



# Combined Project Information Documents / Integrated Safeguards Datasheet (PID/ISDS)

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 20-Jan-2021 | Report No: PIDISDSA28056

**BASIC INFORMATION****A. Basic Project Data**

Country Burundi	Project ID P171745	Project Name Burundi Landscape Restoration and Resilience Project	Parent Project ID (if any) P160613
Parent Project Name Burundi Landscape Restoration and Resilience Project	Region AFRICA EAST	Estimated Appraisal Date 07-Dec-2020	Estimated Board Date 20-Apr-2021
Practice Area (Lead) Environment, Natural Resources & the Blue Economy	Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Ministry of Finance, Budget, Cooperation and Economic Development	Implementing Agency Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock

GEF Focal Area

Multi-focal area

## Proposed Development Objective(s) Parent

The Project Development Objective is to restore land productivity in targeted degraded landscapes and, in the event of an eligible crisis or emergency, to provide immediate and effective response to said eligible crisis or emergency.

## Components

Institutional Development and Capacity Building for Landscape Restoration and Resilience  
Sustainable Landscape Management Practices  
Improved Management of Protected Areas and Reserves  
Contingency Emergency Response (CERC)  
Project Management, Coordination, and Monitoring

**PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)****SUMMARY**

<b>Total Project Cost</b>	6.00
<b>Total Financing</b>	6.00
<b>of which IBRD/IDA</b>	0.00
<b>Financing Gap</b>	0.00



## DETAILS

### Non-World Bank Group Financing

Trust Funds	6.00
Global Environment Facility (GEF)	6.00

Environmental Assessment Category

B-Partial Assessment

Decision

The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate

Other Decision (as needed)

## B. Introduction and Context

### Country Context

- This proposal seeks an Additional Financing (AF) grant in the amount of US\$6 million** to the *Burundi Landscape Restoration and Resilience Project* (BLRRP, P160613) with funds from the Global Environment Facility (GEF). BLRRP was approved in 2018 to address the root causes of landscape degradation, by investing upstream in building resilient landscapes through restoration activities and sustainable landscape management (SLM) practices. The proposed GEF AF will help to finance the costs associated with a scale-up of the parent project activities in selected coffee landscapes in the Kanyanza Province (Matongo Commune).
- Indeed, Burundi's geographic and demographic characteristics, exacerbated by climate risks, have subjected the forests and agricultural lands to immense pressure.** Much of the country's terrain is hilly and mountainous, with natural forests once covering 30–50 percent of its territory. However, with high population density (470 per square km) and rapid population growth (3.3 percent per year over the past two decades), forests have been cleared for agricultural production, and now account for only 6.6 percent of the territory. Steep hillsides have increasingly been brought under cultivation and, with significant land fragmentation into tiny plots, intensive farming practices have failed to preserve soil fertility and caused significant land degradation.
- The consequences of deforestation and land degradation have been costly to the population, the economy, and the environment.** Indeed, as poverty reaches 73 percent of the population, with 8.3 million Burundians living below the poverty line (SCD, 2018), the vast majority of the poor remain rural, and heavily dependent on the land resource for food, income, and energy. However, land is particularly vulnerable to human activity, climate variability and increasingly frequent extreme events. Deforestation and intensive agriculture on hillsides without proper erosion control, and the illicit exploitation of



protected areas due to the reduced availability of wood resources outside them, have disturbed soil integrity and compromised the water retention function of the soil upstream. As a result, landslides and floods are frequent and intense, causing substantial damage to the infrastructure and human lives downstream. Compounding the effects of soil erosion, intensive agriculture without adequate use of fertilizer has also affected yields. Thus, production has stagnated over the last two decades. Soil erosion has also led to the shrinking of water bodies and siltation and drying up of rivers. Finally, deforestation and land degradation have caused the loss of important biodiversity due to changes in habitats, e.g. in Protected Areas (PA).

4. **As mounting climate impacts manifest, Burundi's landscapes face increased risk of degradation.** Burundi has a history of extreme climate-related events. It is the fourth most vulnerable country and the 20<sup>th</sup> least ready country for combating climate change effects and coping with related disasters. Past extreme weather events in the 2000 decade affected over 2 million Burundians and accounted for losses over 5 percent of GDP. With climate change, the frequency and intensity of severe events are likely to increase, amplifying the risks of further agricultural livelihood degradation, through soil erosion and yield reduction. The annual cost of yield losses of major crops because of soil erosion amounts up to US\$209 million, while that of flood risk due to unsustainable land management is about US\$3.3 million (2016 Country Environmental Analysis (CEA)). In addition, pressure on the land resource, further stressed in some instances by the return of displaced populations, has directly contributed to social tensions and related instability.

5. **Landscape restoration is therefore a key pillar of Burundi's 2018-2027 National Development Plan** and its strategies for forest conservation, sustainable land management and climate mitigation and adaptation. It is also reflected in the territorial land use plans of project-targeted provinces. At the global level, Burundi has ratified the three Rio conventions and has in place a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, and a National Climate Adaptation Plan of Action, which emphasize the importance of forests and adaptation of farming practices and the impact of soil erosion. Burundi also has in place a 2012 National Climate Change Policy and a National Strategy and Action Plan on Climate Change. Its Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change is a reduction in Green House Gas (GHG) emissions by 23 percent and 12,000 ha/year reforested. Under the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Target Setting process and the Bonn Challenge, it has a reforestation commitment of 2 million ha. Finally, Burundi is a signatory to the African Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative (AFR100), a country-led effort to bring 100 million hectares of land in Africa into restoration by 2030.

#### Sectoral and Institutional Context

6. **Against a context of overall limited land and agricultural productivity, coffee landscapes are critical to both the economy and natural resource management in Burundi.** Indeed, coffee production and exports in Burundi account for 80 percent of the country's total exports, making the country the 13<sup>th</sup> largest Arabica producer globally. Coffee production covers 70,000 ha nationally with very good agronomic conditions for Arabica cultivation. It plays a vital role in the country for job creation, food security and poverty reduction. It is identified by Burundi's National Agricultural Investment Plan (NAIP)



as a top priority sector for investments with a Coffee Sector Development Strategy approved in 2015 and updated by the Government of Burundi in 2019-2020.

7. **Agriculture is central to stability and development in Burundi, yet it is constrained by recurrent climate shocks and land degradation.** Agricultural production in Burundi is characterized by a low yield per hectare, and limited land productivity. Burundi's agricultural production is predominantly for national consumption, and consists primarily of four food crops: bananas and plantains, roots and tubers (sweet potatoes, cassava, colocase, potatoes, yam), pulses (beans, peas, groundnuts, soybeans, cowpeas, cajanus cajan), and cereals (maize, rice, wheat, sorghum, barley) – and to a less extent, vegetables and fruits. The major agricultural cash crops are coffee, tea, cotton, and sugar crops. Rain-fed smallholder farming for food crops utilizes 90 percent of the cultivated area (approximately 1,210,000 ha),<sup>1</sup> most often taking place on the steep hillsides, and farmers have been constrained by severe shortage of arable land, low productivity, recurrent climate shocks, lack of crop varieties, shortage of agricultural inputs, poor agricultural practices, and limited access to modern reliable irrigation systems.

8. **However, by significantly contributing to the unsustainable land management processes** described earlier, agriculture has been a lead cause of deforestation and affected overall land productivity. Coffee in particular has historically been promoted as unshaded monocrop, which bears sustainability issues. Moreover, coffee production should increase as a result of global demand for Burundi's specialty coffee and national promotion efforts. Related threats could further increase.

9. **More sustainable coffee farming techniques** such as multi-cropping, shade-grown systems, and organic farming are gaining interest, in line with the government's strategy to promote ecological coffee production and strengthen the country's position on specialty coffee markets. Moreover, while monocropping does characterize most coffee plots, the related landscapes are characterized by a diverse mix of crops, livestock and tree plantations, which compete for land to provide for food, incomes, and wood energy. Therefore, coffee landscape restoration and management call for an integrated approach beyond one single crop.

10. **To meet its PDO, the parent BLRRP is introducing measures under an integrated approach,** to rehabilitate deforested and degraded land, prevent further deforestation in natural habitats adjacent to production landscapes, prevent future upstream soil erosion and downstream catastrophes, promote wider adoption of improved agricultural practices, and strengthen climate-smart planning approaches.

11. **To achieve this, BLRRP implements a community-led landscape approach to restore degraded landscapes and improve land management in 22 production hills** across the provinces of Bujumbura and Muyinga (Component 2). To effectively cut down erosion, the approach is systematic, i.e. covering the largest proportion of each hill. It entails land certification, landscape restoration and erosion control, and improved crop production practices.

12. BLRRP also aims at reducing conversion and degradation of forests due to encroachment within three protected areas (PA) (Bururi, Ruvubu and Kibira) and improve land management practices in the riparian production landscapes (Component 3). This is being achieved by strengthening the capacity of

---

<sup>1</sup> A Scoping Study on Burundi's Agricultural Production in a Changing Climate and the Supporting Policies, UNECA (2017).



the PA administration and riparian communities' role in decision making and conservation activities regarding the natural habitats, while promoting alternative livelihoods around the PAs.

13. Finally, the project promotes institutional development and capacity building for landscape restoration and resilience at the national and decentralized levels, including watershed planning and relevant policies (Component 1).

14. **The BLRRP is in full implementation with key project activities initiated in 2020.** Field activities in the three PAs and in support of local community resilience in the targeted two municipalities started in December 2019. The project has three main components focused on institutional development (component 1); landscape restoration works (terracing) and community resilience activities, including farmer field schools land certification (component 2); and conservation activities in protected areas (component 3), all to which this additional financing is aligned. The Project is rated "Moderately Satisfactory" in terms of both "Progress towards achievement of PDO" and "Overall Implementation Progress". The BLRRP PCU is a new unit and comprises Government staff and consultants with expertise in fiduciary domains, relevant technical domains, M&E, safeguards, gender, communication, community mobilization, and administration. Established at the central level, the PCU has small decentralized teams at the provincial level.

15. **The areas where the parent project is intervening do not have coffee production despite its importance to the country.** This AF grant from GEF under the Food, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program, will finance costs associated with a scale-up and expansion of the parent project activities in an additional province that does include degraded coffee landscapes. This would contribute to better achieving the PDO of the parent project and achieving programmatic goals of the GEF.

16. **At global level, the GEF FOLUR Impact Program seeks to transform food and land use systems and help countries reconcile competing social, economic, and environmental interests by moving away from unsustainable sectoral approaches.** GEF support helps countries meet the growing demand for increased crop and livestock production, such as coffee, while eliminating the risk of further expansion of farmland into natural high-biodiversity habitats and forests, erosion of genetic diversity, overexploitation of land and water resources, overuse of chemical fertilizers and pesticides, and inefficient practices that lead to greenhouse gas emissions.

### C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

#### Original PDO

The Project Development Objective is to restore land productivity in targeted degraded landscapes and, in the event of an eligible crisis or emergency, to provide immediate and effective response to said eligible crisis or emergency.

#### Current PDO

The Project Development Objective is to restore land productivity in targeted degraded landscapes and, in the event of an eligible crisis or emergency, to provide immediate and effective response to said eligible crisis or emergency.



#### Key Results

17. A total of 13,397 ha of degraded landscapes will be under improved management, including 3,060 ha of production landscapes and 10,037 ha of restored forest landscapes within/around the Kibira NP, due to reforestation on denuded land and woodlots (on 900 ha) and reduced encroachment/ exploitation of natural habitats and high conservation value forests. ha of protected area restored through encroachment control and reforestation. GHG emissions will be mitigated for an estimated total of 1,188,409 CO<sub>2</sub>e over a 20-year period. Additionally, 48,500 people, 54 percent of which female, are expected to directly benefit from the blending of this project in the BLRRP, bringing the BLRRP direct beneficiaries' target to 663,200 people. Finally, the project will set a path for transformation by connecting to the ongoing BLRRP and taking action at scale, and by supporting sustainable agricultural production practices for broader uptake by other projects, institutions and stakeholders.

PDO-Level Results Indicators are those of BLRRP:

1. Land productivity in targeted degraded landscapes (%)
2. Land area under sustainable landscape management practices (ha)
3. Share of targeted community members with rating 'Satisfied' or above on project interventions (disaggregated by sex) (%)

#### D. Project Description

##### Proposed interventions

18. **Component 1: Development of integrated landscape management (ILM) systems** (USD 490,000–GEF aligned with parent project component 1 on *Institutional Development and Capacity Building for Landscape Restoration and Resilience*). As BLRRP supports the development of the policies and capacities at the national and local levels to plan and implement landscape restoration and ILM at scale, the AF will promote a more sustainable contribution of coffee systems to that goal. Specific institutional support and capacity building activities will be implemented at national level and across the targeted landscape.

19. At national level, the project will address analytical gaps by conducting an assessment on the economic and environmental benefits of sustainable and resilient agricultural practices for select crops (such as coffee, tea, fruits (agroforestry), other horticulture) in degraded landscapes, as a basis to inform stakeholders' strategic decisions and practices. Building on the parent project's M&E activities, it will also test land and forest change observation and M&E tools to document the benefits of these practices. It will evaluate the environmental changes resulting from the interventions within and around the Kibira PA to position Burundi towards possible climate finance and contribute to designing related incentive instruments.

20. The project will also develop/disseminate training guidelines on landscape restoration and sustainable and resilient production practices for diverse crops and related value chains based on the above assessments. On these issues, it will organize training, knowledge sharing and dialogue workshops



on sustainable agricultural options and practices, and their contribution to landscapes restoration and community resilience.

21. Across the targeted landscapes, the project will promote participatory planning for improved land use and allocation: The project will support local stakeholders in developing an integrated territorial plan for sustainable management with the participation of relevant institutional and economic players. The AF will complement the activities of the parent project, in the context of its gender strategy, supporting gender sensitive ILM plans across the targeted landscapes.

22. **Component 2: Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible commodity value chains** (USD 4,560,000 - GEF aligned with parent project component 2 on *Sustainable Landscape Management Practices*). The project will support communities in restoring the degraded coffee landscapes, controlling erosion, and intensifying SLM and crop production practices in the targeted production hills. The approach will be comprehensive, integrated, and driven by the active participation of local communities at the scale of each hill.

- (a) **Sub-component 2.1 - Landscape Restoration and Erosion Control:** On-the-ground restoration will be carried out by developing anti-erosive ditches and terraces, bioengineering, a/re-forestation and other techniques with the direct engagement of communities, land users and the local governments.
- (b) **Sub-component 2.2 - Improved Crop Production Practices and Nutrition:** Interventions will support farmer groups in protecting the topsoil, recovering their soil fertility, and intensifying crop production through SLM practices. They will entail farmers' training and experience sharing, as well as access to improved inputs and livestock as source of manure. Knowledge dissemination will emphasize deforestation-free crop cultivation, agro-forestry and organic production. The project will facilitate producer-buyer exchanges to promote locally produced commodities (e.g. coffee, tea, fruits, other horticulture, honey etc.) that contribute to sustainable landscape management and community resilience.
- (c) **Sub-component 2.3 - Land certification:** Land certification will be offered prior to restoration works using approaches that have proven effective in Burundi. This will secure land users' long-term investment and address any land disputes.

23. **Component 3: Conservation and restoration of natural habitats** (USD 400,000-GEF aligned with the parent project component 3 on *Improved Management of Protected Areas and Reserves*). The project will promote activities that reduce conversion and degradation of forests due to encroachment within the Kibira NP areas adjacent to the targeted coffee landscapes and promote improved land management practices in the riparian landscapes. This will be done by increasing riparian communities' role in decision making regarding the natural habitats through awareness campaigns and involving them in community-led conservation activities (e.g., PA restoration). The project will collaborate with local conservation groups towards this. Also, to reduce the destructive use of natural resources, the project will promote alternative income-generating activities and sustainable agricultural production (e.g., agroforestry)

24. **Component 4: Project Management, Coordination and Monitoring** (USD 550,000, Aligned with component 5 of the parent project on *Project Management, Coordination and Monitoring*). Project





coordination will be fully integrated with that of the BLRRP. An additional PCU decentralized team will be set up in the Kanyanza Province to coordinate project activities locally. The project M&E plan will build on BLRRP's, which includes household surveys and satellite observation to assess and monitor project outcomes at landscape scale. Finally, this component will finance the participation of sector stakeholders in FOLUR events and cross learning mechanisms.

## E. Implementation

### Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

25. **Implementation Arrangements:** The AF will be implemented using the modalities of the BLRRP Project. The PCU will consult other relevant projects operating in the Province or in similar domains to inform its own planning as well as for analytical, training and dialogue activities. Project oversight functions will be conducted by the parent project's multi-stakeholder national steering committee (chaired by the MINEAGRIE). Following the approach of the parent project, a decentralized task force in be established in Kanyanza province and be chaired the Governor.

26. **Private sector engagement:** The project will interact with the private sector, especially farmers cooperatives, at three levels: (1) In Kanyanza, representatives from relevant private sector entities operating in these landscapes across different sectors will be involved in related integrated landscape planning, technically supporting and supervising physical landscape restoration activities and, if relevant, technical activities to promote SLM practices (e.g. training/ communication) and related livelihood promotion; (2) At national level, they will participate as industry stakeholders in training and knowledge exchange activities; and (3) At the FOLUR Global Platform level, they will actively participate in the related information, training, experience sharing, networking and knowledge exchanges and events.

27. **Approach to gender issues:** The gender gaps that were analyzed during the preparation of the parent project (poor access of women to paid jobs, resilient livelihoods, credit, land rights, and extension services - see Appendix 6) have informed its design. The gender strategy that has since then been adopted for the parent project, will inform the AF too, as will a specific study on land and gender, currently under preparation. Hence, the project will facilitate women's access to community labor-intensive activities financed by the project; land certification for women and joint certification of husband and wife; and women's participation in decision-making structures, platform, and governance/planning processes related to landscape management. The project will also design extension service activities for women, including women specific farmer field schools (FFS), including on nutrition promotion. The Result Framework includes one PDO indicator and three intermediate indicators specific for women.

28. **Approach to knowledge management (KM):** KM activities will cut across the project to contribute to the overall project strategy. They will be dealt with under different components to make sure these are focused on, and directly contribute to, the expected outcomes related to each of the components (see also Theory of Change in Annex 1). Hence, Component 1 includes KM activities that will address targeted analytical gaps and contribute to promoting sustainable practices such as the production and dissemination of guidelines, and training and knowledge sharing events on sustainable practices (with emphasis on the national/value-chain level). The emphasis of Component 2 will be on the communities



and stakeholders operating at the local landscape level (e.g. farmer field schools). Component will emphasize Component 4 focuses on international KM exchanges in the context of the broader FOLUR program community, as they contribute to the same priorities (e.g. promotion of ecological certification, responsible sourcing, and sustainable coffee production practices and value-chains). They will also build on similar KM activities under the parent project, e.g. the collaboration with the FAO promoted knowledge exchange platform on SLM, and the proposed exchange visits with Ethiopia on landscape restoration operations at scale. This is illustrated by an intermediate level indicator on KM.

29. **Approach to the COVID-19 pandemic.** The approach is firstly linked to the parent project, as its CERC component can, if requested by the Government, be triggered to contribute to the country's emergency and recovery response to the crisis<sup>2</sup>. Secondly, the project will, through its actual interventions, help Burundi strengthen its response by mitigating negative socioeconomic impacts and support a resilient recovery for the country. Beyond immediate health impacts, COVID-19 poses significant risk to people's access to essential services, food, and resilient livelihoods, especially for informal sector workers and vulnerable groups such as the Batwa, who may be suddenly and more adversely impacted. Proposed activities will help communities strengthen local food supply chains and sustainable production by providing necessary inputs, technical assistance, capacity development and diversification opportunities. It will support community engagement in ecological monitoring (e.g., eco-guards) and labor-intensive activities (e.g., tree plantations) offering alternative income while promoting environmental protection. The project will also help reduce human exposure and vulnerability to zoonotic diseases in the project area. By implementing surveillance of valuable ecosystems and supporting sustainable small-scale agriculture and other practices with lower impact on forests, the project will mitigate encroachment in animal habitats as well as the emergence and spread of zoonotic diseases.

30. **Approach to Sustainability:** Outcome sustainability will be promoted through a combination of levers, 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); economic soundness (building on economic systems that have proved effective); Links with other operations (e.g. parent BLRRP and IFAD project); drawing 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, evaluation and dialogue activities to inform stakeholders' own strategies and practices in the longer run; and strategic KM activities (see previous paragraph). See also the Risk Section below.

## F. Project location and Salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

The AF project will extend parent project activities to the additional province of Kayanza (commune of Matongo). The AF will specifically intervene in nine highly degraded coffee cultivation hills adjacent to the Kibira National Park (NP) in the municipality of Matongo and targets degraded forest landscapes within and

<sup>2</sup> Following a multi-sector direction set in *Réponse aux Impacts Socio-économiques du COVID-19 au Burundi*, World Bank Group, April 2020, covering the three phases of emergency response, post-crisis recovery, and resilience building.



along with the South Eastern two sectors of the Kibira Park (Teza and Rwegura). Interventions in the area are critical in order to stabilize and increase coffee productivity (on the slopes) and to protect those hills from landslides caused by heavy rains, projected to increase under climate change. Rising impacts of climate change are also exacerbating local vulnerabilities, with rainfall events becoming more intense and resulting in increased soil erosion and siltation of rivers and marshlands, decreased soil productivity, environmental degradation, and erosion of farming livelihoods. The Burundi Poverty Assessment identifies the province of Kayanza and their related communes as among the more impoverished provinces and most heavily environmentally degraded in the country. Despite large-scale environmental degradation, Burundi still retains some protected areas with rich biodiversity such as Kibira National Park that must be protected. Increasing population pressures for agricultural expansion and land conflicts are putting these natural ecosystems at risk. The absence of a functional land use planning or management system makes it difficult to properly coordinate development and conservation together. Batwa communities among other vulnerable groups are present in the entire project area.

#### G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Brandon Enrique Carter, Environmental Specialist

Richard Everett, Social Specialist

Hubert Maurice Waterinckx, Social Specialist

Alexis Manirambona, Environmental Specialist

#### SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	This policy is triggered because the project involves a menu of land restoration interventions ranging from soil erosion stabilization techniques (contour bunding, progressive/radical terracing, planting of anti-erosion hedges) and fodder shrubs, to rainwater conservation practices. While the activities are expected to enhance environmental protection, likely negative impacts likely to be generated include possible air and water pollution, changes in soil physiochemical properties, loss of vegetation due to terracing, and the use of agricultural inputs. Existing infrastructure will be protected and this may require some minor civil engineering works. In addition,



social risks draw from political and social tensions in the region, possible exacerbation of land disputes in agriculture projects, and any potential land tenure issues involving the indigenous Batwa.

At this stage, while the priority Provinces have been identified, the exact locations of the interventions, as well as the scope and scale of the interventions, are not known. Hence, an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been prepared, consulted upon and disclosed. It provides the basic criteria and procedures for screening all interventions, and guide the preparation of environmental and social management plans (ESMP). The ESMF provides essential baseline data, confirms policies that are triggered, assesses likely impacts, proposes measures for the strengthening of institutional capacity, and estimates the budget required for the implementation of the mitigation measures. It will also include Social and Environmental Clauses/Guidelines (SEC/G) for contractors, and an Environmental and Social Checklist.

Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03

No

This policy is not triggered. The project does not involve private sector activities.

Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04

Yes

The policy is triggered at this stage because of the presence of some essential ecosystems with rich biodiversity. Given the fact that these unique and rich ecosystems must be protected, it should be ensured that they don't come under increased threat from agricultural development and increased productivity, and future eco-tourism activities. A functional land use planning or management system should be in place to properly coordinate and arbitrate between development and conservation. In fact, one of the objectives of the project will be to enhance the quality of the ecosystems by providing improved livelihood opportunities within the perimeters of farmed areas and thereby reducing the need to go into parks and PAs for resources, such as timber and meat.

Forests OP/BP 4.36

Yes

The country has witnessed a very high rate of deforestation over the past decades, due primarily to human pressure. The total forest cover now amounts to a meager 6.6% of the total land area.



		<p>The Policy on Forests is therefore triggered to ensure that appropriate measures are taken to protect the remaining forest cover by limiting interventions to land that is already under agricultural use and preventing any encroachment in adjacent forest areas. The project provides for the creation of buffer zones around selected protected areas, and such activities as are deemed necessary to enhance the quality of the protected areas. Adherence to the policy will ensure that the development of an eco-tourism business plan is in compliance with the policy objectives.</p>
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	<p>The policy on Pest Management is triggered because of the likelihood that measures aimed at increasing agricultural productivity may encourage the use of pesticides. There is therefore a need to promote the use of integrated pest management techniques, including the safe use, storage and disposal of agro-chemicals, should the need to use agro-chemicals arise; the ESMF includes an Integrated Pest Management Plan to provide as much information as possible on eco-friendly approaches to pest management and on dissemination of composting techniques.</p>
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	<p>At this stage, the policy is triggered as a “precautionary” measure. Preliminary assessment has not brought to light any feature of architectural, archeological, or cultural importance (except for a cemetery in the buffer zone of the National Park of Ruvubu). However, because actual project activity sites are not known, and in view of the type of works to be carried out, the ESMF has confirmed the triggering of the said policy. The ESMF, therefore, includes a chance find procedure (compliant with national regulations and Bank’s policy) to be followed by contractors/Implementing Agency on the proper management of physical cultural resources once discovered during project implementation</p>
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	<p>In the Social Assessment, it was estimated that there are approximately 5,477 Batwa families present in the project area, including areas for possible subsequent phases (13/15 communes in Muyinga, Cankuzo, Ruyigi, Bubanza, Rumonge and Bujumbura Rural provinces). Batwa families in Burundi are often</p>



among the most vulnerable families in the communities in which they live and specific measures were adopted to ensure that they can participate in and benefit from the project. In accordance with OP 4.10, An Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) for the two communes of Isare (Muyinga province) and Buhinyuza (Bujumbura Rural province) that were identified for the terracing activities, and for the activities in the Ruvubu national park, the Kibira national park and the Bururi forest reserve was prepared, consulted upon and disclosed. This plan was consulted at national, regional and at local level in these two communes, and obtained feedback and broad community support from the Batwa communities involved. If further communes among the remaining 11/13 are selected later, the IPP will be consulted and locally disclosed in these communes as well.

In accordance with the policy, a Process Framework (PF) was developed, consulted and disclosed. Indeed, the activities under subcomponent 1.1 aim at reinforcing capacity for strategic planning and policy reforms for landscape restoration, and 2.4 Reducing Pressure on Forests, may lead to further restrictions to use of natural resources in Ruvubu National Park, Kibira National Park and Bururi Forest Reserve, and will provide support to enforce existing restrictions in accordance with Park Management Plans. The PF describes the current destructive uses of natural resources in these areas, eligible key user groups, and the participatory process to identify and implement alternative income generation activities to restore livelihoods after enforcement of the restrictions. Livelihood Restoration Plans for each park / reserve will be developed, consulted in accordance with the PF and disclosed during project implementation and prior to the enforcement of restrictions.

A Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) to guide the management of expected limited resettlement was developed, consulted upon and disclosed. Land acquisition or physical displacement is not expected, but the landscape restoration works (which includes contour bunding, progressive/radical terracing,

Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12

Yes



planting of anti-erosion hedges) may entail plot re-profiling, resizing and consolidation, and economic impacts such as loss of crops and perennials. The project will ensure that assets are not lost and that sources of income and means of livelihood are maintained. Mitigation measures will be taken to avoid any loss of livelihood as early as possible. Resettlement Action Plans will be developed, consulted, and disclosed during project implementation and prior to the start of any works.

Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project does not involve dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	No international waterways are involved.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project sites are not located in disputed areas.

## KEY SAFEGUARD POLICY ISSUES AND THEIR MANAGEMENT

### A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:

This GEF AF project will scale up and expand the same interventions as the parent project in a new province of Kayanza in the municipality of Matongo. Therefore, as appraised for the parent project earlier, project activities will not result in any large-scale, significant, or irreversible impacts that are site-specific. Negative impacts likely to be generated include possible air and water pollution, changes in physicochemical properties of soil, loss of vegetation due to terracing, and the use of agricultural inputs (fertilizers). A no-project alternative would, however, accelerate environmental degradation and severely affect the productivity of agricultural lands. The overall impacts of the project will, therefore, be positive on the site. The expected benefits of restoring landscapes in Burundi include better soil fertility, increased agricultural productivity, and food security, greater availability and quality of water resources, reduced desertification, enhance biodiversity, creation of “green jobs”, economic growth, mitigation, and increased resilience to climate change. Risks are also linked to possible exacerbation of land disputes in the hills that will be restored, and any potential land tenure issues involving the indigenous Batwa, but this will be mitigated by land certification in the project areas.

Batwa communities are present throughout the project areas and vulnerable as a result of smaller than average plot sizes and increased risk of land tenure insecurity. The project is designed to ensure the social inclusion of socio-economic different communities within the project areas and has consulted with national and regional Batwa organizations and communities to ensure that Batwa can participate in and benefit from the project.

Other potentials risks are related to GBV/SEA/SH and gaps due to poor access of women to paid jobs, land rights, and non-access to extended services. The GBV strategic plan that has been carried out for the parent project will be used for AF to minimize these identified GBV risks and gaps.





The project is designed to mitigate environmental and social risks with specific mitigation measures to address potential negative impacts. For that reason, the project has been rated as an Environment Assessment Category B project, and triggers seven safeguards policies as follows:

-OP/BP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment): minor impacts caused by the GEF AF are expected to be generated on-site but these have been documented through the ESMF already updated and publicly disclosed by both sides, i.e. Government and World Bank. This is handled through the ESIA/ESMP instrument of the parent project which will be updated and publicly disclosed for this purpose before the implementation of the AF activities.

-OP/BP 4.04 (Natural Habitats): The site-specific of Matango (Kayanza province) for AF is covered areas by no critical natural habitats which will be affected during the interventions. The ESMF updated for the AF provides guidance on how to address potential impacts related to natural habitats. The ESIA/ESMPs of the parent project will be updated for the GEF AF to identify and address accordingly all these impacts on natural habitats.

-OP/BP4.36 (Forests): The municipality of Matongo is adjacent to the limits of the Kibira National Park and intervention activities for the GEF AF are not expected to affect this protected area. Instead, the GEF AF will carry out some activities promoting the sustainable management of the Park. The Park already has a Park Management Plan which outlines anthropic impacts and proposes related mitigation measures. The project will contribute to mitigating some of these impacts.

-OP4.09 (Pest Management): Due to the impacts which will be generated during terracing activities, chemical fertilizers will be applied to enhance soil fertility on site. The appliance of agricultural inputs is detailed through a separate document (Pest Management Plan, PMP) elaborated for the parent project (under validation) which will also apply for GEF AF.

-OP/BP4.11 (Physical and Cultural Resources): It is not expected to find features related to cultural monuments and cemetery but the update of the parent project's ESMF provides for inserting mitigation measures (if any) through the update of the ESIA/ESMP before the implementation of AF activities.

-OP/BP4.10 (Indigenous Peoples): Batwa communities are present throughout the project areas and are vulnerable as a result of smaller than average plot sizes and increased risk of land tenure insecurity. The target areas of the AF include Batwa communities; The parent project's Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) has been updated and disclosed, and an IPP has been elaborated for the parent project (under validation, expected January 2021) and will be updated for the AF.

-OP/PB 4.12(Involuntary Resettlement): No large-scale or irreversible adverse impact is expected. Nonetheless, a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) was updated from the parent project and disclosed. The preparation of the RAP instrument of the parent project is still at an early stage. A consultant is being recruited and the document is expected to be ready in April 2021. The RAP will then be updated along with the feasibility studies to be carried out in the GEF AF area (Matongo municipality).

2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:  
The project involves a menu of land restoration interventions ranging from soil erosion stabilization techniques





(contour bunding, progressive/radical terracing, planting of anti-erosion hedges) and fodder shrubs, to rainwater conservation practices. Existing infrastructure will, furthermore, be protected and this may require some minor civil engineering works. Thus, some minor negative impacts could be generated.

3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.

An analysis of a “Do Nothing” scenario shows the degradation of the landscapes will continue, while the persistence and intensification of environmental and climate-related disasters will have dire socio-economic costs. No specific project alternatives were considered during the preparation of the AF project, but the project is designed to ensure lessons are learned from the parent project and considered prior to committing to further investments in a possible subsequent scale-up of the project to additional collines in Burundi.

4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.

The Project Coordination Unit (PCU) for the parent project will continue to have overall responsibility for managing the GEF AF project. To fulfill the safeguards function of the PCU, the parent project has recruited an Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialist and a Gender Specialist, and the Bank provides them with adequate training as needed. It will continue to be responsible for ensuring monitoring and supervision, and reporting on the project safeguards performance to the National Project Steering Committee (NPSC) and the Bank. Established at the central level, the PCU also has decentralized teams at provincial level in Bujumbura and Muyinga, i.e. the Provincial Project Coordination Units (PPCUs), and an additional PPCU will be established for the AF in Kayanza province. PPCUs ensure the link between central management and local actors. Staffed each with 2 technical/executive officers, they contribute to the implementation of the PCU’s responsibilities locally, including project supervision and monitoring. Additional resources are also dedicated for the training of key actors at provincial and community levels. OBPE has been entrusted with an oversight function to ensure that national laws and procedures are being properly implemented in project areas.

The Client has updated the parent project’s Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) (OP/BP 4.01), which includes specific sections addressing the requirements of the safeguards policies triggered in particular OP/BP 4.04 (natural habitats), OP/BP 4.36 (forests), OP/BP 4.10 (Indigenous Peoples), OP/BP 4.11 (Physical Cultural Resources), OP/BP 4.09 (Pest Management), and OP/BP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement). An Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF), a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF), and a Process Framework (PF) have also been updated for the GEF AF. All these updated safeguards instruments have been publicly disclosed in-country (OBPE’s website) and by the World Bank in August 2020. An Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP), ESIA/ESMP, IPP have been finalized and are under approval at the World Bank (expected in January 2021). As feasibility studies are not yet finalized for the parent project, the preparation of the RAP instrument of the parent project is still at early stage. A consultant is being recruited and the document is expected to be ready in April 2021. The RAP will then be updated along with the feasibility studies to be carried out in the GEF AF area (Matongo municipality).

In addition, the project has developed a GRM to resolve potential conflicts arising over land ownership and certification including the return of absent/refugee owners, labor-intensive community works grievances, health-and-safety complaints, and other complaints or social conflicts that are associated with the project. The GRM builds upon existing forms of conflict resolution within the community as much as feasible and on the participatory nature of the activities and considers the vulnerability and specific needs of the beneficiaries. The GRM is based on a social analysis of the communities in which it is implemented and will be included in the project manual. The GRM was validated by the Bank and publicly disclosed in French in August 2020 then in Kirundi in December 2020. at the following link:



<http://obpe.bi/index.php/frfr/mise-en-oeuvre/projets/prrbp/mecanisme-de-gestion-des-reclamations>, and in Kirundi version publicly disclosed in December 2020 at the following link <https://prrbp.bi/mecanisme-de-gestion-des-reclamations-traduit-en-kirundi/>. The GRM considers specific categories of complaints (such as refugees/returnees, indigenous people/Batwa). It is being operationalized as part of the information and sensitization campaign that the PIU is currently fielding in the targeted areas of the parent project. The set-up of the related committees at different local levels (commune and hill) started in July 2020 and will be completed in January 2021. The same approach will be followed in the areas covered by the GEF AF. Hence the project will address land dispute risks through the certification process, which will be characterized by comprehensive use of information, communication, awareness, community participation, mediation of identified disputes, and an appeal mechanism, including for conflict-related displaced people and refugees. The GRM is also sensitive to GBV and SEA/SH risks. The project works with the GBV specialist in order to incorporate GBV sensitive mitigations measures in the GRM and the Action plan.

Social issues will be a key aspect of supervision undertaken for the project. In particular, the project will hire an NGO to monitor and report on its social quality and accountability in the targeted communities.

Lastly, regarding security risks, the GEF AF project target area is contiguous to the two sectors (Rwegura and Teza) of Kibira National Park where the insecurity risk level is low. All the two sectors are in two provinces (Kayanza and Muramvya), which are not banned to project staff as per World Bank security clearance due to a low level of insecurity risk. The implementation of GEF AF project activities will not encounter any constraint of security risk on ground. The AF project activities are expected to follow the same path as parent project activities on ground.

5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.

The key stakeholders are the agricultural communities on whose lands the terraces will be built, meaning those in the commune of Matongo (Kayanza province), as well as the communities around the Kibira National Park. Focus groups (farmers groups, young people, women's groups, men's groups, Batwa communities, others vulnerable) and field visits were organized in the GEF AF areas of the commune Matongo and around the targeted protected area of Kibira. The project and safeguards instruments were updated taking into consideration local consultations with these communities of the AF areas and disclosed after their finalization. The Plan to Promote Inclusion of Batwa was consulted locally and regionally with the Batwa communities, including the ones living around the protected area of Kibira, and nationally with UNIPROBA (Unissons-nous pour la Promotion des Batwa). Consultations also involved public actors, local NGOs, Associations, Cooperatives from the different targeted communes, local authorities of the Matongo commune. The project will develop and implement a Citizen Engagement Plan and has an operational GRM manual (as described above) to ensure citizens' active participation, involvement, and ownership of the activities during the implementation phase until the closing of the project.

## B. Disclosure Requirements (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)

### Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure	For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	--



15-May-2020	04-Jun-2020	
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b> Burundi 04-Jun-2020  Comments In-country disclosure on 2 June 2020 at the following link: <a href="http://obpe.bi/index.php/fr-fr/mise-en-oeuvre/projets/prrpb/cadre-de-gestion-environnementale-et-sociale-cges-actualise-financement-additionnel">http://obpe.bi/index.php/fr-fr/mise-en-oeuvre/projets/prrpb/cadre-de-gestion-environnementale-et-sociale-cges-actualise-financement-additionnel</a>		
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>		
Date of receipt by the Bank 15-May-2020	Date of submission for disclosure 04-Jun-2020	
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b> Burundi 04-Jun-2020  Comments In-country disclosure on 2 June 2020 at the following link:  -RPF: <a href="http://obpe.bi/index.php/fr-fr/mise-en-oeuvre/projets/prrpb/cadre-de-politique-de-reinstallation-involontaire-actualise">http://obpe.bi/index.php/fr-fr/mise-en-oeuvre/projets/prrpb/cadre-de-politique-de-reinstallation-involontaire-actualise</a>  -PF: <a href="http://obpe.bi/index.php/fr-fr/mise-en-oeuvre/projets/prrpb/cadre-fonctionnel-actualise">http://obpe.bi/index.php/fr-fr/mise-en-oeuvre/projets/prrpb/cadre-fonctionnel-actualise</a>		
<b>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework</b>		
Date of receipt by the Bank 15-May-2020	Date of submission for disclosure 04-Jun-2020	
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b> Burundi 04-Jun-2020  Comments In-country disclosure on 2 June 2020 at the following link: <a href="http://obpe.bi/index.php/fr-fr/mise-en-oeuvre/projets/prrpb/cadre-de-planification-en-faveur-des-peuples-autochtones-batwa-actualise">http://obpe.bi/index.php/fr-fr/mise-en-oeuvre/projets/prrpb/cadre-de-planification-en-faveur-des-peuples-autochtones-batwa-actualise</a>		

**Pest Management Plan**

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?

NA

Date of receipt by the Bank

Date of submission for disclosure

**"In country" Disclosure**

**If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.**

If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:

IPMP under finalization will be disclosed as soon as it is validated by the Bank (expected by end-January 2021)

**C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting) (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)**

**OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment**

Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?

No

**OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats**

Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?

No

If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?

Yes

**OP 4.09 - Pest Management**

Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?

Yes

Is a separate PMP required?

Yes



If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?

NA

#### OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources

Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?

Yes

Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?

Yes

#### OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples

Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?

Yes

If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?

Yes

If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?

NA

#### OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement

Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?

Yes

If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?

Yes

Is physical displacement/relocation expected?

No

Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)

No

#### OP/BP 4.36 - Forests

Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?

Yes

Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?

Yes

Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?

No



### The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information

Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank for disclosure?

Yes

Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?

Yes

### All Safeguard Policies

Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?

Yes

Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?

Yes

Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?

Yes

Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?

Yes

### CONTACT POINT

#### World Bank

Pierre Guigon  
Senior Environmental Specialist

Amadou Alassane  
Senior Agriculture Specialist

#### Borrower/Client/Recipient

Ministry of Finance, Budget, Cooperation and Economic Development  
Desire Musharitse  
Responsible of the Office of Planning, Monitoring and Evalua  
musgdes@yahoo.fr

#### Implementing Agencies



Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock  
Deo Guide-Rurema  
Minister  
ruremadg@gmail.com

#### FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

The World Bank  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20433  
Telephone: (202) 473-1000  
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/projects>

#### APPROVAL

Task Team Leader(s):	Pierre Guigon Amadou Alassane
----------------------	----------------------------------

#### Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:	Peter Leonard	30-Jan-2021
Practice Manager/Manager:	Africa Eshogba Olojoba	30-Jan-2021
Country Director:	Veronique Kabongo	19-Feb-2021