



Scaling up Nature-Based Solutions for Climate Resilience and Land Restoration across Burundi's fragile colline landscapes

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11397

Countries

Burundi

Project Name

Scaling up Nature-Based Solutions for Climate Resilience and Land Restoration across Burundi's fragile colline landscapes

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

6/4/2024

Review completed by PM

6/24/2024

Program Manager

Ladu David Morris Lemi

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 13, 2024

Yes

Agency Response Thank you.

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 13, 2024

Yes

Agency Response Thank you.

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 13, 2024

a) Yes. However, there is still a missing linkage.

The project discusses about land degradation and climate change, however, the link between climate change and land degradation as well as the drivers is not clear. Secondly, I have not seen STAP's recommendation incorporated into the document. For example, STAP has observed that "the PIF and PID do not make the **case for an adaptation investment** as much as they do a land degradation investment, and it is difficult to assess the potential efficacy of the proposed project and its interventions without an understanding of the trends they are supposed to change. Additional efforts to examine climate trends and land degradation in Burundi may be helpful for uncovering these linkages in order to clarify the climate rationale for this project and also support selected interventions".

Please refer to STAP report on "Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions" points 1 & 2. Some of the information document provided as response to STAP need to be incorporated in the PIF/PID

b) Yes

GEFSEC, August 27, 2024

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

a) additional information added in the PAD. The team has additionally provided a technical annex as a response to GEF comments to the PAD to define land degradation and explore its nexus with climate change and implications in the Burundian context. By examining land degradation indicators such as changes in vegetation cover, soil erosion rates, and landslide susceptibility, the role of climate change such as increasing precipitation and temperature patterns in exacerbating land degradation is clearly explained.

The annex underscores the need for climate-proof land use practices considered as ?adaptation investment? to mitigate the adverse impacts of climate change on soil quality, agricultural productivity, and community resilience.

In terms of addressing these issues, the PAD now clearly discussed ?the link between climate change and land degradation, as well as the drivers? behind these issues on pages 5-15 of the PAD.

b) N/A

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSPs up to \$2 million) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 17, 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes, however, under M&E, please ensure the gender dimensions are reported on and monitored, and that the GAP is budgeted. Also ensure that subcomponents 2.2, 3.2, and 3.4 address and tackle the financial constraints and barriers, especially among rural women, that go beyond gender parity in financial schemes, with ongoing support and capacity building.

d) Yes

e) No. While the GEF contribution is within the $\leq 5\%$ the Co-financing is more than 8%. Please ensure that there is an equal proportionality between the two contributions making sure they are kept at 5% maximum.

Agency Response

Thank you

c) Gender dimensions have been captured under disaggregated indicators under PDO indicator and intermediate indicators. A specific indicator includes ?land certificates delivered, of which bear the woman?s name (percentage)?

The Social Assessment with a Gender Perspective has been budgeted with an estimate cost of 20 000 USD under sub-component 4.3. activities as it is considered a social safeguards? instrument.

Under subcomponent 2.2., gender gaps in watershed management relate, amongst others, to (i) underrepresentation in leadership roles; (ii) inadequate focus on women?s engagement; (iii) unequal access to decision making; (vi) lack of access to credit and financial products; (v) land ownership; (vi) access to resources; (vii) economic empowerment.

As such, the subcomponent will benefit from LDCF resources dedicated to supporting the application of innovative NBS, co-designed with the involvement of local communities, including women and socially vulnerable groups, to enhance the climate resilience of ecosystems and livelihoods, and sustainable land management. The approach may include the deployment of innovative financial instruments, with full engagement and participation of communities, including youth and women. LDCF resources will enable us to take advantage of the potential of NBS in providing socio-economic benefits, while mitigating climate change and improving ecosystem resilience through a participatory approach that enables the identification of communities', in particular rural women's, needs to address financial constraints and barriers in watershed management.'.

Moreover, subcomponent [2.1](#) shall finance activities that include the creation of sub-watershed management committees, promoting integrated decision-making, with the inclusion of all actors mandated in landscape and watershed management covering the project target sub-watersheds, through structured community mobilization and beneficiary selection processes, ensuring social inclusion and leadership of women within them. Subcomponent 3.3. will support women's access to land certificates, through the deployment of targeted activities focusing both procedural support and outreach. In addition, please note that GEF does not finance the activities under component 3.

e) Further explanation is provided in the justification box under the PMC and in the waiver document attached. Please note that the GEF PMC remains well below 5% of the subtotal.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 17, 2024

- a) Yes, however, also refer to (2a) above
- b) Yes
- c) N/A

GEFSEC, August 27, 2024

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you

5 B. Project Description

- 5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?**
- b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**
- c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**
- d) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?**
- e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic co-benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?**
- f) Is the financing presented in the annexed budget table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?**
- g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?**
- h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?**
- i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?**
- j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**
- k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?**
- l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

Overall (a, b & c), please take note of STAP's comment on point 2 (Project rationale, and project description ? are they sound?) which stated that: "While the theory of change (ToC) responds to these challenges, each of the causal pathways are not clearly reflected in the diagram in terms of connecting the barriers to the proposed components", and address accordingly.

d) Yes

e) Yes

f) Yes, but the contributions to the PMC are not proportional to each other. Please note GEF contribution must be equal to Co-financing portion kept at a maximum of 5.0% or less for both

g) Strengthening institutional capacity and policy frameworks have been identified in that regard

h) Yes

i) Yes

j) Yes

k) N/A

l) Yes (Setting up committees and involving local expertise like national universities/Training institutions).

GEFSEC, August 27, 2024

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

a), b), c) Thank you. Please note that the ToC has been clearly outlined with pathways and the STAP responses have been updated.

f) Please see response in section above.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects OFP to request exception).

Is GEF in support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

a) Yes

b) Execution will be done by the government

c) Yes

Agency Response Thank you.

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits ambitious yet realistic?

Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

a) Yes. However, in the key risks table under "political and governance", it states that " the project also proposes to engage with the private sector....." as a risk mitigation. Yet in Core indicator 5, there is not indication of any private sector actor expected to be engaged. Please clarify.

b) Yes except Core indicator 5 as explained in 5.3a above.

GEFSEC, August 27, 2024

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

a) Thank you for flagging this. The core indicator has now been updated and the documents are now aligned.

5.4 Risks

a) **Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**

b) **Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**

c) **Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

Agency Response Thank you.

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

N/A

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

Yes

Agency Response Thank you.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

Yes (such as the National Development Plan (2018) and Vision 2025, National Water Strategy 2011-2020, Environmental, Agricultural and Livestock Policy Document, and the Integrated Farming Plan)

Agency Response Thank you.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

N/A

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

Yes

Agency Response Thank you.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

Please address this item as the project stated that there would be "a well-developed gender and social inclusion focus". Any guiding document to effect that? Please upload the Gender Action Plan you have for this project.

Agency Response

Thank you.

A gender action plan has been uploaded in the roadmap. The PIU is additionally planning to on further preparation of a Social Assessment with a Gender perspective. The purpose of the assessment is to enable a better understanding of the social impacts of the project, with a focus on gender issues, and to identify differences in the needs, expectations and potential impacts of the project on men and women, as well as on different social groups. It will therefore enable the PRCCB project's planning and implementation to place the human factor, stakeholders, target groups, intended beneficiaries or other affected people at the very heart of development interventions

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

Yes

Agency ResponseThank you.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

Yes

Agency ResponseThank you.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

Yes

Agency Response Thank you.
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

CCA-1-1

Agency Response Thank you.
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

Yes

Agency Response Thank you.
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

No

Agency Response
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

No

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

No

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

N/A

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

Yes

Agency Response Thank you.

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

Yes (IDA Grant). However, the letter of co-financing support is missing. Please submit the letter of support confirming the \$50 million World Bank Co-Financing.

Agency Response

Thank you.

Co-financing letter has now been uploaded

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs were provided: Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

N/A (This is national project)

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

Yes (National project)

Agency ResponseThank you.

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

Yes

Agency ResponseThank you.

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

d) Yes

Agency Response Thank you.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table?

(Note: the provision of maps is at the discretion of agencies considering sensitivities in the given context)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

Yes

Agency Response

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the

safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

Yes

Agency Response Thank you.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

a) No. (This has not been provided either in annex G or separately).

b) No

c) No.

Please address this as Annex G has not been filled out and there is no related attachment as well.

Agency Response

Thank you.

The GEF Budget is now updated.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

N/A

Agency Response

ANNEX I: Responses to Project Reviews

8.11 a) Have responses to Council comments, if any, at PIF/PCN stage been provided?

- b) Have responses to STAP screen, if any, been provided?
- c) Have responses to other comments, if any, been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

- a) N/A
- b) Yes
- d) N/A

Agency Response Thank you.

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval /endorsement

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

TBD

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, June 23, 2024

TBD

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/23/2024	

**CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)