



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered : 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



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):	<ul style="list-style-type: none">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,3 Provincial Office of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock,3 locale NGOs,UNIPROBA for FPIC.
Project Duration:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">5 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	April 04 2017
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01 July 2017
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	1 July 2022
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	NA
Actual Implementation End Date³:	NA

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	7,396,330
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	45,050,728
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	1,053,914
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	3 553 200

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	November 2018
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	April 2020
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	NA
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	NA
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	No

Ratings

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

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

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁶ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Salvator NDABIRORERE, NPM, FAOBI	Salvator.Ndabirorere@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Anne Sophie POISOT/ Stefano Mondovi	AnneSophie.Poisot@fao.org Stefano.Mondovi@fao.org
Budget Holder	Isaias ANGUE OBAMA, FAOR Burundi	Isaias.AngueObama@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Paola Palestini, TCI FAO-GEF	Paola.Palestini@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective: To increase adoption of resilient, improved production systems for sustainable food security and nutrition through integrated landscape management and sustainable food value chains						
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 integrated natural resources management approaches	Provincial policy platforms	national and Provincial GSADR existing	N-GSADR and P-GSADRs actively supporting INRM scaling out in Mwaro, Gitega and Muramvya (concrete actions)	P-GSADR has demonstrated success in scaling out INRM in 3 provinces (intersector policy and actions etc)	3 workshop organized (1 in each target Province) with a participation of 151 stakeholders	S
	Knowledge sharing (KS) and planning mechanism on ILM	No KS or coherency across sectors on SLM/INRM scaling out approaches	KS mechanisms set up and being piloted: 1 national, 3 provincial, 4 local	KS mechanisms (1 national linked to WOCAT global, 3 provincial, 4 local) effectively sharing best practices on INRM and value chains.	SLM Group (with 24 technical government staff) in place	S
	ILM regulatory framework	No ILM framework in place/piloted	Consultations held, including community, gender and Batwa representation, for	Harmonized guidance in place for implementing INRM, erosion control, BD,	9 consultation meetings and data collection in 9 watersheds	S

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Marginally Satisfactory** (MS), **Marginally Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU).

			developing harmonized guidance for implementing INRM FFS and interlinked value chains	and interlinked value chains		
	National FFS strategy (extent of operationalization)	National FFS strategy is available but has not yet been operationalized	FFS strategy partly operationalized	FFS strategy fully operationalized	Support to FFS institutionalisation and operationalization road map in close collaboration with Government (DGMVA)	S
	Country Strategic Framework (CSF) (applied)	CSF in place but does not include INRM/landscape approaches and not effectively applied	Consultations held, including community, gender and Batwa representation, for planning CSIF implementation at provincial (3), communal (3) and watershed (3) levels	CSIF applied/ integrated in plans and budgets at provincial (3), communal (3) and watershed (3) levels	4 SLM monitoring tools (LADA-WOCAT, EX-ACT, Collect Earth and DATAR) have been introduced and the SLM group trained is collecting data in order to constitute a advocacy baseline for the CSF	S
Outcome 2 : Increased land area and agro-ecosystems under integrated natural resources/ landscape management and supported by FFS and	Application of INRM practices in the wider landscape	0 catchments	9 catchments with diagnostics completed and community plans developed for INRM including enhanced ABD (at genetic, species and habitat levels)	9 catchments implementing INRM with enhanced BD (at genetic, species and habitat levels)	1. 7 watersheds have been identified for SLM implementation 2. Production of topographic maps (by Rural Engineering	S

sustainable value chains for increased production and sustainable livelihoods					Department of MINEAGRIE) 3. Selection of 3 service providers is undergoing (NGO)	
	extent of adoption of SLM/integrated landscape management practices	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%.)	Diverse improved SLM practices adopted in a combined approach and being monitored and documented by FFS and communities in the 9 catchments	i. Integrated agro-silvo-pastoralist systems with well-designed SLM practices effectively combined across 9 catchments and multiple benefits on livelihoods and ES documented and demonstrated 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 (including 4,000 ha of agrobiodiversity in particular orphan crops such as finger millet)	1. Soil and water conservation implemented through FFS members (contour lines with vegetation : 70 Km; improved stoves: 90; SFM: 1500 compost bins). 2. Agricultural intensification with improved seed combined with cropping good practices (irish and sweet potatoes, beans, soya and horticulture). 2. 1 238 865 plants of indigenous agroforestry and forestry produced covering an area of 4 324 ha	S

					4. River bank protection on 147 Km with 49 063 bamboo plants	
	% of farmers producing for market (disaggregated by gender)	HH-BAT baseline: 53% produce for markets of which 37% female led HHs	60 % (in which 40% female headed households, 20% orphan headed households)	65 % (in which 40% female headed households, 20% orphan headed households)	55% (in which 45% for <i>Irish potato</i>)	S
	% farmers with improved production (disaggregated by gender)	no systematic information on total yields and diversification (baseline collected through FFS)	FFS monitored and demonstrating production and diversity increases compared to normal practice (+25% by 100 FFS)	FFS monitored and demonstrating production and diversity increases compared to normal practice (+25% by 200 FFS)	Data collection underway (40% FFS monitored)	S
	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 capitalization phase of 15 years): - On-farm (increase in biomass/agri. crops): 564,266t CO2 eq avoided - On-farm (increase of tree cover):	On-farm (increase in biomass/agri. crops): -3 296 t CO2 eq avoided - On-farm (increase of tree cover): -1 225 825 t CO2 eq avoided - + 8 611T CO2 émissions	S

				1,958,407t CO2 eq avoided		
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	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	0 staff trained and applying tools for monitoring impacts	80 staff trained and applying tools for monitoring multiple impacts	200 staff trained and applying tools for monitoring multiple impacts	110 staff and FFS Facilitators trained on different SLM monitoring and evaluation tools (LADA-WOCAT, EX-ACT, Collect Earth and DATAR)	HS
	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 and sharing results	1 Focus group by watershed with 15 householders representative and 15 individual interviews (270 farmers applying participatory tools)	S
	Communication strategy in place (visibility and 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	Communication strategy effectively implemented and project experiences shared through diverse, targeted communication and technical materials (10 per year) SLM/INRM impacts compiled and shared on a 6 monthly basis and workshops to discuss findings and	1. Communication strategy document developed, 2. Landscape restoration flyer produced, 3. Experience exchange visit on impact FFS SLM and livelihoods	S

			through project steering committee and GSADR	policy implications at provincial (3) and national levels (1) (e.g. GSADR and BPEAE) and regional hub level (2)		
	Number of project reports submitted in time	0	8	15	3 PPR and 1 PIR produced, approved and submitted into FPMIS	HS

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

NA

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

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

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1: 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)	Continuous activity	3 at a provincial level	3 at a provincial level				60%	9 Watershed management committee meetings at commune level are in plan for this year
Output 1.2: Functioning multi-stakeholder knowledge sharing 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)	Continuous activity	National sharing mechanism based on SLM tools established (24 technical staff)	Data collection by applying SLM monitoring and evaluation tools				50%	9 Watershed committees are being strengthened serving as SLM/INRM knowledge sharing mechanisms at local level.

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

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

¹³ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

on scaling out SLM /INRM at landscape scale								
Output 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	Q ² Y ³		9 consultation meetings and data collection in 9 watersheds				70%	A writeshop is planned for the validation of LADA-WOCAT reports
Output 1.4: National strategy for harmonization of FFS-INRM operationalized in 3 provinces with particular attention to resilient and sustainable food and agricultural systems	Q ² Y ³	National strategy for harmonization of FFS-INRM developed	Road map for FFS national strategy operationalization undergoing				40%	This process is undertaken by the Government the project acts as technical supporter
Output 1.5: Communities consulted through a participatory negotiated territorial development (PNTD) and Free prior informed consent (FPIC) process (from 2)	Q ² Y ³		A service provider is identified and a LOA is in preparation				10 %	A local indigenous people association (UNIPROBA) will carry out the consultations
Output 2.1: Micro-watershed management plans developed and implemented (9) using combined appropriate SLM technologies and a harmonized INRM approach	Q ² Y ³	Training on LADA-WOCAT	Community consultation report on biophysical and socio economic status on 9 watersheds in going				70%	A writeshop is planned to develop a global LADA-WOCAT report and watershed action plan
Output 2.2: National FFS	Continuous	30	1. The first					The project expects to

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		Facilitator trained	generation of 30 facilitators has been recycled; 2. 14 potential master trainers and 7 master trainers trained on climate change, adaptation mitigation and nutrition; 3. 32 new facilitators have been identified and will be trained in July 2019				45%	have 62 operational facilitators in two months The FFS curricula are focused to following mains themes: i. FFS methodology; ii. SLM practices to increase soil productivity and food production; iii. Climate smart agriculture; iv. Nutrition; v. "Caisse de resilience"; vi. Social cohesion and pacific resolution of conflicts; vii. Costs benefits analysis
Output 2.3: Network of (pre) cooperatives/producer organizations and FFS groups supported and demonstrating improved access to food value chains (merged pre 2.3+2.4)	Continuous	No action done yet	No action done yet					The network will be organized after the development of FFS curricula to establish pre-cooperatives/cooperatives for the first generation planned in October 2019
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	Continuous	No action done yet	Training of 27 trainers on DATAR tool				30%	3 provincial training on DATAR local users on Data collection are planned in August

Output 2.5: 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.	Continuous	No action done yet	1. 4324 ha of land cover by tree plantation; 2. 147 Km of river bank protected by bamboo; 3. 70 Km of contour lines in place				30%	1. 4500 degraded land restored SLM good practices (contour lines and agroforestry); 2. 2 500 000 of agroforestry and forestry trees will be produced 3. 150 Km of river bank protected by bamboo
Output 3.1: Government staff and extension workers trained and able to use relevant M&A tools and approaches, also in archiving and analyzing data	Continuous	A first team of 27 government staff trained on LADA-WOCAT	71 government staff trained on monitoring and evaluation tools such as: 1. EX-ACT : 22; 2. Collect Earth: 22 and 3. DATAR: 27				90%	Implementation of these M&E tools will proceed on the field
Output 3.2: 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.	Continuous	No action done yet	Training on Participatory FFS M&E tools for 30 FFS facilitators and 43 FFS groups such LADA-WOCAT and DATAR				20%	The project expects to train the first groups of cooperatives created with the FFS group which curricula have been completed (by November)
Output 3.3: Project results and experiences compiled, communicated widely and shared with the project regional hub and partner projects	Continuous	No action done yet	2 reports and a technical communication shared				60%	The present PIR will be the 2 nd and includes the 4 th PPR
Output 3.4: Project progress	Continuous	2 PPR and	1 PPR and 1PIR					The present PIR will be

reports prepared on time, mid and final review/ evaluation conducted							100%	the 2 nd and includes the 4 th PPR
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	------	---

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

Max 200 words:

In terms of institutional capacity building, the project carried out the following activities: (i) 3 GSADR were organized in the 3 provinces where the project was implemented and 151 representatives of government officials, technical and financial partners, territorial administration, NGOs and community representatives participated, (ii) 30 FFS facilitators for 43 FFS groups were recycled and 32 others targeted for the second training cycle.

In terms of improving community livelihoods, 1418 households grouped into 43 FFS have been involved in training on good agricultural practices, sustainable land management, experimental trials on productivity and agricultural production resilient to climate change. Agroecosystem Analysis (EASA) on various crops, and income-generating activities involving beans, wheat, corn, potatoes, soybeans, have been carried out.

With regard to environmental preservation, the project, in collaboration with OBPE and FFS groups, produced and planted 1,238,865 forest and agroforestry plants covering an area of 4,324 ha. In addition, 49,063 bamboo plants were produced to stabilize 147 km of river banks.

As part of the Monitoring and Evaluation of the project's impacts: (i) 98 government officials were trained on the following monitoring and evaluation tools: LADA-WOCAT, EXACT, Collect and Earth and DATAR, (ii) development of a communication strategy, (iii) Regular progress reports on project activities developed and (iv) Regular monitoring of project interventions on the ground by the PCU, LTO and BH on a regular basis.

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

Max 200 words:

A major constraint encountered in the implementation of the project: slow administrative procedures but it is hoped that with the arrival of the new Operations Officer the situation will be improved.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	During 2019, the project made significant progress in building stakeholder capacities, developing physical activities in the field through FFS groups, restoring degraded landscapes and monitoring and evaluating socio-economic and ecological impacts in the field.
Budget Holder	S	S	As the project teams are already operational, activities are proceeding normally and are in the process of revealing visibility in the field.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	S	S	The project is in general well managed and well-focused towards its objectives and outcomes. Only on the value chain component some delays must be highlighted due to some problems with the project team consultant responsible of this component. The consultant has been now replaced. A suggestion to improve the project performances is to pay a special attention both to the links between FFS groups and cooperatives to strengthen connections with the market, and to the reinforcement of linkages between FFS groups and INRM/watershed management.

¹⁵ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

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

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

GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	S	<p>Overall, the project implementation progress is satisfactory. During this reporting period the focus was geared towards stakeholder and partners involvement in project implementation particularly in: i) awareness raising and community mobilization at national, district and community levels; ii) initiating work in selected project sites through data collection and field diagnostics (LD and BD related) and initial SLM activities on the ground; iii) initiating capacity development among stakeholders at all levels on sustainable agricultural intensification, agro-forestry, soil and water conservation and integrated watershed management approach; iv) ensuring political and institutional buy-in for project, along with the dedication of project staff. The project made some progress towards promoting tested SLM/W practices using participatory approaches at field level which ensured participation of vulnerable groups, especially women. To improve uptake of the recommended practices and technologies the project is training FFS facilitators to facilitate peer to peer learning amongst beneficiaries.</p>
------------------------------------	----------	----------	---

3. Risks

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

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

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant.</i>

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Climate contingency risk: Drought	ML	The project will mitigate this risk by implementing SLM activities, watershed management and CCA&M policies and measures to strengthen pro-active and coordinated responses, as well as by initiating multi-stakeholder, community-based capacity-building initiatives (i.e. FFS). Appropriate partnerships and collaborations with on-going emergency/post-emergency initiatives and with governmental programmes regularly supporting crop health will improve responses to those risks.	No climate contingency concerning drought met during this reporting period.	

¹⁸ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

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

²⁰ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	Climate contingency risk: Floods	MH	<p>The project should work to improve catchment planning to reduce flood risk, including SLMs which enhance rainwater infiltration and water storage.</p> <p>Project to improve food storage facilities in rural areas.</p> <p>Co-financing project working to improve roads.</p>	No climate contingency regarding floods met during this reporting period.	
3	Social risks: Lack of social acceptance of introduced INRM/SLM tools and practices by the target groups will threaten the project's impact and sustainability	L	<p>Cultural values (e.g. linked to food preparation/preferences) and traditions (such as agricultural production methods) in a rural set-up hardly change. In order to ensure social acceptance by target groups and eventual wide-scale adoption of improved crops and INRM/SLM tools and practices, the project uses participatory approaches such as the FFS and HH-BAT to ensure that interventions meet, not only the norm of the social system, but also the different needs of women and men.</p> <p>Moreover, communities have been consulted during the preparation of the project and have expressed their interest and willingness to participate in the project activities.</p>	Communities through farmers field schools (FFS), community leaders and extension services are fully involved on implementing the project and they are enthusiastic of adopting SLM practices. The participatory methodology of FFS approach allowed to strengthen the social cohesion and the gender inequality.	

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Institutional risk: Limited involvement and weak cross-ministerial cooperation between the two involved ministries.	ML	<p>Introducing greater resilience and sustainability into food production systems will require stronger links between the environment and the agriculture sectors at all levels. The project is therefore designed with the view of strengthening cross-sectoral collaborations by establishing multi-sectoral policy and knowledge platforms (the Agriculture and Rural Development Group). Here the stakeholders' common interests, the project's multi-scale benefits (evidence based) and appropriate incentive mechanisms for each party's involvement will be identified and elaborated on. Activities will hence be designed and implemented in a win-win manner for all parties involved.</p> <p>The project's steering committee will also comprise of senior members from the partner government agencies ensuring constant involvement and coordination.</p>	<p>The participation and cooperation with the Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock has been developed at national and provincial level and resulted very effective. Multi-sectoral policy and knowledge platforms have been established. Also, a Projet Focal Point, 3 Provincial Project Focal Points, 30 FFS facilitators and local extension services come from this Ministry.</p>	

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
5	Political risk: reduction in political will and decrease in support from the government	ML	The government has fully and backed the development of the project and high level participation was ensured both at the project preparation and validation workshops. The project through its PSC will constantly coordinate with high level policy makers to keep them apprised and maintain their support for the project.	The government accepted to allocate counterpart as co-financing (offices, staff, ...) and participate on community mobilization and awareness raising around SLM practices and livelihoods.	
6	Security issues	MH	Project cannot mitigate	The security is guaranteed in the project area and throughout the country, which has allowed the project to work in a safe environment	

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	M	Any change in the rating since the previous reporting period.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

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

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

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	Original NTE: NA Revised NTE: Justification:

²¹ Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Through Farmer Field Schools (FFS), gender sensitive approach has been applied. With 43 FFS groups with 1418 persons, 67 % of women and 33 % of Male. In decision-making bodies in FFS committees, the participation rate of women is estimated at 50%. This approach will also be applicable for watershed committees planned in the two coming months.

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

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

Indigenous Peoples and others vulnerable groups in the project area have been consulted and their priorities will be considered during implantation activities in order to improve their livelihoods.

A NGO representative indigenous peoples (Batwa) in Burundi in currently recruiting to conduct consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

(i) Stakeholders involved

1. Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (MINEAGRIE) : institutional facilities
2. Project Steering Committee : Approve Annual work plan and budget, monitor implantation activities on the ground
3. Burundian Office for Environment Protection (OBPE) : production of Indigenous trees
4. Provincial Office of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (BPEAE) of Mwaro, Gitega and Muramvya
5. Geographic Institute of Burundi (IGEUBU) : PES on water
6. Agronomic Sciences Institute of Burundi (ISABU) : horticultures and improved avocado
7. Bioversity International: for agrobiodiversity seeds bank management
8. 3 locales NGO: for activities implementation on the ground regarding watershed management, communities capacities building on SLM and livelihoods
9. UNIPROBA: a local indigenous people, is currently recruiting to conduct FPIC.

(ii) The project have been actively participated on Stakeholders events such as :

- National day of tree plantation in December 2018
- World Food Day in October 2018,
- Avocado value Chain workshop organized by IFAD, Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock and Local NGO specialized on Avocado oil processing,
- World environment Day and International Fight against Desertification Day, June 2019

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

1. The project trained staff government on SLM tools (LADA-WOCAT, EXACT, Collect and Earth and DATAR) to contribute to monitor and assess the socio – economic and ecological project impacts on the field. These tools will also be used in others country, which are involved in the Regional IAP project.
2. Through Farmers fields schools, local community have been trained and implement various approaches and practices on how to improve soil productivity, crop production, cost and benefits analysis, SLM good practices in order to improve their sustainable livelihoods without disturbing the naturel resources.
3. Through the provincial GSADR platforms, the local administrative and others decision makers got knowledge on SLM practices (landscape management, climate change adaptation, nutrition, watershed approach,...) and their place and their responsibilities to sensitize and mobilize local communities on protecting their natural resources.

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	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	1 500 000		
GEF Agency	World Bank - PRODEMA	In Kind	6,000,000	800 000		
GEF Agency	World Bank - PADZOC	In Kind	14,110,728	400 000		
Government	MINAGRIE	In Kind	3,000,000	653 200		
GEF Agency	FAO	In Kind	500,000	200 000		
TOTAL			45 050 728	3 553 200		

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

²² Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

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