



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9178		
Country/Region:	Burundi		
Project Title:	Food-IAP: Support for Sustainable Food Production and Enhancement of Food Security and Climate Resilience in Burundi's Highlands		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1 Program 1; LD-1 Program 2; LD-3 Program 4; LD-4 Program 5; BD-4 Program 9;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$7,396,330
Co-financing:	\$45,050,728	Total Project Cost:	\$52,647,058
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Fritjof Boerstler

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental		

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response	
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?			
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?			
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?			
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?			
	Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
		• The STAR allocation?		
• The focal area allocation?				
• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access				
• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?				
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	The PPG is in the norm and justified. Addressed.		
	Review Date			
	Review	July 01, 2015		
	Additional Review (as necessary)			
	Additional Review (as necessary)			

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	<p>We appreciate the taking stock of different watershed management and sustainable agriculture initiatives from partners and GEF agencies, including the WB, FAO, IFAD. There were no major changes with the initial concept, but the changes - mainly wording in the outcomes and outputs- are explained.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>- The outcomes and outputs follow a logical reasoning and are well aligned with the first two IAP components on the institutional framework and the scaling up opportunities. However, for the third component on monitoring and assessment, we are not seeing how the Global Environment Benefits and resilience will be measured. Clear outputs are lacking in the result framework on this matter (beyond the reinforcement of capacities on LADA, DATAR, HH-BAT, etc.). Please, revise. The activities should be better detailed in the text.</p> <p>- Baseline data and indicators are expected at CEO endorsement, and not after one year of project</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		implementation. January 25, 2017 Addressed.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	- There is a tentative to justify cost-effectiveness, but we do not know what the alternatives could have been (MFA project out of the IAP, individual projects on BD, LD, CCM...). Please, explain the added value and cost-effectiveness of this child-project under a programmatic approach, and how this project is also going to receive from the whole IAP. January 25, 2017 Addressed.	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	- The section on risks is comprehensive in the project document. We do not understand why all these risks are not reported in the request for CEO endorsement, in the section "A.5. Risks". It is confusing, as some of the risks which have been removed were highlighted by the German Council Member (political risks, security). Please, revise. January 25, 2017 Addressed.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	- The Lake Victoria Environmental Programme (LVEMP2) was used by the World Bank for a GEF4 SIP project (#3399);	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>- The Watershed Approach to Sustainable Coffee Production in Burundi project was used by the World Bank for a MFA/SFM GEF5 project (#4631).</p> <p>- In our understanding, these projects can be considered in the baseline analysis, but cannot be included in the cofinancing, to avoid a risk of double counting. Please, explain and correct.</p> <p>January 25, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?</p>	<p>Please, make the information coherent between the project document, the request for CEO endorsement, and the tracking tools.</p> <p>- RCE: table E: 30,079 ha under SLM; p17 in the section on GEB: 80,000 ha under SLM</p> <p>- Carbon information: a minimum of information is needed to understand the assumptions and the calculations of carbon results: the direct benefits from the project over 5 years, the indirect benefit over a 20 year period, the different options on the field, the part of carbon storage, avoided deforestation, etc. An annex will be welcome, also including the whole excel tables from EXACT.</p> <p>January 25, 2017</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Thanks for the revisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - However, please check the consistency of information between the different sections of the tracking tools between the different focal areas: LD, BD, and CCM (especially the # in ha and tCO2e). - Revise the information in the tracking tools: please use the right cells and do not include information in a different column. - Include the # of metric tons of CO2e mitigated in the CR4 in the table E. - In the table A, the project refers to the BD4 Program 9 (BD mainstreaming). However, in the text, most of the activities and expected results refer to the BD3 Program 7 on agrobiodiversity. If you confirm that the main expected result is 4,000 ha with improved management of Crop Wild Relatives (and if you confirm the role of Burundi for these CRWs), you should refer to the BD3 program 7 and fill in the right tracking tools. If you want to maintain the BD4 Program 9, you should demonstrate the benefits for a biodiversity of global importance (Kibira NP?) and include a # of ha under a certification system or the # of sector policies or regulatory frameworks incorporating biodiversity conservation. Please, confirm, complete, or correct and adjust the 	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		tracking tools if necessary. March 7, 2017 Addressed.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	Addressed.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>Yes if we consider the M&E in the project cycle, but as highlighted in the item 2, outputs and activities are lacking to reflect the work needed to measure the GEB and resilience. The use of HH-BAT, IPC, and other tools is mentioned, but not enough clearly to understand what we can expect at the end of the project (p18).</p> <p>- We are taking note of the section A.2 p. 22 describing the three IAP outcomes. However, we would like to see more information to explain how the Burundi child project is going to interact with the regional and cross-cutting hub on the three components, with a particular attention to the assessment of GEB and resilience led by CI/Vital Signs and UNEP. Please, clarify.</p> <p>- Gender issues: The disaggregation of data is one step, but is not enough. A target of 30% of women is not the</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>right response in our view. The section on gender needs more information. We are expecting an analysis of gender inequalities and understand how this IAP child project is going to reduce the gap and address some of these aspects of inequalities (in terms of access and ownership of the land, in terms of possession - livestock for instance, in terms of salaries, in terms of representation in the different forums, etc.).</p> <p>- Please, check the guidelines provided in the template and respond the three questions under A.4. on gender equality and women's empowerment (1) did the project conduct a gender analysis; 2) did the project incorporate a gender responsive project result framework including sex-disaggregated indicators, and 3) what is the share of women and men direct beneficiaries.</p> <p>- Please, check also the questions on CSO and indigenous people in the template under A.3. "stakeholders".</p> <p>January 25, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	OK	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	Addressed.	
	• STAP	Addressed.	
	• GEF Council	Addressed.	
	• Convention Secretariat	NA	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.</p> <p>The comments made by the STAP at PFD level and by the German Council Member have been addressed.</p> <p>January 25, 2017 Please address the remaining points in the item 6. However, we recommend the project for Council information.</p> <p>March 7, 2017 All points have been addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>	
Review Date	Review	December 21, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 25, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 07, 2017	

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.