
		MINEAGRIE) is in the process has signed two Letters of Agreement with the Burundian Office for the Protection of the Environment (OBPE) and the Burundi Agricultural Sciences Institute (ISABU)	
NGOs ²³			
Empowering Response Burundi (ERB)	To support the implementation of FFS groups in the Bujumbura Province	300 FFS groups and 47 Producers' Organizations / Cooperatives identified	Delay in the recruitment of the NGO (April 2021)
Réseau Burundi 2000 Plus (RBU 2000 +)	To support the implementation of FFS groups the Bujumbura Mayor	30 FFS groups and 32 Producers' Organizations supported	Delay in the recruitment of the NGO (April 2021)
Others ²⁴			
Communities- based groups (CBOs)	CBOs have greatly contributed in the identification and categorization of priority value chains during awareness meetings	47 pre-cooperatives were identified in the Bujumbura Province	The pre-cooperatives are being strengthened
New stakeholders identified			
N/A			

²³ Non-government organizations

²⁴ They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women's groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then

10.Gender Mainstreaming

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period.
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio- economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	Gender analysis was conducted during the Mid- term SHARP evaluation
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	The women represent more than 60% in FFS member groups and Producers' Organizations / Cooperatives
Indicate in which results area(s) the proje- project design stage):	ct is expected to	o contribute to gender equality (as identified at
 a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources 	Yes	The women represent more than 60% in FFS member groups and Producers' Organizations / Cooperatives
 b) improving women's participation and decision making 	Yes	Women are fully participating in decision-making
 c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women 	Yes	Women, youth and indigenous people are generating socio-economic benefits through the Village Savings and Lending Associations particularly in the Bujumbura Province
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	The M&E system was 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; indicators of products, results and impacts of the Project are disaggregated taking into account gender sensitive tracking tools such as attendance lists in FFS activities, agroecosystem analysis sessions and data collecting forms
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	The Project staff doesn't have gender expertise however, the FAO Representation in Burundi has a gender Focal Point supporting the project
Any other good practices on gender		The Project is contributing to gender equality taking into account sex, age, and indigenous people without taking into account ethnic, religious and political considerations

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, <u>during this reporting period.</u>

Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	 There is a knowledge management strategy within the Project through the production of newsletters and tweets on good practices and lessons learned by the FAO Communication Officer. Relevant good practices than can be learned and shared from the Project are the followings: Utilization of highly productive certified maize, bean and vegetable seeds; Climate change adaptation and resilience through crop diversification and rotation; Improving soil fertility by planting leguminous crops such as beans that increase nitrogen in the soil; Water and soil conservation practices through tree and bamboo planting for degraded landscapes rehabilitation and riverbanks protection.
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year .	FAO Burundi has elaborated a communication strategy applicable to all FAO implemented projects. The communication strategy is operationalized by an Expert who produces newsletters and tweets on best practices for every project.
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.	Through Village Savings and Lending Associations (VSLA), FFS group members managed to raise funds in the Bujumbura Province from cash for work activities. The link below says more on beneficiary quote and photos. ARTICLE 037 LDFdocx.docx
Please provide links to related website, social media account	The Project does not have his own website
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	The links are provided in the file hereby attached Les articles et les tweets publiés sur le p
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details	The current FAO Burundi communication and knowledge management Focal Point is called Joseph NSABIYABANDI, Mobile: +257 79 983 657; email: Joseph.Nsabiyabandi@fao.org.

12.Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.

If applicable, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities.

The link below shows the FPIC report.



Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

Indigenous peoples and other local communities are fully involved in the implementation of project activities. They are very few Batwa in the Nyabiraba Commune of the Bujumbura Province who are associated in all FFS activities including value chains development, landscapes rehabilitation and riverbanks protection. The Project activities are not likely to affect the livelihoods of the Batwa people.

Sources of Co- financing ²⁵	Name of Co- financer	Type of Co- financing ²⁶	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	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	0	6,166,859
GEF Agency	WB/PRDAIGL	In Kind	4,068,000	0	0	4,068,000
Government	MINEAGRIE	In Kind	7,265,141	USD 3,000,000 (offices + Secretary + Driver + Caretaker from MINEAGRIE as from April 2020)	3,000,000	7,265,141
		TOTAL	17,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	17,500,000

13. Co-Financing Table

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

N/A

²⁵Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁶Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating	g. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.
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 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. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the project's approved implementation plan.

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	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components
(MU)	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.

<u>**Risk rating**</u> will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:

High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks

Annex 2.

GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as <u>OpenStreetMap</u> or <u>GeoNames</u> use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <u>https://coordinates-converter.com</u> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking <u>here</u>

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description
Kabezi	-3.54474	29.35129		Bujumbura Province
Kanyosha	-3.45512	29.35594		Bujumbura Province
Mutambu	-3.5285	29.43279		Bujumbura Province
Nyabiraba	-3.45759	29.47524		Bujumbura Province
Muha	-3.40019	29.36464		Bujumbura Mayor
Mukaza	-3.38086	29.36558		Bujumbura Mayor
Ntahangwa	-3.34638	29.38352		Bujumbura Mayor

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.

The link is the map showing the Project intervention area in the provinces of Bujumbura and Bujumbura Mayor.

