



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

### 2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

## Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA .....	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE) .....	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	12
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS .....	17
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) .....	19
6. RISKS .....	21
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION .....	22
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS .....	24
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	24
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING .....	27
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES .....	28
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT .....	30
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE .....	31

## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Africa
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Burundi
<b>Project Title:</b>	Support for sustainable food production and enhancement of food security and climate resilience in Burundi's highlands
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/BDI/040/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	9178
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Multi Focal Area: IAP Food Security, Climate change, Biodiversity, Land Degradation
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burundian office of Environment Protection (OBPE)</li> <li>• Rural Engineering Department (GR)</li> <li>• Burundi Geographic Institute (IGEBU)</li> <li>• Institute of Agronomic Sciences of Burundi (ISABU),</li> <li>• Bioversity International,</li> <li>• Direction Générale de la Planification Environnementale, de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage,</li> <li>• Centre de Multiplication des Semences Maraîchères et Fruitières</li> <li>• 3 Provincial Office of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock,</li> <li>• 2 local NGOs : ADISCO, APROCUVI</li> <li>• ADRSEPAL for FPIC.</li> </ul>
<b>Project Duration (years):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 years</li> </ul>
<b>Project coordinates:</b>	<i>Submitted separately to the FAO-GEF coordination Unit</i>

### Project Dates

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	04 April 2017
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	04 September 2017
<b>Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	05 September 2023
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if approved) <sup>2</sup></b>	NA

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	7,396,330
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>3</sup>:</b>	<b>45,050,728</b>
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)<sup>4</sup>:</b>	<b>4,506,679</b>

<sup>1</sup> As per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.

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

<sup>4</sup> For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>30 340 000</b>
--	-------------------

**M&E Milestones**

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:</b>	22/06/2022
<b>Expected Mid-term Review date<sup>6</sup>:</b>	-
<b>Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):</b>	2020
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date<sup>7</sup>:</b>	<i>June 2023</i>
<b>Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)</b>	

**Overall ratings**

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	<b>S</b>
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	<b>S</b>
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	<b>L</b>

**ESS risk classification**

<b>Current ESS Risk classification:</b>	<b><i>Moderate</i></b>
---	------------------------

**Status**

<b>Implementation Status (1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</b>	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR
--	---------------------

**Project Contacts**

<b>Contact</b>	<b>Name, Title, Division/Institution</b>	<b>E-mail</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Salvator NDABIRORERE	Salvator.Ndabirorere@fao.org
<b>Budget Holder</b>	David PHIRI	David.Phiri@fao.org
<b>Lead Technical Officer (LTO)</b>	Anne Sophie POISOT	<a href="mailto:AnneSophie.Poisot@fao.org">AnneSophie.Poisot@fao.org</a>
<b>Alternate LTO</b>	Stefano Mondovi	Stefano.Mondovi@fao.org
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	Paola PALESTINI	Paola.Palestini@fao.org

<sup>5</sup> Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

<sup>6</sup> The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.

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

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

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term Target <sup>9</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>10</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
To increase adoption of resilient, improved production systems for sustainable food security and nutrition through integrated landscape management and sustainable food value	<b>Outcome 1</b> Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms operational in supporting policy, institutional and knowledge sharing mechanisms for scaling out of sustainable agriculture systems and integrated	IAP TT LD-4 (ii): Type of mechanisms, institutions, legal and regulatory frameworks  <u>Mechanisms:</u> (i) Provincial policy platforms (incl. AgBD)	<u>Mechanisms</u>  i) National and Provincial GSADR existing	<u>Mechanisms</u>  i) N-GSADR and P-GSADRs actively supporting INRM scaling out in Mwaro, Gitega and Muramvya (concrete actions)	<u>Mechanisms</u>  i) P-GSADR has demonstrated success in scaling out INRM in 3 provinces (intersector policy and actions etc)	3 workshops to harmonize and scale up INRM approaches organized (1 in each targeted Province) with a participation of 151 stakeholders  An LOA with the General Direction of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock Planning (DGPEAE) has been	S

<sup>8</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic Co-benefits as well.

<sup>11</sup> 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)**.

natural resources management approaches					signed to achieve the whole objective such National GSADR.	
	(ii) Knowledge sharing and planning mechanism on ILM	ii) No KS or coherency across sectors on SLM/INRM scaling out approaches	ii) KS mechanisms set up and being piloted: 1 national, 3 provincial, 4 local	ii) KS mechanisms (1 national linked to WOCAT global, 3 provincial GSADR, 4 local) effectively sharing best practices on INRM and value chains.	SLM National Group (with 24 multidisciplinary technical governmental staff) in place and their capacities reinforced. The LOA with DGPEAE will contribute and facilitate the finalization and promote popularization and dissemination of 3 main strategic policies related in INRM	S
	<u>Legal &amp; regulatory frameworks:</u> iii) No ILM framework in place/piloted	<u>Legal &amp; regulatory frameworks:</u> iii) Consultations held, including community, gender and Batwa representation, for developing harmonised guidance for implementing INRM FFS and interlinked value chains	<u>Legal &amp; regulatory frameworks:</u> iii) Harmonised guidance in place for implementing INRM, erosion control, BD, and interlinked value chains	i) 9 reports on Community Action Plan for 9 targeted watersheds developed and under implementation ii) Study report on NFPIC developed and now available.	i) 9 Community Action Plans for 9 targeted watersheds under implementation i) Study report on NFPIC developed and under implementation.	S

	(iv) National FFS strategy (extent of operationalization)	iv) National FFS strategy is available but has not yet been operationalized	iv) FFS strategy partly operationalised	iv) FFS strategy fully operationalised	Road map of FFS institutionalisation is under review according to the new governmental approach related to environmental agricultural and livestock policy (l'Approche "Centre de Rayonnement")	S
	(v) Country Strategic Framework (CSIF) (applied)	v) CSIF in place but does not include INRM/landscape approaches and not effectively applied	v) Consultations held, including community, gender and Batwa representation, for planning CSIF implementation at provincial (3), communal (3) and watershed (3) levels	v) CSIF applied/ integrated in plans and budgets at provincial (3), communal (3) and watershed (3) levels	i. A national strategy of watershed management and erosion control adopted by the government is under the implantation through the 9 community actions plans (erosion control, agroforestry and forestry, riverbank protection)	S
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Increased land area and agro-ecosystems under integrated natural resources/ landscape management and supported by FFS and	i) IAP TT LD-3 (ii): Application of INRM practices in the wider landscape	i) 0 catchments	i) 9 catchments with diagnostics completed and community plans developed for INRM including enhanced ABD (at genetic, species and habitat levels)	i) 9 catchments implementing INRM with enhanced BD (at genetic, species and habitat levels)	i.1. Biophysical and socio-economic characterisation completed in 9 catchments ii.2. Land Use Systems characterisation with Collect Earth tool for 3 provinces	S

<p>sustainable value chains for increased production and sustainable livelihoods</p>					<p>iii.3. 9 Watersheds topographic maps developed (by Rural Engineering Department of MINEAGRIE) in addition to communities vision maps</p>	
	<p>ii) extent of adoption of SLM/integrated landscape management practices</p>	<p>ii) HH-BAT baseline: shows that many farmers use advised practices but not in a systematic manner so as to improve productivity and ES (manuring 93% crop rotation 83%, agroforestry 79%, agro-sylvo-pastoral integration 75%, intercropping 68%, contour lines 56%.)</p>	<p>(ii) Diverse improved SLM practices adopted in a combined approach and being monitored and documented by FFS and communities in the 9 catchments</p>	<p>ii) Integrated agrosilvopastoral systems with well designed SLM practices effectively combined across 9 catchments and multiple benefits on livelihoods and ES documented and demonstrated</p> <p>ii) 30,000 ha of combined SLM practices in place by the project end plus 50,000 ha scaled up through baseline projects and watershed plans</p>	<p>1. 106 FFS located in 58 Collines (46 652 ha) of 9 catchments adopted agro-sylvo-pastoral best practices such as erosion control on 947,95 Km, 15.241.856 trees plantation, 506 improved stoves, 7551 improved composts for Soil Fertility Management .</p> <p>2. Land area covered by forestry and agrorestery: <a href="#">25980</a> ha</p> <p>3. Production of 157 063 bamboo trees to protect 47 Km of riverbanks of Kayokwe et Kaniga river banks. Promotion of small-scale irrigation to increase climate resilient and food</p>	<p>S</p>

2022 Project Implementation Report

					production even during the dry season on 1614 ha with 2696 HH beneficiaries. 4 15.241.856 forestry and agroforestry plants produced, so that the project reached a covered area of 25 980 ha improved compost 7 551.	
	iii) % of farmers producing for market (disaggregated by gender)	iii) HH-BAT baseline: 53% produce for markets of which 37% female led HHs	iii) 2,500 (>30% female headed households, 20% orphan headed households)	iii) 8,930 (> 30% female headed households, 20% orphan headed households)	3504 farmers with 2453 women and 1051 men produce for the market (70 %)	S
	iv) % farmers with improved production (disaggregated by gender)	iv) no systematic information on total yields and diversification (baseline collected through FFS)	iv) FFS monitored and demonstrating production and diversity increases compared to normal practice (+25% by 100 FFS)	iv) FFS monitored and demonstrating production and diversity increases compared to normal practice (+25% by 200 FFS)	61% of members of FFS monitored	S
	v) metric tons of CO2 eq avoided			over a duration of 5 years: - On-farm (increase in biomass/agri. crops): 28,213t CO2 eq avoided - On-farm (increase of tree cover): 97,920t CO2 eq avoided	- On-farm (increase of tree cover during the reporting period): -3 298 016 t CO2 eq avoided (using the	HS



					The indirect benefits (over a capitalization phase of 15 years): - On-farm (increase in biomass/agri. crops): 564,266t CO2 eq avoided - On-farm (increase of tree cover): 1,958,407t CO2 eq avoided	Ex-Act Carbon Balance tool)	
<b>Outcome 3:</b> M&A framework in place and capacity of relevant institutions built capacitated in carrying-out monitoring activities and communicating experiences and impacts for informed decision making	Targeted institutions: IGEBU, OBPE, MINAGRIE, MEEATU, universities  (i) Staff in concerned institutions trained and applying tools and systems for monitoring GEBs, SLM/INRM and interlinked value chains and their impacts on food and livelihood security and ecosystem services	i) 0 staff trained and applying tools for monitoring impacts	i) 80 staff trained and applying tools for monitoring multiple impacts	i) 200 staff trained and applying tools for monitoring multiple impacts	i) 254 Governmental staff of which 62 FFS Facilitators trained – ( 210 men and 44 women) on different SLM monitoring and evaluation tools (LADA-WOCAT, EX-ACT, Collect Earth and DATAR)		?
	(ii) Farmers applying Participatory impact Monitoring tools	0 Farmers applying Participatory impact Monitoring tools	250 farmers applying Participatory impact Monitoring tools and Sharing results through FFS exchanges	636 farmers applying Participatory Impact monitoring Tools	24 420 farmers applying Participatory Impact monitoring tools		HS
	(iii) Communication Strategy in place (visibility and Communication for Development) Availability of project	no information and communication materials	Communication strategy in place and project experiences shared through diverse, targeted communication and	Communication Strategy effectively implemented and project experiences	1 communication Strategy Developed and under implementation		S

	results and communication materials in country and shared with regional Hub		technical materials (at least 6 per year) SLM/INRM impacts compiled and shared on a 6 monthly basis for discussion and decision making/ planning at all levels including through project steering committee and GSADR	shared through diverse, targeted communication and technical materials (at least 10 per year) SLM/INRM impacts compiled and shared on a 6 monthly basis and workshops to discuss findings and policy implication at a provincial (3) and national (1) levels (e.g.GSADR and BPEAEs) and regional hub level		
	Number of project reports submitted in time	0	8	15	13 reports in which 9 PPR and 4 PIR Developed and approved	HS

**Action Plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings**

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

### 3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1: Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms operational in supporting policy, institutional and knowledge sharing mechanisms for scaling out of sustainable agriculture systems and integrated natural resources management approaches.				
Output 1.1.1: Agriculture and Rural Development Sector Working Groups (GSADR) at national (1) and provincial (3) levels strengthened and watershed management committees and multi-year plans in place at project sites (9)	<u>Number of Communal GSDAR</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	
Output 1.1.2: Functioning multi-stakeholder knowledge sharing	Number of exchange visits	2	2	

<sup>12</sup> Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

<sup>13</sup> 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 sentence with main achievements)

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

mechanism in place at national (1), provincial (3), and local (4) levels (watershed; FFS networks) and promoting exchange of experiences and lessons learned (success and failure) on scaling out SLM /INRM at landscape scale				
Output 1.1.3: Legal and regulatory frameworks on SLM, sustainable use of agrobiodiversity and agricultural and environmental strategies and plans better known at national (1) and provincial level (1) and applied in communal development plans and watershed management plans	Number of fairs on agrobiodiversity organized	3	3	
Output 1.1.4: National strategy for harmonization of FFS-INRM operationalized in 3 provinces with particular attention to resilient and sustainable food and agricultural systems	A FFS national strategy institutionalized	1	0	The project is waiting for the Government policy on FFS approach under review
Output 1.1.5: Communities consulted through a participatory negotiated territorial development (PNTD) and Free prior informed consent (FPIC) process (from 2)	FPIC implemented	1	1	
Outcome 2.1: Increased land area and agro-ecosystems under integrated natural resources/ landscape management and supported by FFS and sustainable value				

chains for increased production and sustainable livelihoods				
Output 2.1.1: Micro-watershed management plans developed and implemented (9) using combined appropriate SLM technologies and a harmonized INRM approach	Number of action plans implemented	9	9	
Output 2.1.2: National FFS curricula (1) updated and FFS master trainers (25) and facilitators (100) trained on the job with 318 FFS groups which are practicing and supported in SLM/ INRM at farm and watershed scale	National FFS Curricula developed and adopted	1	1	
	Number of FFS master trainers trained	25	25	
	Number of FF Facilitators trained on the job	35	35	
Output 2.3: Network of (pre) cooperatives/producers organizations and FFS groups supported and demonstrating improved access to food value chains (merged pre 2.3+2.4)	Number of cooperatives group supported	39	39	
Output 2.1.4 : An in situ seed bank system established and farmer-produced adapted varieties promoted through FFS and knowledge sharing on nutritional and other benefits of diversified local food systems at community and provincial levels	Number of seed bank established	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	Local varieties to be promoted have been identified and seed banks infrastructures are under building
	Number of ha under small irrigation to support value chains	1224	1224	

Output 2.1.5: Steep slopes and highly degraded areas rehabilitated through tree planting, with attention to indigenous species, to increase biodiversity, productivity and resilience and to reduce pressure on woody material.	Number of linear km of erosion control	500	424,95	
	Number of ha of woodland installed	1 700	1 700	
	Number of ha of Agroforestry covered	10 000	10 000	
	Number of linear km of river bank protected with bamboo trees	25	25	
	Number of fruits trees planted (Apple tree, <i>Artocarpus hetelophylius</i> , Macadamia)	15 000	15 000	
	number of ha of existing seed forest stands rehabilitated	200	200	
	Number of ha of new seed forest stands installed	50	50	
	Number of forest seed harvesters	80	80	
	Number of improved stoves produced	500	506	
Outcome 3 M&E framework in place and capacity of relevant institutions built capacitated in carrying-out monitoring activities and communicating experiences and impacts for informed decision making				
Output 3.1.1: Government staff and extension workers trained and able to use relevant M&E tools and approaches, also in archiving and analyzing data	Number of government staff trained	80	76	

Output 3.1.2: Pre-cooperatives and FFS groups trained and able to use participatory impact monitoring tools and approaches (HH-BAT, FFS PM&E, LADA local) as a basis for decision making.	Number of cooperatives and FFS groups trained	50	39	
Output 3.1.3: Project results and experiences compiled, communicated widely and shared with the project regional hub and partner projects	Number of technical papers developed and shared	4	3	
	Number of tweet shared	9	8	
	Number of public –reporting realized	3	2	
Output 3.1.4: Project progress reports prepared on time, mid and final review/ evaluation conducted	Number Project progress reports prepared	2	1	



## 4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

**Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.**

As part of institutional capacity building, the following results have been achieved : (i) organization of 14 open days for FFS groups at the end of their apprenticeship training, (ii) structuring of 106 FFS groups into 39 cooperatives, (iii) Strengthening of entrepreneurial capacities and business plan for emerging cooperatives, (iv) Training on the “Resilience Fund” approach for representatives of 106 FFS groups, (v) Organization of fairs on the genetic diversity of crops and (vi) Organization of exchange visits as part of the transfer of knowledge and know-how on promoting value chains.

In terms of landscape restoration, the project ensured the production of 7,350,000 forest and agroforestry seedlings to cover 1,700 ha of micro-afforestation and 10,000 ha of agroforestry with the HIMO approach. In addition, 100,000 bamboo plants have been produced to protect 25 km of riverbanks on a spacing of 3 m for each bank.

In addition, 424.95 km of contour lines have been put in place to ensure water and soil conservation in Mwaro, Muramvya and Gitega provinces.

As part of the improvement of the forest genetic base, the project was able to maintain 200 ha of existing seed stands, training of 80 harvesters of forest and agroforestry seeds as well as the installation of 50 ha of new forest seed stands.

In terms of improving the livelihoods of communities in the 9 targeted watersheds of the project, 20 tons of food seeds (10 of maize and 10 of beans), 35,000 banana shoots, 21,000 colocase shoots and 35,000 pineapple shoots distributed for Season B 2021 and 10 tons of bean seeds and 14 tons of maize seeds for Season 2022A. In addition, 2,000 hens and 200 roosters were made available to communities to ensure improved food and nutritional security and livelihood.

It should also be noted that 1,224 ha of farms are under hill irrigation in the provinces of Mwaro and Muramvya to cope with climate change. In addition, fairs on crop diversity have been organized with the support of Bioversity International.

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

	<b>FY2022 Development Objective rating<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>FY2022 Implementation Progress rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons<sup>17</sup> justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	During 2021 fiscal year, the project had planned significant progress in building stakeholder capacities, developing physical activities in the field through FFS groups and cooperatives, restoring degraded landscapes and monitoring and evaluating socio-economic and ecological impacts in the field.
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	Efforts to increase disbursement and the volume of field interventions have been observed during this year 2022. We encourage the project team to continue on this path.
<b>GEF Operational Focal Point<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	The project activities are well aligned with the orientations and objectives of the Government. Its implementation on the ground is satisfactory. Real and visible impacts on the ground in terms of restoring degraded landscapes, improving food security and on climate change resilient are beginning to appear.
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>Despite the Covid-19 context, the project team performed well achieving a satisfactory rate in term of objectives and project implementation. The work in the field went beyond the initial expectations, thanks to the ability of the team and the project coordinator who made it possible to interpret the project activities as a single intervention strategy, allowing the 3 project components to be linked efficiently and effectively.</i>
<b>FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>Project implementation is progressing well towards expected outcomes and outputs - relevant MTR recommendations and management responses to improve delivery have been reflected in this year's AWP/B and delivered accordingly. Overall, the project is advancing well.</i>

<sup>15</sup> **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.

<sup>16</sup> **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.

<sup>17</sup> Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

<sup>18</sup> In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

<sup>19</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

## 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

*Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)*

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Add new ESS risks if any 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
<b>ESS 1: Natural Resource Management</b>				
<b>ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats</b>				
<b>ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</b>				
<b>ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</b>				
<b>ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management</b>				
<b>ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement</b>				
<b>ESS 7: Decent Work</b>				
<b>ESS 8: Gender Equality</b>				
<b>ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage</b>				
	An agreement with concerned Indigenous Peoples is in place for the Free, Prior and Informed Consent aspect of the project activities, and includes: jointly monitoring	The FPIC has been developed and the project is monitored as per FPIC agreement		FAO

	<p>of the project, terms of withdrawal of consent, and access to feedbacks and complaints mechanism</p> <p>The project is monitored as per FPIC agreement with Indigenous Peoples and information is widely disseminated in a transparent and timely manner</p> <p>The project design allows flexibility to adjust activities in case of consent withdrawal.</p>			
<b>New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY</b>				

**In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social (ESS) Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.**

<b>Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)</b>	<b>Current ESS risk classification</b> Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>20</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
M	Yes, it is still valid.

<b><i>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.</i></b>
<p>The project received complaints on the operations of an implementing partner, the NGO ADISCO. The NGO ADISCO was contracted by the project in March 2020 . Upon contract signature (Letter of Agreement), the NGO received the first payment instalment to carry out the work. However, the implementation of this contract has been characterized by many difficulties. The Rural Engineer who was charged to ensure the</p>

<sup>20</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

supervision and quality control of the work of ADISCO sent a report to the FAO Representative indicating that the NGO was employing child labour in for labour intensive work such as the digging of anti-erosion ditches. After receiving this report, the first action of the FAO was to suspend the NGO ADISCO for a period of one month from 09/11/2020. In November 2020, the FAO Office sent a mission to enquire and further assess the situation on the field. Subsequently, FAO initiated an investigation led by the Investigations Unit of the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) Since then, operations with the NGO are on hold.

## 6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of 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 <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	COVID -19	M	No	Strategic measures in place to continue developing minimum activities on the fields	COVID -19 pandemic is not now a big issue and activities are restarted	

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
L	L	During the previous reporting period, the main challenge of the project was a low level of delivery but at this stage and considering the movement of purchase requested we are confident that the project will be at 80 % of delivery at the end of September 2022.

<sup>21</sup> Risk ratings means a rating of accesses 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: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

## 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 <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
<p><b>Recommendation 1:</b>  <b>Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms and knowledge-sharing mechanism:</b> Expand the mandate of the GSADR to include considerations related to the knowledge-sharing mechanism (WOCAT-DATAR Group), the management of good practices (Communal Platform on Good Practices)</p>	<p>An LAO between FAO and DPEAE has been signed in order, to facilitate and organize National and Provincial GSADR, organize knowledge sharing mechanism and design policy and regulatory Framework in INRM</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 2:</b>  <b>Establish a dynamic with the Sub-regional Office to create an expert pool at the national and/or regional level:</b>            1. Form a pool of experts at the regional level for the tools: Exact, DATAR, WOCAT with a view to having national and sub-regional expertise available and at a lower cost in order to overcome the difficulty of not having international experts available.</p>	<p>Not applicable for the project.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 3:</b>  <b>Transform the Community Watershed Management Plans into a "bankable" document and facilitate ownership of the watershed management plans once the management committees are in place</b></p>	<p>The community Watershed Management Plans are now part of Communal Community Development Plans: bankable document.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 4:</b>  <b>Highlight the Resilience Fund approach implemented by the project.</b>            Highlight the Resilience Fund approach in the logframe and implementation reports. The Resilience Fund approach implemented by the project, although very effective, is not sufficiently highlighted and promoted by the project because no related indicators are clearly developed in the project's monitoring and evaluation system for the economic and social pillars</p>	<p>Indicators related Resilient Fund approach have been integrated into project's logical framework.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 5:</b>  <b>Produce initial capitalization documents on knowledge management</b>            The evaluation recommends that the project produce simple materials in the local language, "Kirundi"-and also in pictorial form, radio programs, videos, plays, etc., to disseminate messages more effectively. This strengthens SLM/INRM integration and awareness of the many synergistic benefits of SLM technologies. The</p>	<p>The main technologies and approaches have been developed and disseminated into communities such as : breeding, nutrition, Village Savings and Loan Association (VSLA). Through collect Earth tool, a land use system regarding the project area has been developed.</p>

<p>institutionalization of the RWH approach underway with the ministry's extension services will also strengthen the knowledge sharing mechanism. The project can also produce a map of all reforested areas</p>	
<p><b>Recommendation 6:</b>  <b>Consolidate the structuring, functioning of existing FFSs, promote pilot value chains, and take into account the concerns of indigenous populations</b></p>	<p>The project focuses on consolidate and support 106 existing FFS groups. These FFS groups are transformed into 39 cooperatives including indigenous people where 9 value chains are promoted.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 7:</b>  <b>Identify good practices according to the FAO approach and share knowledge of them with stakeholders</b></p>	<p>5 technologies and 3 approaches are currently under documented into WOCAT.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 8:</b>  <b>Organize additional training for the 15 other untrained managers to set up a functional system for collecting data on impact indicators related to household food security, resilience and nutritional aspects</b></p>	<p>The SHARP tool has been used on the project baseline and it will be also contribute for motoring of the project impacts on food security, resilience and nutritional aspects at the end of the project next year.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 9: Continuously document all quantitative and qualitative data related to the project's implementation at the FFS level</b></p>	<p>The project continues to collect data regarding the project progress with participation of FFS groups.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 10:</b>  <b>Recommendation 10: Improve the speed of the project's procurement process through greater involvement of the FAO Country Office and clarify misunderstandings about procedures in order to anticipate possible blockages in the project's implementation</b></p>	<p>Nowadays, the project has adopted an anticipative purchasing strategy.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation 11:</b>  <b>Request an extension of the project for 12 months and re-budget the remaining activities, prioritizing those related to improving the living conditions of the local beneficiary communities. It will also be necessary to take into account the new activities resulting from the recommendations of the MTR</b></p>	<p>The project has introduced the Non Cost Extension request which has been approved.</p>
<p><b>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>

## 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 Guidelines<sup>22</sup>. 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	NO change		
Components and cost	NO change		
Institutional and implementation arrangements	NO change		
Financial management	NO change		
Implementation schedule	NO change		
Executing Entity	NO change		
Executing Entity Category	NO change		
Minor project objective change	NO change		
Safeguards	NO change		
Risk analysis	NO change		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	NO change		
Co-financing	NO change		
Location of project activity	NO change		
Other			

## 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 during this reporting period.

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



Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
<b>Government Institutions</b>			
OBPE <sup>23</sup>	Indigenous trees production and plantation	Activity completed	None
DGA <sup>24</sup>	Anti-erosion control quality	Activity completed	None
DGEREA <sup>25</sup>	Improvement of Genetic forest	Activity completed	None
IGEBU	Monitoring of water quality at 9 watersheds level	Activity undergoing	None
DGPEAE	Knowledge sharing mechanism and GSDAR plateform facilitation	Activity undergoing	None
ISABU	Vegetables and fruits plants production	Activity completed	None
CMSMF	Fruits production	LOA under development	None
BPEAE Gitega	Monitoring and support for project interventions in the field	Activity undergoing	None
BPEAE Mwaro	Monitoring and support for project interventions in the field	Activity undergoing	None
BPEAE Muramvya	Monitoring and support for project interventions in the field	Activity undergoing	None
<b>Non-Government organizations (NGOs)</b>			
ADISCO	Support for project interventions in the field on focusing on SLM good practices	Contract suspended	It is accused of using children in the hard works (anti –erosion dicthing). This matter is under Inspector General Office for investigation.
APROCUVI	Support for project interventions in the field	Activity undergoing	None

<sup>23</sup> OBPE : Office Burundais pour la Protection de l'Environnement

<sup>24</sup> DGA : Direction Générale de l'Agriculture

<sup>25</sup> DGEREA : Direction Générale de l'Environnement, de Ressources en Eau et Assissement

	on focusing on SLM good practices		
Bioversity International	Monitoring and support for agrobiodiversity in the filed	Activity completed	None
<b><i>Private sector entities</i></b>			
<b><i>Others[1]</i></b>			
<b><i>New stakeholders identified/engaged</i></b>			

---

[1] 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

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) <u>during this reporting period.</u>		
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	During the project implementation, 70 % of beneficiaries are women.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	No	Not applicable to our case.
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	The women and men are trained on natural conflicts resolution.
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	In the project, when the president of cooperative is a man, a woman is vice president and vice versa. The project pays attention that the participation in decision makers is important.
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	Women are actively participating in cooperatives activities.
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	Data on gender –disaggregated are available
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	staff have been trained on gender sensitive monitoring and Evaluation
Any other good practices on gender		

## 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.	The project has a knowledge management strategy to collect and document good practices. LADA WOCAT tools assist the project on collecting and documenting SLM good practices. EXACT, DATAR and Collect Earth assist in impact analysis. The relevant good practices are : Agroforestry, riverbanks protection with bamboo, integrated watershed management, small scale irrigation technology, community solidarity chain on breeding pigs, ....
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	Yes, our communication strategy allow us to develop many communications tools such as : tweets, papers, publi-reporting, visibility panels, ...
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	<p>Community woodlots are installed and contribute to the restoration of degraded landscapes and the protection of the environment. During fiscal year 2022, the project restored 1,700 ha of communal and private woodlots as well as 10,000 ha of agroforestry. This landscape restoration also contributed to the socio-economic transformation of the beneficiaries. This activity made it possible to generate monetary income for the populations participating in the work of nurseries and the planting of the seedlings produced. To this end, US\$365,000 have been injected into this work.</p> <p>Members of cooperatives actively participate in the protection of riverbanks by producing and planting bamboo seedlings. From the start of the project to this date, the members of the CEPs specialized in the production and planting of bamboo were able to provide the communities with 157,063 bamboo seedlings which were planted and made it possible to protect 47 linear km.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Thanks to income from the sale of products sold and dividends from IGAs developed in FFS groups, collective and/or individual livestock restocking efforts are observed at FFS level and within FFS members (purchase of pigs , goats, rabbits and cows). In addition, plots of land have been purchased and have enabled FFS groups to increase their land assets; the case of the tezimbere uburimy cooperative of Gisitye which bought 3 cows, the kerebukira isuka cooperative of muyebe which acquired 2 cows and 15 goats, the tujehamwe cooperative of Gisuru which bought 25 rabbits and the majority of CEP members and cooperatives who own individually purchased goats and chickens.</p>
<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p>	<p>1. <b>Articles :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://www.fao.org/burundi/actualites/detail-events/fr/c/1467579/">https://www.fao.org/burundi/actualites/detail-events/fr/c/1467579/</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://www.fao.org/burundi/actualites/detail-events/fr/c/1468676/">https://www.fao.org/burundi/actualites/detail-events/fr/c/1468676/</a></li> </ul> <p>1. <b>Tweets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <a href="https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1468815309159247872?s=20">https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1468815309159247872?s=20</a> ;</li> <li><a href="https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1468816630906073095?s=20">https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1468816630906073095?s=20</a> ;</li> <li><a href="https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1468818176972668932?s=20">https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1468818176972668932?s=20</a> ;</li> <li><a href="https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1468820421852205059?s=20">https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1468820421852205059?s=20</a> ;</li> <li><a href="https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1474368127500697622?s=20">https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1474368127500697622?s=20</a> ;</li> <li><a href="https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1474376940672925714?s=20">https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1474376940672925714?s=20</a> ;</li> <li><a href="https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1474383956229431300?s=20">https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1474383956229431300?s=20</a> ;</li> <li>▪ <a href="https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1540047581082001411?s=20&amp;t=EpEDrP7G2XqzqexWup7DA">https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1540047581082001411?s=20&amp;t=EpEDrP7G2XqzqexWup7DA</a></li> </ul>
<p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visibility panels</li> <li>• Publi-reporting,</li> <li>• Articles,</li> <li>• Video materials</li> </ul>
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact detail</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication management focal point : Nsabiyabandi Joseph E-mail : Joseph.nsabiyabandi@fao.org</li> </ul>

## 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.

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

**Yes, the project has a FFS group of Batwa involving in SLM and livelihoods activities in Mwaro Province.**

### 13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>26</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	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 – PRODEFI	In Kind	21,440,000	21 440 000	11 000 000	21 440 000
GEF Agency	World Bank - PRODEMA	In Kind	6,000,000	3 000 000	3 800 000	3 800 000
GEF Agency	World Bank – PADZOC	In Kind	14,110,728	2 400 000	2 800 000	2 800 000
Government	MINAGRIE	In Kind	3,000,000	3 000 000	1 553 200	3 000 000
GEF Agency	FAO	In Kind	500,000	500 000	400 000	500 000
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>45 050 728</b>	<b>30 340 000</b>	<b>19 553 200</b>	<b>31 540 000</b>

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

The World Bank project (PRODEMA and PADZOC) have been completed.

<sup>26</sup> 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

<b>Development Objectives Rating.</b> A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	Project is expected to achieve or exceed <b>all</b> its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	Project is expected to achieve <b>most</b> of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	Project is expected to achieve <b>most</b> of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve <b>some</b> of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only <b>some</b> of its major global environmental objectives)
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	Project is expected <b>not</b> to achieve <b>most</b> of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits)
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, <b>any</b> of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

<b>Implementation Progress Rating.</b> 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.	
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	Implementation of <b>all</b> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	Implementation of <b>most</b> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	Implementation of <b>some</b> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	Implementation of <b>some</b> components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	Implementation of <b>most</b> components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

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