



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

Review PIF 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

10/18/2023

Review completed by PM

12/4/2023

Program Manager

Ladu David Morris Lemi

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

2. Project Summary

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 results?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

3 Indicative Project Overview

- 3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**
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?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, December 02, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

- a). Yes
- b). Yes, However, there are no outputs for component 1 (Enabling environment for climate resilience page 7), component 2 (sustainable landscape management page 8) and component 3 (Community livelihood resilience support) in the PIF document.

Please provide the expected project outputs for each component.

Agency's Comments
Thank you.

- b) Outputs added for the project components in the PIF document

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, December 04, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, December 02, 2023

Please address the gender comment below in the portal as indicated previously

GEFSEC, November 24, 2023

A part from the statement "The project will have a well-developed gender and social inclusion focus, because women make up a disproportionate share of the population in rural collines..." under component 3, there is no any other mention of gender in the whole

PIF and there is currently no outcome/output that specifically deals with gender. Please include gender perspective at the outcome/output levels as suggested previously.

GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

While the PID indicates that the project intends to develop and integrates gender and social inclusion focus across all components and gender elements are expected to be key results of the project, this is not currently reflected in the portal. Please elaborate on the gender dimensions of the project components and outputs, and include gender perspectives in the project description, as required at PIF stage.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

The team updated the PIF accordingly by clarifying where a greater gender focus will be applied (specific reference to Component 3).

Thank you.

- ToC revised with gender.

More details on gender activities for Components 1 and 3, as relevant. All updates in the PCN. -

12/04/2023 - Update of PIF to match PCN/PID of details on gender activities.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, November 24, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

- a). Yes
- b). No (higher co-financing)
- c). Yes. However, co-financing is higher. Please note that both the GEF and Co-financing contributions to PMC must be proportional. The current contributions are 5% for the GEF and 10% for Co-financing. For FSP like this, contribution is kept at less or equal to 5%.

Please revise the Co-financing accordingly.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

b) & c) - the PMC from co-financing has been reduced as requested down to below 5% of financing subtotal in proportion with the GEF PMC.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

a). Yes (provided in PID)

b). Yes (provided in PID)

Agency's Comments Thank you.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) 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?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, November 24, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

a). Yes.

b). Yes

c). Yes

d). No

Please provide details of the relevant stakeholders who will be involved in the implementation of the project and their respective roles in the project.

Additional information on stakeholder's respective roles in the project outcomes and any existing plans on stakeholder consultation in project development is also required.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Additional information added to the PIF specifying the lead implementing agency, as well as the other stakeholders that will be involved and with which cooperation will be key.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, November 24, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

- a). Yes
- b). No. Please refer to 3.1b above and address accordingly.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

- b) Outputs added for the project components in the PIF document

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, November 24, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

- a). No.
- b). No details are provided.
- c). No.
- d). Yes

Please provide details on existing institutional arrangements including project execution plans that have been put in place or yet to be confirmed. additionally, it is obvious that GEF or other partners have initiatives implemented or are being implemented in Burundi. Please highlights of those initiatives (i.e. lessons learned) including how this new project intends to cooperate with those initiatives during the implementation period.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

the World bank is not expected to play an executing role in this project. Additional information on institutional arrangements have been added in the PIF template as well as in the project document. The team has listed other projects (WB and non-WB) in the portfolio which are active in this space in Annex 3; also added int he PIF template.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project?'s indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, November 24, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

- a). Yes

b). Yes.

Please note that core indicators 1 and 4 can not be 0.0 as per the information given in the project document. For example, the project states that it will support climate-resilient livelihoods for the most climate-vulnerable communities and that it will also finance direct climate-resilient investment packages to support vulnerable communities' livelihoods resilience and income diversification (component 3); the GEF resources will support the scale-up of nature-based solutions for landscape restoration and integrated watershed management measures that will alleviate landslide, erosion, and flood risks currently affecting people, food production, livelihoods, and infrastructure as well as financing goods, services, and civil works, including high-intensity public works that provide employment opportunities for local communities (component 2); and that capacity-building support will be provided to strengthen institutional, technical, and human capacities (component 1).

All the above narrative proves that there are direct beneficiaries or people to be trained. Please revise and provide appropriate data for indicators 1 and 4.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Indicators 1 and 4 have been revised and data included in the core indicator template.

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

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, November 24, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

- a). No
- b). No.
- c). Yes

For points a & b, we take note of the overall project risk classification as "High or Substantial", please provide details on any expected risks that might affected the project throughout the lifecycle including any mitigation measures.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

the information is provided in the ESRS of the project. An updated ESRS will be provided at Appraisal stage (CEO Endorsement) after the project preparation is completed.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

- a). Yes
- b). Yes
- c). Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments 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's Comments
GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments 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's Comments
GEFSEC, October 26, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 26, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, November 24, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 24, 2023

No.

The document states that consultations was/were made with only the Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock of Burundi (MINEAGRIE) and that additional stakeholder consultations will be conducted during project preparation. Could you provide the exact dates when this consultation(s) were made.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Additional information on stakeholder consultations have been entered into the PIF template.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 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's Comments
GEFSEC, December 04, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

Yes (LDCF)

Please note that there is disparity between the figures entered into Annex A and those in the LoE. The figures must be the same as shown in the LoE or a new LoE should be provided.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

A new LOE is being issues by the country which will exclude a PPG. team awaiting final signature from OFP.

Thank you. LOE updated

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

CCA-1.1, CCA-1.2 and CCA-1.4

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

It is not clear is this requires a change. please advise.

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments
8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, December 02, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

No. However, the LoE indicates \$327,000 as PPG.

Please clarify the elimination of the PPG indicated in the LoE and provide a new LoE with correct amount.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

A new LOE is being issued by the country which will exclude a PPG. team awaiting final signature from OFP.

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, December 02, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

No.

First, the LoE template has been modified by removing the footnote which is an important part of the letter.

Second, the amount indicated in the LoE is different from the one in the portal. For example, the LoE indicates GEF Financing as \$18,048,624 and Fee as \$1,624,376, but the portal indicates GEF Financing as \$18,348,624 and Fee as \$1,651,376.

Third, The project title in the portal is different from the country endorsed project title

Please ensure that the distribution of the project amount and the project title in the portal is the same as shown in the LOE. Additionally, please provide a new LoE without modifying the template.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

A new LOE is being issued by the country which will exclude a PPG. Team awaiting final signature from OFP. The project title will also be corrected in the revised LOE

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments
Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, December 04, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, December 04, 2023

The Taxonomy section still remains blank in the portal. Please update

GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

No details have been provided.

Please provide the information

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

The taxonomy is tagged and showing as such from our end. please advise if it is still not showing and we can send the taxonomy by email as well.

Taxonomy added

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 27, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 31, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, December 04, 2023

The Agency to provide information about the the ESRS of the project.

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

| | PIF Review | Agency Response |
|---|-------------------|------------------------|
| First Review | 10/31/2023 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 11/24/2023 | |

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)

12/2/2023

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)