



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
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	14
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	18
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	21
6. RISKS	24
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION (ONLY FOR PROJECTS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED AN MTR)	25
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	28
9. STAKEHOLDERS’ ENGAGEMENT.....	29
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	30
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	31
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	33
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	34

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	Burundi
Project Title:	Support for sustainable food production and enhancement of food security and climate resilience in Burundi's highlands
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/BDI/040/GFF
GEF ID:	9178
GEF Focal Area(s):	Multi Focal Area: IAP Food Security, Climate change, Biodiversity, Land Degradation
Project Executing Partners:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burundian office of Environment Protection (OBPE) • Rural Engineering Department (GR) • Burundi Geographic Institute (IGEBU) • Institute of Agronomic Sciences of Burundi (ISABU), • Bioversity International, • General Directorate of Environmental Planning, Agriculture and Livestock, • Center for Multiplication of Vegetable and Fruit Seeds • 3 Provincial Office of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock, • 2 local NGOs : ADISCO, APROCUVI • ADRSEPAL for FPIC.
Project Duration (years):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 Years
Project coordinates:	Submitted separately to the FAO-GEF coordination Unit

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	04 April 2017
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	04 September 2017
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	05 September 2021
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	05 September 2024

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	7,396,330
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	45,050,728
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	5,682,619
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding	5,355,834

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD) ⁴ :	
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023 ⁵	31,540,000

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	31/03/2023
Expected Mid-term Review date ⁶ :	-
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	2020
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date ⁷ :	August,2023
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	<i>[It is mandatory for projects to update the TT or CI before Mid-Term or Terminal Evaluation stage. For projects that have a planned MTR or TE in the next fiscal year, please indicate YES here and provide the updated TT or CI as Annex.]</i>

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	S
Overall implementation progress rating:	S
Overall risk rating:	Moderate

ESS risk classification

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

Status

Implementation Status (1 st PIR, 2 nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	6 th PIR
---	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Oscar NIYONZIMA	Oscar.Niyonzima@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Pissang Tchangai Dadémanao	Dademanao.PissangTchangai@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Prosper Dodiko	doprosper2002@yahoo.fr

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.

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.

Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Anne Sophie POISOT	AnneSophie.Poisot@fao.org
	Stefano MONDOVI (alternate LTO)	Stefano.Mondovi@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Sandra Corsi	Sandra.Corsi@fao.org

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 ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
To increase adoption of resilient, improved production systems for sustainable food security and nutrition through integrated landscape management and sustainable food value	Outcome 1 Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms operational in supporting policy, institutional and knowledge sharing mechanisms for scaling out of sustainable agriculture systems and	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 2 workshops of GSADR on National Level have been organized.	S

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)**.

	integrated natural resources management approaches						
		(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. Thanks to the LOA with DGPEAE, the DGPEAE enhances the knowledge sharing mechanism through (i) the design of a consolidated sharing information system on SLM/INRM and (ii) the popularization and dissemination of 3 main strategic policies related in INRM	S
		<u>Legal & regulatory frameworks:</u>	<u>Legal & regulatory frameworks:</u>	<u>Legal & regulatory frameworks:</u>	i) 9 reports on Community Action Plan for 9 targeted	i) 9 Community Action Plans for 9 targeted	S

		iii) No ILM in framework place/piloted	iii) Consultations held, including community, gender and Batwa representation, for developing harmonised guidance for implementing INRM FFS and interlinked value chains	iii) Harmonised guidance in place for implementing INRM, erosion control, BD, and interlinked value chains	watersheds developed and under implementation ii) Study report on NFPIC developed and now available.	watersheds under implementation ii) Study report on NFPIC developed and under implementation.	
		(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 has been adopted 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	S

						and forestry, riverbank protection)	
	<p>Outcome 2: 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</p>	<p>i) IAP TT LD-3 (ii): Application of INRM practices in the wider landscape</p>	<p>i) 0 catchments</p>	<p>i) 9 catchments with diagnostics completed and community plans developed for INRM including enhanced ABD (at genetic, species and habitat levels)</p>	<p>i) 9 catchments implementing INRM with enhanced BD (at genetic, species and habitat levels)</p>	<p>i.1. Biophysical and socio-economic characterisation completed in 9 catchments ii.2. Land Use Systems characterisation with Collect Earth tool for 3 provinces iii.3. 9 Watersheds topographic maps developed (by Rural Engineering Department of MINEAGRIE) in addition to communities vision maps</p>	<p>S</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%,</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</p>	<p>1) 106 FFS located in 58 Collines (46 652 ha) of 9 catchments adopted agro-silvo-pastoral best practices such as erosion control on 1007,6 Km, 18.075.455 trees plantation, 873 improved stoves,</p>	<p>S</p>

			<p>agro-sylvo-pastoral integration 75%, intercropping 68%, contour lines 56%.)</p>		<p>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>11030 improved organic manure composters for Soil Fertility Management.</p> <p>2) Land area covered by forestry and agroforestry: 28996 ha</p> <p>3) Production of 257 063 bamboo trees to protect 300 km of riverbanks of Ruvubu, Kayokwe and Kaniga river banks.</p> <p>Production of 40.000 avocado seedlings, 3.000 false mango seedlings and 3.000 celery palm seedlings as part of "Green City Initiative"</p> <p>Promotion of small-scale irrigation to increase climate resilient and food production even during the dry season on 1614 ha with 2696 HH beneficiaries.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						4) 18.075.455 forestry and agroforestry plants produced, so that the project reached a covered area of 28 996 ha.	
	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)	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)	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 The indirect benefits (over a	- On-farm (increase of tree cover during the reporting period): -8 194 054 t CO2 eq avoided (using the Ex-Act Carbon Balance tool)	HS

					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		
	Outcome 3: 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)	S
		(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	636 farmers applying Participatory Impact monitoring	24 420 farmers applying Participatory Impact monitoring	S

				FFS exchanges	Tools	tools	
	(iii) Communication Strategy in place (visibility and Communication for Development) Availability of project results and communication materials in country and shared with regional Hub	no information and communication materials		Communication strategy in place and project experiences shared through diverse, targeted communication and 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	Communication Strategy effectively implemented and project experiences 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	1 communication Strategy Developed, implemented and update at 31th December,2022	S
	Number of project reports submitted in time	0		8	15	15 reports in which 10 PPR and 5 PIR Developed and approved	S

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

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 ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ 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	Number of Communal GSDAR	2	2	
Output 1.1.2: Functioning multi-stakeholder knowledge sharing mechanism in place at national (1), provincial (3), and local (4) levels	Number of exchange visits	2	1	Decision to combine the 2 visits

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 sentence with main achievements)

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

(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	0	Postponed in july 2023
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	Roadmap adopted	In order to take account Governmental approach
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	65	65	
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	42	42	
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	200	179	
	Number of ha of woodland installed	656	1261	
	Number of ha of Agroforestry covered	6125	9544	
	Number of linear km of river bank protected with bamboo trees	100	100	
	Number of fruits trees planted	46000	46000	Production and plantation of of 40.000 avocado seedlings, 3.000 false mango seedlings and 3.000 celery palm seedlings as part of "Green City Initiative"
	Number of improved stoves produced	360	367	
Outcome 3.1:				

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	11	10	
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	1	1	
	Number of public –reporting realized	2	2	
Output 3.1.4: Project progress reports prepared on time, mid and final review/ evaluation conducted	Number Project progress reports prepared	1	1	

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)

As part of institutional capacity building, the following results were achieved : (i) 97 open days organized/held on nutrition and good practices in order to sensitize the community member to good practices in nutrition through the FFS groups, (ii) Training on SHARP tool, nutrition, Post-harvest management facilitated, (iii) Support towards the processed products' certification and the application of norms and food standards by the BBN, (iv) Exchange visits for FFS/Cooperative representatives as part the transfer of knowledge and know-how on promoting value chains were facilitated.

In terms of landscape restoration, the project ensured the plantation of 18,075,455 forest and agroforestry seedlings to cover 5,398 ha of micro-forestation and 23, 598 ha of agroforestry with HIMO approach. Regarding river banks protection, 257 063 bamboo plants were planted to protect 300km of river banks on a spacing of 3m for each bank. In addition, 1007.6 km of contour lines were 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 250 ha of existing seed stands (in which 50 ha have been installed by the project) and follow-up 80 harvesters of forest and agroforestry seeds trained by the project.

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. The implementation of Green City Initiative has allowed the production and plantation of 40.000 avocado seedlings, 3.000 false mango seedlings and 3.000 celery palm seedlings in Gitega City.

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 rating¹⁵	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ 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 has continuously recorded satisfactory results until 2023. However, in order to ensure the consolidation of the project achievements on the ground, it is deemed necessary to grant an extension to the project to (i) finalize the community infrastructures still under implementation, (ii) complete the agri-food processing equipment and (iii) train beneficiaries on their rational use and management.
Budget Holder	S	S	The project is technically, administratively and financially well managed. The achievements are visible and show that the project is contributing to sustainable development. This project is a model to be considered among others in the field of sustainable land management and climate resilience. The project integrates the right strategy for strengthening value chains, the trainings of FFS groups to be upscale into cooperatives and the sustainable management of natural resources (water, land and forests), all in a package at the community level. The project demonstrates remarkable results in capacity building, landscape restoration and forest improvement. The no cost extension obtained will allow the completion of the remaining activities, help consolidate the results and maximize the overall impact of the project.

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

GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸	S	S	The project carried out actions of visible impact in terms of capacity building, restoration of forest ecosystems, the natural landscape, and the safeguarding of forest resources, thus reflecting the project's contribution to sustainable development. Agricultural value chains were strengthened, and climate-smart irrigation techniques were introduced in the project area, which effectively addressed the challenges posed by climate change. The decision to extend the project will allow the remaining activities to be completed, ensuring the consolidation of achievements, and maximizing the overall impact of the project.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	S	The project is well managed and concrete results on the field are visible. It continues to demonstrate that it has a clear underlying strategy and that the components and activities of the project are coherent and well connected to each other. As already underlined, this project is a good example/model to be taken into consideration from other similar interventions. In particular, it is important to underline the good use of tools such as SHARP, LADA, Collect Earth and DATAR, the good strategy of strengthening value chains (grouping FFS groups into cooperatives) and land management, with well-integrated interventions well connected each other's.
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	S	S	The project has made notable advancements in capacity building, landscape restoration, and improving the forest genetic base. These achievements highlight the project's contribution to sustainable development. By strengthening value chains and implementing climate-smart irrigation techniques, the project has effectively addressed the challenges posed by climate change. The decision to extend the project will enable the completion of remaining activities, ensuring the consolidation of achievements, and maximizing the project's overall impact.

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.

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 **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. 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				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
	An agreement with concerned Indigenous Peoples is in place for the	The FPIC has been developed and the project is monitored		FAO

	<p>Free, Prior and Informed Consent aspect of the project activities, and includes: jointly monitoring 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>	as per FPIC agreement		
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

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

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

²⁰ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) 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>)

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.

The project has encountered challenges with the operations of the implementing partner, NGO ADISCO. Despite receiving payment to carry out the works, the implementation of the contract has been marred by difficulties. A report from the Rural Engineer responsible for supervising ADISCO's works revealed that the NGO was employing child labor for labor-intensive tasks like digging anti-erosion ditches.

Upon receiving the report, FAO took immediate action by suspending NGO ADISCO for one month starting from 09/11/2020. In November 2020, a mission was sent by the FAO Office to conduct further investigations on the ground. Additionally, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) initiated an investigation into the matter. Consequently, operations with the NGO have been suspended.

Given these circumstances, the project team believes it is crucial for FAO to resolve the case with NGO ADISCO before the project closure, ensuring appropriate actions are taken to address the reported issues.

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	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	
2	Rift valley Fever	M	No	Community awareness of the disease scope on animal farm and ways to reduce its spread	Rift vally Fever is currently and remain under control	

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
L	L	The main challenge of the project is now a low level of delivery but at this stage and considering the movement of purchase requested we are expecting that the project will be at 90 % of delivery at the end of August 2023.

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 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>Recommendation 1: Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms and knowledge-sharing mechanism: 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>Two (2) workshops organized as part of implementation of the LOA between FAO and DGPEAE in order to facilitate and organize National and Provincial GSADR, organize knowledge sharing mechanism and design policy and regulatory Framework in INRM</p>
<p>Recommendation 2: Establish a dynamic with the Sub-regional Office to create an expert pool at the national and/or regional level: 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>Recommendation 3: 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</p>	<p>The community Watershed Management Plans are now part of Communal Community Development Plans: bankable document.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4: Highlight the Resilience Fund approach implemented by the project. 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 and regularly tracked.</p>
<p>Recommendation 5:</p>	<p>During the fiscal year, the participative video technics for Monitoring and Evaluation have been applied.</p>

<p>Produce initial capitalization documents on knowledge management</p> <p>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 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>Recommendation 6: Consolidate the structuring, functioning of existing FFSs, promote pilot value chains, and take into account the concerns of indigenous populations</p>	<p>The project focuses on consolidate and support 106 existing FFS groups. These FFS groups are transformed into 42 cooperatives including indigenous people where 9 value chains are promoting six sustainable value chains</p>
<p>Recommendation 7: Identify good practices according to the FAO approach and share knowledge of them with stakeholders</p>	<p>5 technologies and 3 approaches SLM/INRM have been documented into WOCAT database and 2 of the 5 technologies have been validated.</p>
<p>Recommendation 8: 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</p>	<p>The SHARP tool has been used on the project baseline and in last March-April 2023, for assessment project impacts on food security, resilience and nutritional aspects. A final report is waited early July 2023</p>
<p>Recommendation 9: Continuously document all quantitative and qualitative data related to the project's implementation at the FFS level</p>	<p>The project continues to collect data regarding the project progress with participation of FFS groups and/or cooperatives</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>The project has implemented an anticipative purchasing strategy, which has proven effective in meeting procurement needs. To further support the project in generating purchasing requests, the Country Office has strengthened its team. This enhancement ensures a more efficient and streamlined procurement process, ultimately benefiting the project's overall operations.</p>

<p>Recommendation 11:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The project team is requesting another extension to insure consolidation of project achievements for beneficiary interest.</p>
--	---

<p>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe</p>	<p>The project team carefully considered the exit strategy for the project, focusing on the smooth transition of infrastructure responsibilities to public technical services, administration, and cooperatives associated with the FFS groups. However, after careful evaluation, it was determined that the best course of action was to request an extension for the project. This decision was made to ensure the successful completion of crucial tasks, such as finalizing the establishment of community infrastructure, including the equipment for storage sheds. Additionally, the extension will enable the completion of the construction of hillside irrigation infrastructure, acquisition of equipment for agri-food processing units, and the provision of necessary training and support for beneficiaries.</p> <p>By opting for an extension, the project will have sufficient time to conclude these important activities, ensuring the project's overall success and long-term sustainability.</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 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	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 minor project amendment (define)	No change		

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 during this reporting period.


Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
DGEREA ²³	Protection of Genetic forest	Activity undergoing	LAO with Minister of Environment, Agriculture and livestock to be signed
IGEBU	Monitoring of water quality at 9 watersheds level	Activity undergoing	None
DGPEAE	Knowledge sharing mechanism and GSDAR platform facilitation	Final Report to be developed	None
CMSMF	Fruits production	LOA on Green City Initiative implemented in Gitega city and final report is under development	None
BPEAE Gitega	Monitoring and support for project interventions in the field	Final report in waiting	None
BPEAE Mwaro	Monitoring and support for project interventions in the field	Final report in waiting	None
BPEAE Muramvya	Monitoring and support for project interventions in the field	Final report in waiting	None
BBN	Accompanying to certification and food standars use	Undergoing	None
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
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. This matter is under Inspector General Office for investigation.
APROCUVI	Support for project interventions in the field on focusing on SLM good practices	Final report in waiting	None

²³ DGEREA : Direction Générale de l'Environnement, de Ressources en Eau et Assissement

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) during this reporting period.		
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>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>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 in which 5 technologies and 3 approaches have been documented. Two (2) of the 5 technologies have been approved by the WOCAT experts. 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, As impact analysis, we can mention the application of DATAR tool in the establishment of varietal diversity indicators for the 4 main cultures as Irish potato, beans, maize and taro.</p>
<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.</p>	<p>The project’s communication strategy allows to develop many communications tools such as: papers, publi-reporting, visibility panels,</p>
<p>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.</p>	<div style="display: flex; align-items: flex-start;">  <div style="margin-left: 10px;"> <p>The hillside irrigation implemented by the project has had a significant positive impact on the livelihoods of households and members of the "TSINDAMAPFA" cooperative in Giheta Commune, Gasunu Hill, Gitega Province. One member, Evariste Gasunzu, shared his story to highlight the transformative effect of the project: “My name is Evariste Gasunzu, I am the president and member of the TSINDAMAPFA/Together to defeat hunger cooperative. My life, like that of the members of our Cooperative, has improved with the</p> </div> </div>

	<p>development of the canal on the Mutwenzi River by the project. Previously, we cultivated almost nothing in the dry season, the water of the Mutwenzi river was of no use to us, we watched helplessly as it flowed towards the Ruvubu river. With the development of an irrigation dam, we began to practice off-season crops, mainly season C maize, which was an innovation in our Cooperative. We manage to sow an area of 4Ha and we obtain a production of 12 tons (with an average yield of 3T/Ha).</p> <p>With the 2022C season, we harvested 12 tons of Corn Grain, which we sold for 30 million Burundian francs (at the rate of 2500 FBU per Kg).</p> <p>We took half of the revenue from the sale of the harvest that we shared between the members of the cooperative and each was able to easily amass a sum of 500,000 FBU which he brought back to his home to meet the needs of the household, the rest of the receipts went to the account of the cooperative which currently records a turnover of 20 million francs BU.</p> <p>Currently, the Cooperative has a farm of 8 cows bought with funds generated by off-season crops to have organic manure.</p> <p>We intend to open a point of sale of the various inputs that the population has commonly needed such as vegetable seeds and fertilizers that are not found in our locality.</p> <p>I end by thanking the project, FAO and his partners for giving us this irrigation canal which was the starting point of our economic ascent”</p>
<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p>	<p>1. Articles :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://www.fao.org/burundi/actualites/detail-events/fr/c/1467579/ • https://www.fao.org/burundi/actualites/detail-events/fr/c/1468676/ <p>2. Tweets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1468815309159247872?s=20 ; https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1468816630906073095?s=20 ;

	<p>https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1468818176972668932?s=20 ;</p> <p>https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1468820421852205059?s=20 ;</p> <p>https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1474368127500697622?s=20 ;</p> <p>https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1474376940672925714?s=20 ;</p> <p>https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1474383956229431300?s=20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ https://twitter.com/FAOBurundi/status/1540047581082001411?s=20&t=EpEDrP7G2XqzqexWup7DA
<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"> • Publi – reporting; • Resilience assessment report with SHARP tool in RSF final workshop; • Varietal diversity analysis for main crops in the project area.
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point’s name and contact details</p>	<p>Communication management focal point : Nsabiyabandi Joseph E-mail : Joseph.nsabiyabandi@fao.org</p>

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

<p>Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.</p>
<p>Yes, the project has a FFS group of Batwa involving in SLM and livelihoods activities in Mwaro Province.</p>

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁴	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁵	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 – 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	3 800 000	3 800 000	3 800 000
GEF Agency	World Bank – PADZOC	In Kind	14,110,728	2 800 000	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
		TOTAL	45 050 728	31 540 000	19 553 200	31 540 000

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

The projects (PRODEMA and PRADZOC) financed by the World Bank and the PRODEFI project of IFAD which served as co-financing for this project were closed before the end of this project but at least because the project has just had the NCE over one year for the second time.

²⁴Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁵Grant, 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. 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 (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk rating 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 [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name			Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description
Province	Commune	Site				
Gitega	Giheta	Gasunu	-3.3545238	29.9800315		Maize irrigation infrastructure for off-season production
Gitega	Giheta	Rwingiri	-3.3496047	29.9159455		Irrigation canal development
Gitega	Giheta	Muremera	-3.3162103	29.9065097		Coffee depulping unit
Gitega	Giheta	Muremera	-3.3163277	29.9077514		Development of marshes for rice cultivation
Gitega	Giheta	Rwingiri BV	-3.2774829	29.9062302		Protection of watersheds by tracing level curves
Gitega	Giheta	Rweru	-3.2965706	29.816969		Shed for myciculture
Gitega	Giheta	Kibiri	-3.4981151	29.8599864		Pig breeding center
Mwaro	Kayokwe	Mabaya	-3.6535827	29.7130222		State afforestation
Mwaro	Kayokwe	Ruvumu	-3.5091677	29.7338593		Hill irrigation infrastructure
Mwaro	Kayokwe	Kibogoye	-3.5304792	29.723476		Plantation for pineapple production
Mwaro	Kayokwe	Kibogoye	-3.5235156	29.7284513		Hillside irrigation
Mwaro	Kayokwe	Musama	-3.5182582	29.7536968		Private eucalyptus base of 5ha
Mwaro	Kayokwe	Kibenga-Migende	-3.5189627	29.7644514		Storage shed in rehabilitation

Mwaro	Kayokwe	Kibenga-Migende	-3.5103231	29.7801919	CEP Tujehamwe/ Integration of agriculture with livestock and forestry
Mwaro	Kayokwe	Muyebe	-3.5012301	29.7932423	Breeding barn with pigs
Mwaro	Kayokwe	Muyebe	-3.4933257	29.7876224	Storage shed
Muramvya	Rutegama	Nkonyovu	-3.2912592	29.7204852	Storage shed
Muramvya	Muramvya	Mpehe	-3.2953285	29.5818395	Agricultural and forestry production
Muramvya	Muramvya	Mpehe	-3.2894196	29.5665655	Eucalyptus afforestation
Muramvya	Muramvya	Busimba	-3.2693994	29.5645862	Hill irrigation infrastructure
Muramvya	Bukeye	Busekera	-3.2426601	29.5652404	Wheat production site
Muramvya	Bukeye	Bukeye	-3.2299079	29.591156	Wheat and corn flour processing
Muramvya	Bukeye	Nyambo-Gashishima	-3.1475278	29.5817622	Hill irrigation infrastructure

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