

Landscape restoration for increase resilience in urban and peri-urban areas of Bujumbura

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10099

Countries

Burundi

Project Name

Landscape restoration for increase resilience in urban and peri-urban areas of Bujumbura

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

10/10/2018

Review completed by PM

10/28/2020

Program Manager

Katya Kuang-Idba

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - Yes, it is aligned with CCA-1 and CCA-3.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - Clarifications requested. Some of the outputs are written as outcomes -- 1.4 (this seems like an end use, but not an output. Is the output the local development plan itself?); 3.3 (What is the specific output here? Is it a green entrepreneurship training program? Or what is the exact end product of the "increased access to finance" under this component (access to finance courses/training)?); 3.5 (What is the output here -- this seems to be delivering a number of end uses).

An outcome measures the achievement or longer term impact that will occur because of the services provided by this project. Outputs should be quantifiable and measurable against the project's outcomes - programs, trainings, workshops etc delivered.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - Thank you. This is cleared for this stage of project development.

Agency Response

UNDP, 12/10/2020: Outputs 1.4 and 3.3 rephrased to focus on the end "product", the risks maps for output 1.4, the solutions supported for 3.3. Knowledge management-related outputs (2.4 and 3.5), rewritten to focus on the knowledge products produced.

Revised outputs:

Output 1.4: Output 1.4: Flood and erosion risks maps developed for use in climate-resilient planning (urban development and investment in Bujumbura, local development plans in communes of the Ntakangwa watershed).

Output 2.4: Knowledge and guidance material on (i) landscape restoration, and (ii) flood management and protective infrastructures prepared and disseminated within Burundi and via South-South exchanges.

Output 3.3: Startup creation facilitated through the provision of technical support (training, mentoring) and finance (to invest in resilient practices and technologies);

Output 3.5: Knowledge and guidance material on (i) resilient livelihood options and (ii) and green entrepreneurship and startup creation leveraging urban, peri-urban and rural win-win opportunities for climate resilience prepared and disseminated within Burundi and via South-South exchanges.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/5/2020 - Not clear. Please provide more information on the three initiatives listed in Table C which are providing co-financing to the proposed initiative including project objective, main activities, and outcomes so that it is easier to determine the additionality of the requested LDCF financing as well as exactly what the LDCF is proposed to be covering within the context of the co-financing.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - This is cleared, although the timelines of these projects may not align considering many end in 2022-23. This is something to keep in mind at CEO ER.

Agency Response

UNDP, 12/10/2020: The three projects identified for the co-financing are now more detailed (objective, components) and more details on how they are relevant to the LDCF intervention and the basis for their co-financed contributions are explained.

UNDP, 28/10/2020: Noted, we will keep that in mind for the CEO ER.

Regarding the comment from GEFSEC below:

- 1) Guidance is provided on the Council decision GEF/C.39.9, including that there should be proportionality between the PMC covered by cofinanced amounts and the PMC covered by the GEF funding. Please refer to the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf and please amend.

The amount of the PMC co-financing has been raised to match the LDCF PMC. The co-financing will be provided in large part by the UNDP cash co-financing for the project.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
NA

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - Yes. Burundi is eligible to access \$10 million under the current adaptation programming strategy.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - NA. Please remove any entries from this table to avoid double counting (LDCF core indicators are provided through the spreadsheet uploaded on the portal).

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - Cleared.

Agency Response UNDP, 12/10/2020: All entries have been removed from Table F.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - Yes

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - Yes, the adaptation problems and barriers are well articulated.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - More information requested. As mentioned on the section on co-financing, it is not immediately clear at the moment which of the baseline projects are contributing co-financing to the proposed projects and therefore difficult to ascertain the additional costs in the context of what's already being financed. Please provide more information on those projects which are part of the baseline scenario and a distinction between those which are providing co-financing to this initiative.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - This is cleared.

Agency Response UNDP, 12/10/2020: Table 3 presenting the summary of the baseline projects in a table now includes a column to indicate which baseline projects contributes in terms of co-financing.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - Somewhat, more information requested. Please articulate how component 3 is tied to components 1 and 2 -- at the moment it seems the first two components are interrelated and that products financed under component 1 will inform and support the delivery of activities under component 2. Please briefly explain how the third component will tie together the project cohesively through the delivery of the green entrepreneurship activities proposed. Additionally, this component provides a strong entrypoint for green recovery from COVID-19, and as such, some articulation on how these activities will support building back better from the current crises would be appreciated.

Agency Response

UNDP, 12/10/2020: Component 1 provides the evidence-basis for integrated watershed planning, and will ensure that activities proposed in both Component 2 and Component 3 are implemented considering the watershed as a whole, taking into account the perspective and specific needs of urban, peri-urban and rural communities. Component 2 relies heavily on community support to restore ecosystem services in the watershed, the sustainability strategy of the project depends on this community engagement and support. Component 3 provides the support and incentives necessary to ensure buy-in from the watershed's communities engaged in Component 2 and promotes win-win strategies for rural upstream communities (EbA for resilient livelihoods options) and urban downstream communities (green entrepreneurship) to adopt land use and livelihood strategies that are conducive to the landscape stability and the maintenance of essential ecosystem services. Additionally, the market analysis planned under the Component 3 will provide viable options and strategies to be included in the planning processes under the Component 1.

Indeed, the project strategy hinges upon the long-term resilience building of the target vulnerable landscape and the residing community and therefore directly contributes to the post-COVID recovery. Additional information on the COVID-19 situation in Burundi have been added in the initial situation analysis, linkages with COVID-19 recovery efforts have been added in the description of Component 3.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - No. More information is required to determine the additionality of the proposed LDCF-financing, particularly on the baseline investments which are providing co-financing to this initiative. Please refer to the items on co-financing and the baseline scenario.

Agency Response UNDP, 12/10/2020: The description of baseline investments and projects identified as co-financing should now provide a better understanding of the additionality of the LDCF-financing. As of now, baseline investments in or near the Ntahangwa watershed have either no focus on adaptation/resilience or have only incidental resilience benefits for parts of the Ntahangwa watershed. The business-as-usual scenario described in the baseline scenario highlights this and this LDCF intervention will drive the additional adaptation investment aiming to address climate vulnerabilities in the Ntahangwa watershed (in close complementarity with the ongoing LDCF interventions that are ending by end of 2020).

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - More information requested. The number of hectares estimated to benefit from the intervention seems low for the amount going into this project, calling the cost effectiveness into question. Please provide the justification of how this was determined and calculated.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - Cleared for this stage of project development.

Agency Response UNDP, 12/10/2020: The 3,000 ha refer to the area of land where anti-erosion measures will be established under Output 2.2. The aim of the project is to make the majority of the watershed resilient to climate change, whose surface is estimated at 12,829 hectares. Pending a detailed GIS exercise during the PPG to draw the contour of the watershed and determine the watershed's area, the project will aim to achieve 10,200 ha under climate-resilient management, or 80% of the current estimated watershed area through the integrated watershed management plan and associated interventions on the ground.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - Please provide some information on how the project will ensure the sustainability of its activities even following project closure.

Agency Response

UNDP, 12/10/2020: The sustainability strategy is now further detailed in section 7. The LIPW scheme is important to ensure the sustainability of the land restoration activities, building on the engagement of local communities and the support provided to them through the third component with livelihood options compatible/contributing to watershed resilience. The aim is to reduce reliance on public funds to ensure the project's sustainability as Burundi is an LDC with a large public deficit projected to grow as the COVID-19 crisis deepens. Increasing self-reliance by supporting the economically viable and climate resilient land use and livelihood options is at the core of project's sustainability strategy. This will be complemented by the capacity and policy and planning work under the component 1 that will lock in and reinforce these approaches in the long term.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC< 10/6/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2929 - Yes. There is an indicative list of stakeholders to be engaged, which is sufficient for this stage of project development.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - More information requested. What are the specific gender elements of this project and specific to this project's activities? How will the project ensure female participation in the microfinance products delivered as part of output 3.4?

Agency Response UNDP, 12/10/2020: The gender section has been revised to explain how the components and activities promote gender equality and women's empowerment. The description of output 3.4 was revised to provide additional elements on how the project will engage and promote these financial facilities to women.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - Yes the information provided is sufficient for this stage of project development.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 10/6/2020 - More information requested. Climate risk is not listed, nor is fiduciary risk. Are either of these considered as major risks to the project? If so, please elaborate.

Agency Response UNDP, 12/10/2020: A climate-related risk and a fiduciary risk have been added to the risk table. Measures to limit fiduciary risks of nationally implemented projects are in place in Burundi, they include limitation on advances and direct payment modalities that prevent fund misuse (additional text in the project arrangement on measures to reduce the fiduciary risk were included). A screening of social and environmental safeguards risks is included with the PIF submission and identifies additional social and environmental risks, including a climate-related risk. During the PPG, a social and environmental safeguard plan will be prepared together with appropriate safeguard management measures to limit the impact of those risks should they arise during implementation.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - More information requested. There are two other LDCF projects that have either recently closed or are ongoing (AfDB - ECRAMB) and an FAO Project on using Farmer Field Schools for natural landscape rehabilitation -- is the project team in consultation with the proponents of these projects to maximize any potential synergies and prevent any duplication. Additionally, the GCF is financing projects in Burundi, including one readiness proposal. Please describe how this project is in coordination with the GCF financed initiatives.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - This is cleared for this stage of project development, but additional information regarding coordination with any GCF initiatives will be expected at CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

UNDP, 12/10/2020: The early warning system developed as part of the current LDCF project complemented and was harmonized with the climate and hydrological observation networks system built through the AfDB-led ECRAMB project, which ended in 2018. Coordination and synergies with the FAO project "Natural landscapes rehabilitation and Climate Change Adaptation in the provinces of Bujumbura and Bujumbura Mayor through a Farmer Field School approach" are

presented in the coordination section. To avoid duplication of efforts, the government asked UNDP to focus on the Ntakangwa watershed while the FAO is focusing on other areas of the Bujumbura and Bujumbura Mairie provinces.

The readiness proposal helped build the capacity of the GCF National Designated Authority in Burundi and is supporting the preparation of a preliminary NAP (due in November) and will be finalized in 2021. Consideration on the NAP are included in the section on National priorities (see the additional details in the response below).

UNDP, 28/10/2020: Noted.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSC, 10/6/2020 - More information requested. How will this project interface with the ongoing in-country NAP Process?

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - The information provided is sufficient for this stage of project development.

Agency Response UNDP, 12/10/2020: The NAP is planned for finalization in 2021 as part of UNDP's Climate Promise initiative to support the revision of Burundi's Nationally determined contributions (NDCs). The proposed LDCF project takes into account other national strategies upon which the NAP and NDCs are being built on. During the PPG, additional efforts will be made to ensure that the proposed LDCF project aligns with the approved NAP and revised NDC once they are approved. A consideration on the NAP and NDC has been additionally elaborated at the end of the section 7 on Consistency with National Priorities.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - The KM approach provided is sufficient for this stage of project development. More detailed information is expected at PPG.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC< 10/6/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/5/2020 - No. The endorsement letter is for a project with a different title from 2018. Please provide the updated LOE.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - Thank you for the clarification, this is cleared.

Agency Response UNDP, 12/10/2020: The endorsement letter was received in 2019 with the correct title, the old letter and the new one were both in the Portal, but it wasn't possible to remove the old letter from the system.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC , 10/5/2020 - Not yet. Please refer to the flagged items and the below and resubmit.

General comments:

- The GEF STAP continues to request an explicit Theory of Change (ToC) included at PIF stage (even a preliminary ToC would be sufficient for this stage of project development). Please refer to the STAP primer on this - <https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer>.

- Given the current context, the Secretariat would appreciate a more thorough analysis of the COVID-19 pandemic and its potential affects on this project, including impacts, risks, and opportunities posed by COVID-19. Please refer to this document on the GEF web site for more guidance:

<https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future>

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - Not yet. Please address the two comments below at your earliest convenience for consideration:

- 1) Guidance is provided on the Council decision GEF/C.39.9, including that there should be proportionality between the PMC covered by cofinanced amounts and the PMC covered by the GEF funding. Please refer to the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy: and please amend.
- 2) Please articulate a bit more on the integration of COVID risks and opportunities **specific** to this project into the project's design and approach if possible. The overall impact of COVID does not seem high in Burundi, particularly in comparison to other countries, so are there even any specific impacts to this project?

GEFSEC, 10/28/2020 - Yes. The agency has addressed these review items adequately for this stage of project development and this project is being recommended for technical clearance.

GEFSEC, 10/30/2020 - Please address the following:

- 1- There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC – it should be around 5% as it is the GEF contribution. Hence, for a co-financing of \$15,598,917, the expected contribution to PMC must be \$779,946 instead of \$425,353. Please amend.
- 2- Stakeholder engagement: Please provide a brief description of the stakeholder consultations that took place with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, civil society organizations and private sector entities, as indicated in the Stakeholders section (#2). Please note that the GEF Policy on Stakeholder Engagement (Nov 2017) requires that that at PIF stage ‘Agencies provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development...’
- 3- Co-financing: Please refrain using “public investment” for other than national/sub-national Agencies.

GEFSEC, 11/2/2020 - GPU Cleared.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 11/20/2018 - As decided by the LDCF/SCFF Council countries, including Burundi, that had GEF-6 projects in the pipeline were requested to hold consultations with the GEF Secretariat on adaptation priorities and LDCF programming at the onset of the GEF-7 period.

In light of the recent National Dialogue and consultation held from 10 to 12 October 2-19, the Operational Focal Point has been requested to confirm the current LDCF priorities. The Agency is requested await and duly consider the priority confirmation before considering to re-submit the proposal.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - This project has been confirmed as a priority by the OFP during consultation with the GEFSEC in December 2019 at COP25.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/6/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/27/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/28/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Burundi. *Landscape Restoration for Increased Resilience in Urban and Peri-Urban Areas of Bujumbura* (GEF ID: 10099) Agency: UNDP; GEF Project Financing: \$10,000,000 Co-financing: \$16,024,270. This project aims to increase the resilience of watershed communities in and around Bujumbura through a resilient integrated watershed management approach. The project will address the vulnerability of urban and peri-urban communities of Bujumbura and the Ntahangwa watershed to the increased frequency of floods, storm runoffs and landslides projected by climate models. It will achieve

this through three components: (i) Developing technical capacities for climate-induced flood and erosion risks mapping and their use to inform climate-resilient integrated watershed management and other planning processes; (ii) Ecosystems services for flood and erosion protection restored and flood protection measures to improve the resilience of communities in the Ntampang watershed and in Bujumbura; (iv) Livelihoods options and green entrepreneurship to increase resilience of the urban, peri-urban, and rural communities in the Ntampang watershed. The project will build on the previous LDCF intervention in the Ntampang watershed to increase the resilience of at least 120,000 people (8% of the population of the target areas), while benefitting 10,000 (about 80% of the watershed's estimated area) under more sustainable and climate resilient land practices. The integrated watershed and flood management practices will ensure the increased resilience of both upstream highland communities and downstream lowland communities living in more urban areas through a comprehensive planning and management approach making use of climate information available in the country together with specific investments in landscape restoration, flood management measures and resilient livelihoods support. Landscape restoration in areas connected to Bujumbura will help restore flood-related ecosystem protection for both highland upstream communities and lowland urban communities with adaptive solution ranging from tree planting to watershed protection and reinforcement of riverbanks structures. To complement the restoration efforts, livelihood activities will promote green entrepreneurship and provide better access to markets (at this stage, the main sectors targeted are agriculture and agro-industry as well as the charcoal sector); thus connecting urban communities to peri-urban communities in the watershed. The charcoal sector's reliance on trees makes it a prime sector to target through a climate-resilient value chain approach. The agro-business sector will benefit from increasing the value of agricultural products and creating new investment opportunities. The urban focus of this project opens new doors to tap into the nascent startup ecosystems of Bujumbura while providing support for youth entrepreneurship and employment opportunities.