



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>8010</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Burundi</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Natural Landscapes Rehabilitation and Climate Change Adaptation in the Region of Mumirwa in Bujumbura and Mayor of Bujumbura through a Farmer Field School Approach</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>FAO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$5,877,397</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$17,400,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$23,427,397</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Saliha Dobardzic</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>William Settle</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes, the letter dated Aug. 28, 2014 is on file.	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes. Please refer to Section 24.	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>Yes, the project is aligned with the Climate Change Adaptation objectives, namely to reduce the vulnerability of people, livelihoods, physical assets and natural systems to the adverse effects of climate change (CCA-1), and to strengthen institutional and technical capacities for effective climate change adaptation (CCA-2).</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>Yes, the project is aligned with the national strategies and plans, including the NAPA, National Policy Strategy and a Plan of Action for Climate Change, and National Policy for Climate Change.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>Not clear. The baseline problem references the NAPA's long-term modeling, and the expected effects of climate change. It would be useful to consider other relevant sources of information on climatic change as well. It is unclear whether the baseline projects already incorporate climate change considerations.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please consider all relevant sources of information for describing the climate change problem in Burundi, and please clarify which baseline project or</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>interventions require additional funding for ensuring resilience.</p> <p>Update 4/30/2015: This has been done.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>It appears so. However, please see comments under Section 6. The problem formulation and a clearer baseline project description would assist in assessing whether the information in Table B is sound and appropriate.</p> <p>Update 4/30/2015: Yes, the information in Table B is adequate.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Not clear. Please clarify why additional investments are needed to complement the GIZ project for the Improvement of Food Security and Social Cohesion.</p> <p>Update 4/30/2015: LDCF funding would complement the GIZ by building adaptive capacity within a project that does not state adaptation as an objective.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>Yes, a number of civil society organizations are referenced, and a consultative workshop will be organized at the beginning of the PPG phase to jointly develop a stakeholder</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Participation Plan.	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>Not clear. Although the risks listed are for the most part well-described, and the mitigation measures are well-defined, it is important to ensure that the implementation of the project is planned in such a way that, should extreme weather events occur, the risk is adequately managed (for instance, cropping could be done in phases to reduce the risk of total destruction from any single-season extreme weather events.)</p> <p>Recommended action: please ensure, during the PPG phase, that the implementation plan adequately takes into account the risks of extreme weather events during the implementation of the project.</p> <p>Update 4/30/2015: The risks section has been reformulated to include coping with risk of extreme weather event occurring during implementation.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	Yes.	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how,</li> </ul>	<p>The project appears to be potentially sustainable and scalable, but it is not clear whether the project is innovative.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please comment on the innovative</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>aspects of the project.</p> <p>Update 5/7/2015: The project is innovative in this particular context, in that the scope of such activities in Burundi is currently relatively narrow, and with this intervention they would be expanded.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>It appears so. However, this will be reviewed upon the revision in response to comments on Sections 6, 7, and 13.</p> <p>Update 5/7/2015: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>The amount of cofinancing appears adequate.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	Yes. The amount does not deviate from the norm.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>Not yet. Please see comments under Sections 6, 7, 8, 11, and 13.</p> <p>Update 5/7/2015: The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	May 07, 2015	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**