

Burundi Landscape Restoration and Resilience Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10594

Countries

Burundi

Project Name

Burundi Landscape Restoration and Resilience Project

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

5/29/2020

Review completed by PM

2/10/2021

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

CEO Approval Request

Part I ? Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

- At PCN, we highlighted a potential concern on the use of LD1.1 objective on SLM and the absence of LD1.3 (restoration) and eventually LD1.4 (landscape). Now that the project strategy has been revised and the number of ha under restoration is the main field indicator, it is clear that the GEF annex should include the LD1.3 objective on restoration.
- If you want to maintain a single LD objective for the sake of simplicity, we suggest using the LD1.3 specifically defined for landscape restoration and remove the LD 1.1 for SLM on productive landscape (comment already made and not addressed or responded at PCN).
- Thanks for the revision of the Rio Markers in the portal (CCM 1, CCA 0). However, the information is not coherent with the GEF Data Sheet, as highlighted at PCN level. Please, correct.

September 15, 2020

- This discussion on the selection of LD objectives was important to well define the project focus and propose coherent indicators. We noted that the targets for the indicators 3.2, 4.3, and 6 have been adjusted (respectively on forest restored, SLM, and carbon), as well as the number of beneficiaries. Cleared.
- However, please note that the table A in the GEF Data Sheet and the portal should be revised. In the text field for the Focal Area Outcomes, we should read ?Transformation of food systems through sustainable production, reduced deforestation from commodity supply chains, and increased landscape restoration.? Please, correct both in the GEF Data Sheet and the portal.

January 18, 2021

Not addressed.

Portal, Table A: In the FA outcomes, include the IP objective "Transformation of food systems through sustainable production, reduced deforestation from commodity supply chains, and increased landscape restoration".

February 1st, 2021

Addressed

Agency Response

WB Response Feb 09, 2021: Thank you. Noted clearance.

WB Response Jan 26, 2021: Table A in the GEF portal is now corrected to only indicate the IP FOLU in a single row (and not by Focal area). At the time of previous submission, the portal was not accepting deletions of rows perhaps due to a glitch. This is now corrected.

December 22, 2020: Point is noted. Recommended change to outcome text has been made in the portal GEF Data Sheet/CER.

WB Response August 31, 2020: Since PCN stage, as per recommendation, the FA objective has been revised to LD 1.3.

On the Rio Markers, the GEF data sheet has been aligned (CCM 1).

2. Project description summary. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Since PCN, an effort was made to make the information in the project paper and the GEF annex consistent.

- We made comments at PCN about the formulation of the project title, objective, and framework. We understand the decision to maintain the language from the parent project. However, please check the consistency of information: 1) the project title in the header is different and 2) the project objectives are different between the portal, the GEF datasheet, and the project paper.

- Please ,check the nature of components (TA vs. Inv) and the budgets (component 4: 224,286 in the portal vs. 264,286 in the GEF annex).

- Check the metrics for the different indicators (# of ha under SLM, under restoration).

September 15, 2020

Thanks for the change. However, please, check the amounts for the component 2 in the project paper (\$4.56 million) and the GEF Data Sheet (\$4.6 million). Please correct. The numbers should also be coherent in the portal.

About the indicators, the targets are coherent in the portal, the GEF Data Sheet and the project paper: 3.: 11,200 ha of forests restored; 4.3: 3060 ha under SLM; 4.1: 1,475,000 tons of CO2e over a 20-year period; 11: beneficiaries: 48,500: 26,250 women + 22,250 men.

January 18, 2021

- With the cancellation of the PCSP, can you maintain the current Theory of Change, still including "improved value chain strategies and practices for sustainable coffee systems and sourcing"?

February 1st, 2021

Addressed

Agency Response

WB Response Feb 09, 2021: Thank you. Noted clearance.

WB Response Jan 26,2021: Please note that the cancelation of the CSCP mainly resulted in the removal of those proposed activities which relied on the CSCP's led outputs, including, more specifically, the training to auditors on ecological certification and support to two local washing stations on ecological certification. In addition, under Component 1? Institutional Development and Capacity Building for Landscape Restoration and Resilience? support to inform stakeholders? strategic decisions and practices economic and environmental benefits of sustainable and resilient agricultural practices remains but was broadened beyond coffee (e.g. as coffee, tea, fruits (agroforestry), other horticulture) in line with a need to promote agricultural diversification which underpins community and landscape resilience. Core activities supporting production through coffee growers? associations and cooperatives remain along the related indicators in the results framework. Therefore, we believe that the impact "improved value chain strategies and practices for sustainable coffee systems and sourcing" is still very relevant within the context of the Theory of Change. Noting the comment, the Theory of Change has been slightly revised in the Project Paper to remove

?Ecological certification auditors trained? as Output, which was an oversight in the last revision.

December 22, 2020: The documents were checked and have been found to be consistent and are now coherent. Please note that Component 2 cost in PP is 4.56M (Table 1 as well as Project Description) and similar to the Portal CER/Datasheet (Table B).

Evolving context: Owing to the evolving baseline context in Burundi both due to the institutional reforms in the coffee sector and the changing priorities owing to the COVID-19 pandemic, small adjustments have been made to the project paper during appraisal of the project in discussion with the Government counterparts and the WB's country management unit. A key development has been on the status of the Bank's Coffee Sector Competitiveness Project (CSCP) which after a long period of uncertainty is in the process of being canceled owing to shifting priorities and reforms in Burundi's coffee sector. This has resulted in a lower associated baseline cofinancing and removal of those proposed parallel activities (minor change) which relied on specific CSCP's led outputs (e.g. certification). Cofinancing leverage options will be revisited during implementation as the pandemic situation evolves. Finally, owing to the country's request for refocusing support for resilience of the communities given the pandemic context, the promotion of diversification by the project (with coffee and tea, fruits, other horticulture crops etc.) has been better emphasized as critical to the sustainability of landscapes and the resilience of communities. All indicators of the Results Framework, especially those introduced for FOLUR (coffee) and activities remain as before. Following final assessments during Appraisal by the Client, small refinement have been made to two targets (landscape area reforested at the periphery of the Kibira National Park and corresponding GHG estimation) to capture realistic coverage area aligned with the limited budget of Component 3 (400,000 USD) which also includes a broader set of activities along with support to plantations (Park's maintenance with Indigenous Peoples, Revenue Generating Activities with local communities).

WB Response August 31, 2020: Following discussions and comments that were clarified at the projects decision meeting, the below further clarifies the above comments.:

- - The project title has been adjusted in the portal.
- - The project objective in the Data Sheet has been aligned with the Project Paper and the Bank's portal

- - Component 1 and 4 are both TA, the other components are Investments. The value of C4 in the datasheet and the portal have been aligned (the correct amount is \$264,286). The PMC (285,714) is reflected separately in the PMC row as per the GEF portal template.
- - The metrics of the indicators has been checked, with 3,060 ha and 11,200 ha for, respectively, landscapes under improved practices and restored land.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

No.

- We take note of the presence of minutes of negotiation in French. Please provide an informal translation highlighting the project title, the amount in US\$, the nature of cofinancing (grant), and the time frame of the project.
- We did not find any evidence for the cofinancing in -kind from the government. Please, correct.

September 15 2020

Cleared.

January 18, 2021

- The cofinancing is still at a ratio of 1:5, but since the last submission, the cofinancing has decreased from \$46 to \$31 million. We understand that this decrease was provoked with the cancellation of the Coffee Sector Competitiveness Project, significantly changing the context of interventions. Some explanations would be welcome.
- Please, note that an informal translation of the minutes of negotiation of the BLRRP are available in the documents, but the minutes of negotiations provided in the portal are related to the Coffee Sector Competitiveness Project, but not those from the Parent Project . Please, revise .
- Note that a wrong document is also logged in the "documents" in place of the Letter of Endorsement. It might be a portal issue. Please, verify.

February 1st, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response

WB Response Feb 09, 2021: Thank you. Noted clearance.

WB Response Jan 26,2021:

- The cancellation of CSCP has indeed resulted in a lower associated baseline cofinancing, as was explained in the earlier responses and the evolving context in Burundi. The cancellation follows the recent major institutional restructuring of the coffee sector in Burundi with newly formed Office de Développement du Café (ODECA) taking over functions previously implemented by other entities (now dissolved) including the Coffee Sector Regulatory Authority ARFIC (which inter alia promoted ecological coffee production and certification), the multi-stakeholder value-chain association Intercaf?, and the national coffee producers' confederation CNAC (earlier involved e.g. in training of producers as well as buying and selling cherries). While ODECA is not meant to replace the private sector, many operational details will be specified in the upcoming months. Intercaf?, CNAC and other entities now dissolved were key implementing partners of the CSCP as per the financing agreement signed between the Bank and the Government of Burundi. Given that the reform has introduced a new institutional set up for the coffee sector in Burundi, it no longer aligns with the proposed implementing arrangements of the CSCP (and requires cancellation). But on the other hand opens a broader mid- to long-term dialogue between the Bank and Government of Burundi on the needs of the sector as a whole (especially institutional) taking into account the major reform under implementation. The proposed GEF AF activities promoting restoration of coffee degraded landscapes and focusing on coffee production activities with local producers and cooperatives remain highly, if not more, relevant and supported by the government. As noted by GEF SEC, the cofinancing is still at a ratio of 1:5, and the Burundi Landscape Restoration and Resilience Project (BLRRP) still provides a strong baseline and context as before for the proposed GEF funding (fully blended across all its components).

- Noted. BLRRP Minutes of Negotiations and its translation has been uploaded again with the package. The signed minutes of negotiations of the BLRRP was submitted on 5/26/2020 but labeled CSCP in error. Please see page 3 of the roadmap documents in the portal.

- The correct LoE was uploaded in the portal (8/14/2020 in the Roadmap). Rechecked the entry and the correct letter is indeed attached (clear and legible). Kindly confirm with the GEF portal team for any glitch. The letter has been sent via email for reference as well.

December 22, 2020: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

- As requested Informal translations of the Minutes of the Negotiations for the parent project and the CSCSP (without the annexes) have been attached for GEFSEC reference only, and not for public disclosure.
- Letter from the Government confirming the counterpart cofinancing is now submitted with the package. It should be noted that these are usually confirmed during negotiations.

5. GEF resource availability. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

This project under a global program is a chance for the country to be visible and make progress on food system and landscape restoration issues.

The GEF resources are provided by STAR resources from the country (\$4 million) and the FOLUR incentive (\$2 million). We understand the focus on landscape restoration on the ground, but we would like to see a well-articulated KM and coordination strategy at the local, the national level, and beyond with the FOLUR and the coffee producer countries.

September 15, 2020

Addressed.

Agency Response

December 22, 2020: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

KM activities form a substantial part of the AF, as reflected for instance in the bottom part of the Theory of Change. A specific paragraph has been added in the main text of the Project Paper to capture the main directions of the approach to KM under the AF. The team will also work with the Client to further specify the KM strategy as it further prepares the project. These KM activities are actually dealt with under different components, in support of the project's own strategy. The purpose is to make sure related activities directly contribute to the expected outcomes related to each of the components. For instance, Component 1 includes several KM activities that contribute to promoting sustainable practices and strategies, as well as integrated landscape planning at watershed scale among national stakeholders). Component 2 will, as part of Farmer Field Schools promotion, implement significant KM activities at local level targeting the local communities, firms and other relevant stakeholders operating in the area. Component 4 will support Burundi's participation in FOLUR's annual meetings, conferences and events. About \$0.8M are earmarked for related activities. They will also build on similar KM activities under the parent project, e.g. recent experience capitalization workshop on engaging communities for conservation in PAs (March 2020), collaboration with the FAO promoted knowledge exchange platform on SLM, and exchange visits with Eastern African countries on landscape restoration operations. Finally, one intermediate level indicator has been added on KM (Component 1).

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response **WB Response August 31, 2020:** Noted.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response **WB Response August 31, 2020:**Noted.

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed (\$2 million).

Agency Response **WB Response August 31, 2020:** Noted.

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

- The number of ha under SLM and restoration have not been updated with the figures in the project paper and the GEF Annex. Please, revise.
- For the core-indicator on Emissions avoided, we would expect that at least for forest restoration the benefits would be direct and not indirect. Please include the FAO-Ex Act tool at CEO Endorsement, as well as a note to explain the assumptions, and the selection of the different criteria (comment already made and not addressed or responded at PCN).

September 15, 2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

December 22, 2020: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

Under the AF, the "Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems" is +3,060 ha, and the "Area of land restored" is +11,200 ha, with a "Total area under improved management" of 14,260 ha. These figures are indicated in the Data Sheet (Annex F as well as table of Section F of main text) and the Project Paper under Project Description (Components 2 and 3), the Results Framework (two new sub-indicators at PDO level) as well as Appendix 5 on GEF specific information.

On Emissions avoided, indeed, under component 3, most benefits of forest restoration will be direct (as now reflected in the Appendix 4, Economic Analysis, in the Project Paper).

Annex I of the GEF data sheet and Appendix 8 of the Project Paper indicates the main assumptions that have been used for the EXACT based estimate. These elements have been added to the Data Sheet under Section F, following the table.

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response **WB Response August 31, 2020:** Noted. Thank you.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Project Description. Is there sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The description in the text and the ToC are fine. We made comments at PCN stage about the lack of information on the challenges and barriers beyond the production level/activities. There is still not much information on the coffee value chain itself, the challenges faced by smallholder farmers, the private sector, the value chain governance

from the producers to the national level. We wonder if this information is available in the CSCSP, the coffee competitiveness project.

In our understanding, all the coffee value chain aspects should be covered by the CSCSP. It is for this reason, that the current proposal focuses on landscape restoration and stays relatively discrete on the coffee aspects. Please, confirm.

September 15, 2020

Thanks. The appendix 7 indeed is very instructive about the coffee sector in Burundi. Cleared.

Agency Response

December 22, 2020: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

Indeed, we can confirm that the CSCSP has been the World Bank's major, strategic investment effort (US\$55M in total) to support the coffee sector and related value-chain in Burundi, including with regards to the respective stakeholders and institutions. In that context, dealing with sector organizational issues goes beyond the scope and capacity of this AF. Therefore, the AF will focus on *sustainable* coffee promotion in Burundi specifically. Hence, annex 7 provides an analysis on *sustainable* coffee promotion in Burundi, in particular with regards to the related key challenges that smallholder farmers and washing stations face.

2. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request This is an additional financing. The baseline scenario is not detailed, but is available in the parent project. We are comfortable with the proposed approach, as the project team was extended to FAO specialists, and the GEF6/FAO IAP project is now included in the text both because of the SLM Alliance at national level and the development of Farmer Field Schools, FFS.

Agency Response **WB Response August 31, 2020:** Noted. Thank you.

3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The alternative scenario is fine.

However, in connection with the FOLUR strategy, we wonder if the KM strategy is enough structured, from the local to the national level and the sub-regional coffee landscape, and with the other WB projects, the IFAD and FAO projects (notably the national SLM alliance).

A more accurate framework would help to estimate a better budget.

The current budget seems very low for significant KM, coordination, and project management.

Component 4 stays vague in terms of information on engagement with other coffee producing countries and the Global Coordination Project. More detailed information on plans for engagement should be included. Are there any plans for participation in any global commodity platforms?

September 15, 2020

Thanks. The KM strategy has been clarified in the responses and a revised text is available in the project paper. KM is seen as a cross-cutting activity anchored in the different project components: in the component 1 to generate knowledge on the value chain and sustainable practices, in the component 2 targeting the communities and concerned stakeholders, and in the component 4 focusing on the exchanges in the broader context of the FOLUR, with partners (FAO, among others) and neighboring countries, as Ethiopia. Other activities are planned in the parent program.

Cleared.

Agency Response

December 22, 2020: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

As mentioned earlier, a paragraph on the KM approach has been added in the main text: it emphasizes the fact that related activities will be undertaken under the different components to contribute to the respective outcomes. As a result, the related budget is actually higher than what it may seem (e.g. many Component 1 and Component 4 activities are clearly KM related). They are structured along the same lines as the project components, where Comp. 1 focuses essentially on the national/sector level with an emphasis on the selected key issues identified (e.g. ecological certification and organic coffee perspectives/opportunities) in order to inform/influence national stakeholders strategies and practices, Comp. 2 on the local level in the targeted landscapes of Kayanza, and Comp. 4 on international exchanges. Under certification related activities,

the AF will link up with the Rainforest Alliance. Activities will also build on the KM activities of the parent project, such as on the SLM exchange platform and regional exchanges to learn from experiences on sustainable landscape management and restoration (related plans, e.g. with Ethiopia, have been postponed due to Covid 19).

As indicated in the Project Paper, sub-regional exchanges with other coffee projects in Eastern Africa have already been planned under the AF. National institutions/stakeholders are very interested in learning from these experiences. In addition, as part of the national coffee strategy, national stakeholders have already started expanding their global networks to promote Burundi's coffee in specialty markets. They also wish to further strengthen their participation in relevant international platforms to amplify the national strategic priority to strengthen its participation in sustainable coffee markets on specialty coffee markets, in particular sustainable coffee markets. Towards this, AF supported international exchanges will focus on those specific issues that have been identified in the Project Paper (e.g. promoting benefits and opportunities regarding sustainable production and landscape management practices, as well as ecological certification and responsible sourcing), including the key challenges described for farmers participation in the Annex 7. Related plans, including participating in global commodity platforms, are yet to be specified under this AF, and the project team will actually seek guidance from the Global Coordination Project. Also, as the KM strategy is further developed during preparation, targeted exchanges will be specified.

4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

At PCN, we highlighted a potential concern on the use of LD1.1 objective on SLM and the absence of LD1.3 (restoration) and eventually LD1.4 (landscape).

Now that the project strategy has been revised and the number of ha under restoration is the main field indicator, it is clear that the GEF annex should include, and probably specifically, the LD1.3 objective on restoration.

We understand that the language of the parent project is maintained for the component 3 (**Improved Management of Protected Areas and Reserves**, USD 400,000), but the work is aligned with the FOLUR program component on *Conservation and restoration of natural habitats*.

September 15, 2020

We understand that GEF-financed activities under the component 3 will not directly finance protected area management but will support participative land management practices in the riparian landscapes to reduce encroachment within the Kibira National Park. Batwa communities will be particularly targeted. Communication and awareness campaigns will involve local conservation groups. Income-generating activities based on

alternative livelihoods and sustainable agricultural production will be promoted to reduce pressures and destructive use of natural resources in and around the Kibira NP.

Agency Response

December 22, 2020: Yes and Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

See earlier response to a similar comment. LD1.1 has been changed to LD 1.3.

Indeed, in general as per Banks Investment Process and guidelines for additional financing, the title and structure of the parent project are maintained. The context for FOLUR and synergy with its components as a child project has been detailed.

5. Project Description. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed at PFD level, the EoI, and the PCN.

Agency Response **WB Response August 31, 2020:**Noted. Thank you.

6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed at PFD level, the EoI, and the PCN.

Agency Response **WB Response August 14, 2020:** Noted. Thank you.

7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

At PCN, our comment about sustainability was not addressed. We understand we cannot ask too much on sustainability for a \$6 million project, but this GEF grant comes in addition to a \$30 million IDA grant and the CSCSP project on competitiveness, and in synergy with FAO and IFAD projects.

In continuity with a former comment, a more robust KM strategy may help improving the language on scaling up, innovation, and sustainability.

September 15, 2020

Cleared

Agency Response

December 22, 2020: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

A paragraph on sustainability has been added in the main text of the Project Paper to further clarify. However as presented earlier the project addresses key factors of sustainability including:

- Political will and strategic strength: strong alignment with the country's strategy to promote specialty coffee and restore landscapes at large scale;
- Farmers/Community driven development: using community participatory approaches and farmer led extension systems;
- A long term effort: considering the scale of landscape restoration/management needs in Burundi (as prioritized in the 2019 Country Partnership Framework (CPF)), the AF like the Parent Project are explicitly considered as the first element of a cycle of potential successive projects (see e.g. Parent PAD).
- Economic soundness: building on systems that have proved effective;
- Link with other operations, including locally (choice of the targeted area): parent BLRRP, IFAD project?
- Drawing the proposed systems and approaches from successful experience, e.g.: shade coffee system and forest restoration promotion from the PADZOC experience; and productive landscape restoration and management from experience in Rwanda and Ethiopia;
- Implementing analytical and dialogue activities to inform stakeholders' strategies and practices in the longer run.

As suggested previously, the many KM activities of the AF (and related parent project) will indeed contribute to the project outcomes, including in terms of sustainability, as well as scaling up/out, and innovation promotion.

8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

A map and coordinates of the targeted landscapes are available. In future PIRs, more accurate coordinates will be needed to geo-reference the restoration work.

Cleared.

Agency Response **December 22, 2020:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, however there could be more discussion on how the project will collaborate with other coffee producing countries in the sub-region which are also involved in FOLUR.

September 15, 2020

Cleared

Agency Response

December 22, 2020: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

This AF is a child project of the FOLUR program and will contribute to its overall impact. Under the FOLUR IP, interventions in coffee landscapes are expected to contribute to the long-term outcomes of 'Sustainable, Integrated Landscapes & Efficient Food Value/Supply Chains at Scale' by (a) promoting sustainable food systems; (b) reducing negative externalities in the coffee value chain; (c) promoting deforestation-free commodity supply chains; and (d) promoting landscape-scale restoration for production & ecosystem services. The AF's interventions are aligned with the Program's priorities. These interventions are expected to tackle the described challenges and contribute to the multiple Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) identified by the Program, including biodiversity conservation, sequestration of GHG and avoidance of emissions, avoided degradation of landscapes, and restoration of the same.

Under Component 1, the promotion among national stakeholders of integrated landscape planning as well as the economic and environmental benefits of these sustainable coffee landscape management practices through knowledge management activities will contribute to the expected outcomes, locally, nationally and globally, from increased food production and food security, to improved household resilience to climate and NR risks, improved biodiversity and GHG sequestration, and improved strategies for sustainable coffee systems.

Under Component 2, the AF will promote more sustainable land management and farming practices, including agro-forestry, in the coffee landscapes,

Under Component 3, the AF interventions will reduce encroachment and restore degradation hotspots in and around the natural habitats adjacent to the coffee landscapes.

Component 4 will amplify Component 1 activities by supporting exchanges with other projects in the region to share experience on the AF's specific directions/issues, e.g. restoration and SLM of coffee landscapes at scale, as well as the promotion of certification and responsible sourcing. Beyond these countries only, Burundi's participation in international fora/platforms that promote sustainable coffee systems and markets will contribute to the overall impact program, in line with the country's strategic positioning on specialty coffee markets.

As also indicated in the Project Paper, the AF will support exchanges with other projects in the region to share experience on the AF's specific directions/issues, e.g. restoration and SLM of coffee landscapes at scale, as well as the promotion of certification and responsible sourcing. Beyond these countries only, Burundi's participation in international fora/platforms that promote sustainable coffee systems and markets will contribute to the overall impact program, in line with the country's strategic positioning on specialty coffee markets (see earlier comment).

10. Stakeholders. Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The list of stakeholders is included.

Consultations and meetings are mentioned, but without further details (dates, number of participants). Could you complete this information at least in the portal, if not in the project paper.

Thanks.

September 15, 2020

Cleared

January 18, 2021

With this new submission, we just noted that the last consultation with the stakeholders on the ground were in Matongo in December 17, 2019. Is there a planning of activities to relaunch the dialogue? Any change to expect since the recent elections of May 2020?

February 1st, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response

WB Response Feb 09, 2021: Thank you. Noted clearance. The GEF CER includes the details of the stakeholder engagement plan for the project.

WB Response Jan 26, 2021: Consultations in the project area during the core project design phase were indeed carried out in December 2019 during a Bank's preparation mission (and noted in the SEP). Despite the COVID context and elections in 2020, as per its usual process the Bank has maintained a strong and continuous dialogue with the Client to move the preparation process along throughout 2020 (including updating safeguards instruments, project design technical meetings, Bank's Decision Meeting, finalization of the GEF package etc.). In December 2020, the Bank organized an Appraisal mission of the GEF AF which included a two day meeting with Burundi Government (Ministry of Agriculture as Executing Agency, Ministry of Finance which will sign the Grant agreement) to appraise the proposed GEF project (activities, implementation arrangements, results framework, safeguards etc.) in order to ensure strong ownership of the Client including post elections. There are no changes that impact the GEF project.

December 22, 2020: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

The stakeholder engagement plan is included in the relevant GEF data sheet section. A table indicating relevant meetings with coffee specific stakeholders during the preparation of the AF has been added to the Project Paper and the related section of the GEF data sheet.

Other consultations of local stakeholders during the preparation of the project are detailed in the Environmental and Social Management Framework in Section 10 (ESMF).

In that context, one should bear in mind that consultations started during the preparation of the parent project, as the Kayanza area was initially identified as one of selected intervention areas. As that stage, the process included not only safeguards related consultation (see related documents) but also consultations under the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM) process facilitated by IUCN (see related report). These have been the basis for the AF updates. Also directly relevant to the FOLUR AF was the stakeholders workshop to take stock of lessons and

recommendations from the GEF PADZOC project at closure (Nov. 2018), at which time the pre concept preparatory work on the FOLUR AF was initiated to ensure an agreed upon EOI.

11. Gender equality and women's empowerment. Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The Gender Action Plan is very interesting and responds questions raised at PCN.

Agency Response **WB Response August 31, 2020:** Noted. Thank you.

12. Private sector engagement. If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

In the project paper, the role of cooperatives, as elements of the private sector, is mentioned. However, the institutional context of the Coffee sector and the role of the private sector are not detailed.

We understand there is an on-going reform of the coffee sector. Are these elements available? Or addressed by the CSCSP on coffee sector competitiveness?

September 15, 2020

Thanks. The appendix 7 indeed is very instructive about the coffee sector in Burundi. We better understand the articulation between this AF, the parent project, and the CSCSP.

Cleared.

Agency Response

December 22, 2020: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

There is indeed an on-going reform of the coffee sector, which started at the end of 2019. Its key characteristics are captured in Annex 7 of the Project Paper, i.e. the creation of a single national agency to implement a number of functions that earlier were fulfilled by other institutions, including the cooperative organizations (CNAC) and

value-chain stakeholders organization (Intercaf?). The cooperatives will remain an important stakeholders group under the reform (and for the AF in the Kayanza area). The private sector will continue to operate in the coffee sector within the reform framework and will be associated to AF activities, in particular under Component 1

This is also described in the country's related strategy, a comprehensive document prepared by the Government, and which can be shared. It is not the purpose of the AF to address the broader implications of the reform. However, this reform doesn't affect the country's strategy to position its coffee sector on specialty markets, which remains central. Therefore, the AF will, by involving all relevant stakeholders, contribute to related efforts on *sustainable* coffee markets.

13. Risk. Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

- There is a risk analysis.
- However, the current COVID-19 situation is not mentioned. Please, clarify how and if the COVID-19 crisis may affect the project.

September 15, 2020

- The PID/ISDS is dated on April 8, 2020. Is there any new document to share about the risks and the safeguards? The COVID-19 situation for instance is not addressed.
- Since our exchanges in end of May 2020, there are new GEF guidelines about the COVID-19 situation. Please, check how they apply to the current situation in Burundi and elaborate a more comprehensive response. The simple mention in the project paper is probably not enough.

Agency Response

December 22, 2020: Revised PID/ISDS is updated and included in the submission package, following project appraisal. COVID related risks and mitigation measures are now included in the PID/ISDS, GEF CER and Project Paper paras 43 and 58.

In addition links to the disclosed updated safeguards documents (August 2020) were earlier provided and made available in the GEF CER, including the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF), Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF), and Process Framework (PF). More information has been provided on the operationalization of the project's Grievance

Redness Mechanism (GRM) (approved in August 2020) as well as links to the publicly available document (in French but also in Kirundi as published in December 2020).

WB Response August 31, 2020: Noted.

The COVID-19 situation is actually mentioned in the risk section (under 'Other risks?'). However, the text has been expanded to clarify how the crisis may affect the project and related mitigation approach.

14. Coordination. Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

- The role of other projects is included, as the WB project on coffee competitiveness (CSCSP), the IFAD Agriculture Production Intensification and Vulnerability project, and the FAO/GEF project on restoration under the IAP on Food Security.
- The proposed project will use the SLM alliance installed by the FAO/GEF6 project for coordination, as well as the multi-stakeholder steering committee chaired by the MINEAGRIE.
- There will also be a local steering committee, chaired by the Governor at Kayanza province level.
- Relevant coffee sector organizations (such as ODECA and COCOCA) will be invited to sit on these committees.

Agency Response **WB Response August 31, 2020:** Noted. Thank you.

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response **WB Response August 31, 2020:** Noted. Thank you.

16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed 'Knowledge Management Approach' for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

There are interesting propositions buried in the text (role of FFS, role of the SLM alliance, participation to the FOLUR platform and events?), but 1) there is a lack of a

coherent KM strategy and 2) the budget seems very low. A better KM framework will reinforce (or not) the justification for the proposed budget.

We remind that a third of the project budget is provided by the FOLUR incentive notably to improve these KM aspects in a child project under a program.

September 15, 2020

Cleared (Cf. item II, 4).

Agency Response

December 22, 2020: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

See response to earlier comment on this subject. Some text on KM specifically has been added in the main text of the Project Paper. The KM strategy will be further specified during appraisal. As indicated earlier, KM activities are actually whole part of the project's strategy (as emphasized for instance in the bottom part of the theory of change). Considering the importance of KM activities under Components 1 and 4, the budget is actually relatively significant and based on consultation with the counterparts.

17. Monitoring and Evaluation. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

See Section 8, pages -31-37

January 18, 2021

- The targeted core indicators are focused on # 3 (land restored), 4 (land under improved management), 6 (carbon), and 11 (beneficiaries). However, we noted that you kept the METT indicator for the Kibira National Park from 60 to 70? Please, explain how the PA management will be improved.

- In the indicators per component (project paper, p31-37), there is no more baseline and targets for knowledge events. Please, explain. Also, confirm that the exchanges at regional level (Ethiopia for instance), in synergy with national and external partners (SLM platform, FAO...) are maintained.

- Even with the institutional changes on the coffee sector, we understand that the work along the coffee value chain with the coffee growers associations, the coffee

cooperatives remain. This is why the indicators related to the adoption of improved technology and certification approaches remain. Please, confirm.

February 1st, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response

WB Response Feb 09, 2021: Thank you. Noted clearance.

WB Response Jan 26,2021:

- Point is noted and this has been corrected in the Project Paper (results framework). The Bank is fully aligned with the FOLUR approach which does not provide for directly supporting the management and administration of protected areas. Note, however, that in addition to the main GEF AF financed activities in the Kibira NP's buffer zone supporting alternative livelihoods and sustainable agricultural production of riparian communities and reforestation, the GEF AF will also support forest dependent Batwa communities in decision making regarding the natural habitats through awareness campaigns, and involving them in community-led conservation activities in the Kibira NP (e.g. maintenance activities etc.). However, the latter will have a negligible impact on the management effectiveness of the Kibira NP. Therefore, the METT score of the Kibira NP is not increased as a result of the GEF AF. The Annex F to the GEF DS on Core Indicators only reports on the FOLUR indicators and does not include any target related to METT.

- Thanks for noticing this oversight which has been corrected in the Project Paper and GEF Data sheet. As indicated in the "Monitoring & Evaluation Plan: PDO Indicators" (page 43) this indicator measures the number of knowledge-sharing events that the project organizes/co-organizes to promote sustainable agricultural and resilient systems and their contribution to SLM. These events indeed include exchange visits/fora overseas as a contribution to the broader FOLUR Impact Program efforts as well as technical/ multistakeholder training/ information/ dialogue meetings.

- We confirm these indicators are related to GEF AF activities supporting coffee growers associations and cooperatives in coffee production landscapes.

WB Response August 31, 2020: Noted. Thank you.

18. Benefits. Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Especially because of the pandemic situation, agriculture diversification aspects have been added to increase the benefits for smallholder farmers.

Agency Response **WB Response August 31, 2020:** Noted. Thank you.

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

January 18, 2021

Budget, please respond to the following interrogations:

- Please, justify the need for a vehicle. (\$50,000 under the outcome 2.1). Is the cofinancing contributing to the purchase of transport vehicles?

- We understand that the office supplies (\$20,000) under the component 2, outcome 2.3, is related to the preparation of land certificate. This is the reason why these office supplies are not included in the pmc. Please, confirm.

February 1st, 2021

We understand the need for a vehicle, as the GEF project extends the approach to a new province. Two other vehicles were bought by the cofinancing for the two other provinces in addition to those bought to support the central project unit in Bujumbura.

Addressed.

Agency Response

WB Response Feb 09, 2021: Thank you. Noted clearance.

WB Response Jan 26,2021:

- The GEF AF results in covering a new area (Kayanza province) and will require setting up a new Provincial Coordination Unit as explained in the sections related to implementation and institutional arrangements. The new provincial PCU requires, at minimum, 1 vehicle to ensure project operations and oversight.

- Confirmed. As for the Parent project, the GEF AF will provide institutional support the Provincial Land Technical Services (e.g. desks, laptops, other office supplied) to strengthen operations and capacity on the ground and support the project's certification activities under component 2.

WB Response August 31, 2020: Noted. Thank you.

20. 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 CEO Endorsement Request Please see the cell 13 on risks.

Agency Response **December 22, 2020:** Noted and clarifications have been provided on the inclusion of information in the revised PID/ISDS.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Responses to comments made at PCN level are lacking.

September 15, 2020

Cleared.

Agency Response
December 22, 2020: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

See additional Annex B to the GEF data sheet with matrix of comments and responses.
While most of the comments were addressed at the Decision meeting stage, clarifications are included in the Matrix.

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Comments made at PFD not responded, as highlighted at PCN

September 15, 2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

December 22, 2020: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

As requested a matrix of responses has been provided for the project to provide general clarifications on key issues in the context of Burundi. It may however be clarified as was done earlier, that at the PFD stage there were no specific comments relating to the Burundi child project.

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Comments made at PFD not responded, as highlighted at PCN

September 15, 2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

December 22, 2020: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

As requested a matrix of responses has been provided for the project to provide general clarifications on key issues in the context of Burundi. It may however be clarified as was done earlier, that at the PFD stage there were no specific comments relating to the Burundi child project.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Part III ? Country and Agency Endorsements

1. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

The letter of endorsement logged into the portal is not a readable document. Please, update

September 15, 2020

Cleared.

January 18, 2021

As in September, the document logged into the portal is not readable.

February 1st, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response

WB Response Feb 09, 2021: Thank you.

WB Response Jan 26, 2021: The clean LoE was uploaded in the Portal and is legible in the portal. It has been sent separately via email as well as it appears to be a glitch on the GEF end.

December 22, 2020: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response August 31, 2020:

There is perhaps a portal glitch since the earlier file appears legible. It has again been uploaded. Thank you.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

WB Response Feb 09, 2021: It appears that there is a portal glitch at the GEF end and the GEF comment is not visible or registered in this review sheet (in the portal). WB clarification/response is therefore provided here in this entry box (see response below the comment). As clarified via email the GEF comments is:

" Please, address the following comment: Stakeholder engagement the Policy on Stakeholder Engagement requires Agencies to provide, at CEO endorsement, a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) or equivalent or equivalent documentation and describes the minimum information that is required. This child project doesn't include a separate SEP and the Agency says that the SEP ?was not required during preparation, as the AF falls under the parent?s safeguards policy?. However, please note that the GEF Policy on Stakeholder Engagement applies to all GEF-financed activities, regardless of the level of risk (it?s not a safeguards issue alone). At this stage, please complement the information provided in the Stakeholder Engagement section, by including a description of the timing of engagement of stakeholders, particularly civil society and local communities throughout the project cycle. We understand that a more complete SEP and other related information is being prepared under the Parent Project."

WB Response Feb 09, 2021: Comment is noted. It is however clarified that the SEP for this project is submitted in the stakeholder section of the GEF CER and not as a separate word document. Stakeholder engagement is indeed central to the design of the project. Given the existing stakeholder engagement under the ongoing parent project , the reference to the SEP process and its documentation for AF was in the context of issuing a separate SEP document . As mentioned the SEP is embedded in the CER, which the reviewer may have missed (pl refer to Part II Justification, section 2 of the CER). The stakeholder engagement plan in the CER includes details on the engagement and the overall consultation process. However to avoid any confusion the detailed information from the CER is now culled out verbatim separately into a word document and attached for GEF reference in the portal. Hope this helps clarify the issue. Thank you.

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Not yet.

September 15, 2020

Thanks for the revised package. The main concerns have been addressed (anchorage in the FOLUR, private sector, KM, component 3...). Please, check the items 1 and 2 in the section I and the items 13 and 20 in the section II.

January 18, 2021

The context in Burundi has evolved, causing additional questions: please, check the items 2, 4, 8, 10, and 19 (+ one pending issue in the item 1).

February 1st, 2021

The project is technically cleared.

February 8th, 2021

Please, address the following comment:

Stakeholder engagement the Policy on Stakeholder Engagement requires Agencies to provide, at CEO endorsement, a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) or equivalent or equivalent documentation and describes the minimum information that is required. This child project doesn't include a separate SEP and the Agency says that the SEP was not required during preparation, as the AF falls under the parent's safeguards policy?. However, please note that the GEF Policy on Stakeholder Engagement applies to all GEF-financed activities, regardless of the level of risk (it's not a safeguards issue alone). At this stage, please complement the information provided in the Stakeholder Engagement section, by including a description of the timing of engagement of stakeholders, particularly civil society and local communities throughout the project cycle. We understand that a more complete SEP and other related information is being prepared under the Parent Project.

February 9th, 2021

Not addressed

February 10, 2021

The comment is addressed. The project is recommended for technical clearance and Council information.

See the comment below for a next time:

Thank you. This is much more comprehensive and addresses the comments made on Stakeholder Engagement. For the future, please remind the Agency that there's a specific section on Stakeholder Engagement in the template that requests a SEP or equivalent documentation (as per the Policy). Therefore, it would be appreciated if the Agency uses that section for that purpose and refers to any pertinent documents, instead of 'embedding' the SEP into other parts of the template or the parent project.

Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/8/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/15/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/18/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/1/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/10/2021	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations