

Simplified Approval Process

Annex 2a: Logical framework



GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND

GCF SAP Proposal: Scaling up Climate Resilience Solutions for Burundian Smallholders - Annex 2a Logical Framework

1. LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This section refers to the project/programme’s logical framework in accordance with the **GCF’s Integrated Results Management Framework** to which the project/programme contributes as a whole, including in respect of any co-financing.

1. GCF Impact level: Paradigm shift potential (max. 300 words)

This section of the logical framework is meant to help a project/programme monitor and assess how it contributes to the paradigm shift described in section D.2 above by applying three assessment dimensions - scale, replicability, and sustainability.

Accordingly, for each assessment dimension (see the definition per assessment in the accompanying guidance note), describe the current state (baseline) and the potential scenario (target) and rate the current state (baseline) by using the three-point-scale rating (low, medium, and high) provided in the guidance note. Also describe how the project/programme will contribute to that shift/transformation under respective assessment dimensions (scale, replicability and sustainability). In doing so, please refer to section D.2 (paradigm shift potential).

Through the provision of GCF funds and co-financing, this project will directly reach 10% of the total population in Burundi (13.7% of the smallholder population; and 20.5% with the addition of indirect beneficiaries) and achieve a total of 1.99M tCO₂eq of permanent removals. This will be achieved through 1) the provision of sustainable access to climate-resilience inputs for smallholder farmers, 2) climate-smart extension and training advisory and 3) agroforestry support. This will equip Burundian households—already vulnerable to the worst impacts from climate change—to become more resilient to the impact of climate change, while reducing the carbon footprint of their agricultural activity, because farming productivity and household incomes will sustainably increase, and agroforestry practices will be implemented and maintained. This project is aligned with national priorities of the Burundian government—specifically under Vision 2025, National Development Strategy and NDC’s—to expand food security and drive-up tree cover through rural agroforestry.

Burundi is where One Acre Fund (1AF) has seen the greatest impact from its model; the program is well received by farmers, with extremely high year-on-year re-enrollment. This GCF-funded project will **scale** this transformative model to 303,000 *new* households (1.5M direct beneficiaries)—the anticipated project reach by year 5 of the project—and across ~5% of the total agricultural land in Burundi. It will also make a meaningful contribution to global climate change mitigation efforts through rural agroforestry across a combined land size of 26,000+ hectares.¹ In terms of **replicability**, enrolled individuals will be better equipped to access future financial services from MFIs and other financial service providers through the provision of certificates from 1AF, detailing their creditworthiness. The project will also share learnings with a wider ecosystem in the agricultural sector, working to achieve pro-smallholder systems change among public/private actors. In terms of **sustainability**, the sustainable provision of climate-resilience inputs to smallholder farmers will provide proof-of-concept for other players in the financial and agricultural sectors, enabling them to enter the market with tailored farmer-resilience-oriented products and services.

Assessment Dimension	Current state (Baseline)		Potential target scenario (Description)	How the project/programme will contribute (Description)
	Description	Rating		

¹ This is a conservative estimate takes into consideration the GCF-attributable total size of land restored—through rural agroforestry—specifically with agroforestry trees that survive for more than 2 years.

<p>Scale</p>	<p>Smallholder farmers are vulnerable to the effects of climate change, with limited capacity to adapt and build resilience. The agricultural ecosystem in the country offers some viable solutions, but these are mostly via short-term projects of limited scale.</p> <p>Government interventions to address climate change would benefit from a wider scale and scope in order to adequately respond to the impacts of climate change across Burundi. Current mitigation efforts already underway are focused on tree planting but would benefit from improvements to adoption and outcomes.</p>	<p><u>Low</u></p>	<p>Smallholder farmers across Burundi will have access to the products (such as hybrid seed and agroforestry seedlings) and services (such as climate-smart training) required to build their adaptive capacity and become more resilient in the face of climate change.</p> <p>Burundi as a nation will make positive strides towards accelerating its climate mitigation capacity through the widespread acceptance of smallholder agroforestry as a tool to meaningfully offset carbon emissions.</p>	<p>The project will build smallholder adaptation at a national level through the provision of agricultural and agroforestry input support, as well as extension services (climate-smart training), supporting to build resilience to the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>In addition, this project will make a meaningful contribution to global climate change mitigation efforts through 26,000+ hectares restored through rural agroforestry, and a cumulative 1.99M tCO₂eq of permanent removals.</p> <p>These efforts will be directed towards the most high-need geographies, building the resilience of the most vulnerable households.</p>
<p>Replicability</p>	<p>While adaptation measures have been identified by the government, a lack of resources has contributed to an inconsistent roll out of these measures. Tree planting efforts are taking place, but are limited in scope and given their focus on public lands, are not replicable on smallholder farming systems.²</p> <p>Further, although agricultural actors in the country have offered some viable solutions, these are generally not replicated; the projects lack meaningful visibility—they are short-term/not designed for long-term sustainability, and limited in scope.</p> <p>As a result, the vast majority of smallholder farmers still cannot access formal financial instruments that support the provision of agricultural products (inputs) and services (training). In addition, the overall adoption of climate-smart agricultural practices is generally low, except in villages supported directly by 1AF</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>New potential market entrants, such as extension service providers and MFIs, will have a blueprint on which to develop and scale up services that are relevant to the smallholder context, multiplying impacts in the long-term. This will be achieved through the scale and visibility of this project.</p> <p>As a result of the replication of smallholder services, farmers will have greater access to financial instruments to purchase crucial agricultural inputs, and climate-smart training on the utilization of these inputs. This will catalyze the adoption of climate smart agriculture practices and household climate resilience.</p> <p>Lastly, smallholder agroforestry efforts will be common throughout Burundi and further contribute to carbon mitigation outcomes in Burundi.</p>	<p>This project will demonstrate that smallholders in Burundi—for too long marginalized by the financial and agricultural sector—are viable customers and individual climate change-agents. This will be demonstrated by proving the creditworthiness of farmers in Burundi (1AF expects a <2% leakage rate on the recovery of input costs, based on historical data), as well as their ability to adopt climate-smart farming practices.</p> <p>These outcomes will invite other players to design and deliver financial and agricultural advisory services to farmers. The project will share learnings with a wider ecosystem in the agricultural sector, and advocate/partner with government to address major issues that affect smallholder farmers.</p> <p>Beneficiaries will also be better equipped to access future financial services from financial service providers—such as MFIs—through the provision of certificates from 1AF.</p>

² Public tree-planting efforts are taking place through programs such as 'Ewe Urambaye'.

	or other international actors.			Lastly, through this project, agricultural best practices will be spread through deep market penetration in previously underserved parts of the country, leading to climate-smart farming adoption in high-need areas, and spillover impacts.
Sustainability	<p>The provision of adaptation services and technologies—mostly by international organizations—is limited in design; these projects tend to be close to fully (if not fully) donor-funded. The sporadic and short-term nature of these projects means they are not sustained in a way that can drive meaningful <i>long-term</i> climate resilience at the household level.</p> <p>Local development planning processes exist but implementation is inconsistent. Burundi remains one of the poorest countries—in terms of GDP/capita—in the world, and its population is one of the world’s most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change.</p>	Low	<p>The financial and agricultural sectors roll out success models that are not dependent on donor subsidy, and that capitalize on the role of farmers as viable customers.</p> <p>As an end-state, farmers then become marketplace agents, demanding the provision of financing and advisory services. New programs emerge to fill this gap, and become viable in the long-run, without overdependence on donor subsidy.</p> <p>The result is an ecosystem where farmers will have greater access to adaptation-oriented products and services, grow more resilient in the face of a changing climate, and make a sustained contribution to global carbon emission reduction goals.</p>	The project will implement a sustainable, long-term model for the provision of climate-resilience inputs to smallholders, with >98% of input costs recovered through annual farmer contributions, driving future re-enrollments in the program. ³

2.1. GCF Outcome level: Reduced emissions and increased resilience (IRMF core indicators 1-4, quantitative indicators)

Select appropriate IRMF core and supplementary indicators to monitor project/programme progress. More than one IRMF (core and or supplementary) indicators may be selected as applicable for each GCF results area and project/programme outcome (as defined in the table in section B.2.2). If IRMF indicators are unable to measure any given project/programme outcomes, project/programme-specific indicators should be developed under section 3 (“Project/programme specific indicators”).

GCF Result Area	IRMF Core Indicators (1-	Means of Verification (MoV)	Baseline	Target		Assumptions / Note
				Mid-term	Final ⁵	

³ This projection is based on historical trends; there is an—on average—less than 2% leakage rate in Burundi, meaning that over 98% of input costs are recovered annually through farmer contributions.

⁵ The final target means the target at the end of project/programme implementation period. However, for core indicator 1 (GHG emission reduction), please also provide the target value at the end of the total lifespan period which is defined as the maximum number of years over which the impacts of the investment are expected to be effective.

	4) ⁴					
<u>Choose an item</u>	<u>Choose appropriate indicators and supplementary indicators</u>	<i>Sources of information and methods used to collect and report data /information to measure progress against targets</i>	<i>The starting point or current value of the indicators before the implementation of the project</i>	<i>The estimated value of the indicator at the mid-point of the implementation</i>	<i>The estimated value of the indicator at the completion of the implementation</i>	<i>Externalities and factors outside project management's control that may impact the outcomes Data sources and methodologies applied for estimating baseline and targets</i>
<u>MRA 4</u> Forestry and land use (These two sets of GCF indicators act as sub-indicators for Outcome 3 in the Theory of Change)	<u>Core 1</u> GHG emissions reduced, avoided or removed / sequestered	Ex-ACT Tool Agroforestry surveys (planting and survival rates). ⁶	0	88k tCO ₂ eq of permanent removals (mid-term)	222k tCO ₂ eq of permanent removals (final) 1.99M tCO ₂ eq of permanent removals (cumulative across the 25 year lifespan of the project)	<u>Methodology</u> : 1AF has used the Ex-ACT Tool to determine the estimated value of permanent removals by midterm (2027), endline (2029) and cumulatively across the 25-year lifespan of the project; 5 years implementation, plus 20 years capitalization. Only additional (incremental) trees are counted—those that will be planted as a result of GCF funds and co-funder contributions <i>and</i> that are expected to survive to maturity. Survival estimates are based on historical data (actuals). As a result of this methodology, 1AF will only report on <i>permanent carbon sequestration</i> through this project. ⁷ <u>Externalities</u> : The government—the sole provider of agroforestry seeds—continues to provide seeds of sufficient quality and quantity, and government messaging on tree product utilization is sufficiently aligned with 1AF to allow continued adoption.

⁴ The IRMF Indicators are set out in the [Integrated Results Management Framework](#)

⁶ See Outcome 3 for more details on methodology.

⁷ 1AF also retains a third-party verified methodology based on existing voluntary carbon market standards, species-specific sequestration rates, and anticipated tree lifetime in number of years. While the tCO₂eq of permanent removals is estimated using the Ex-ACT tool, this internal third-party methodology is discussed in Annex 14a.

	<p><u>Supplementary 4.1</u></p> <p>Hectares of terrestrial forest, terrestrial non-forest, under restoration and/or improved ecosystems</p>	<p>Agroforestry surveys (planting and survival rates; tree spacing averages per species)</p>	0	13,900+ cumulative hectares of surviving trees planted	26,400+ cumulative hectares of surviving trees planted	<p><u>Methodology:</u> Under Output 3, 1AF has provided an explanation of the methodology to determine and monitor the number of individual surviving trees (i.e. through in-person visits and tree counts of a representative sample of project and non-project farmers). This is used to determine the total hectares: First, 1AF determines the expected average spacing per tree in smallholder agroforestry systems using historical data⁸. This is then used to determine the expected maximum tree density in Burundi, in number of trees per hectare. Second, the total number of surviving trees (determined using the aforementioned methodology on physical tree counts) is divided by the maximum tree density per hectare. Note that as above, only additional (incremental) trees are counted—those that will be planted as a result of GCF funds and co-funder contributions and that are expected to survive to maturity.</p> <p><i>Externalities the same as those detailed above (under Core 1).</i></p>
<p>ARA 1 and ARA 2</p> <p>Most vulnerable people and communities</p> <p>Health, well being, food, and water security</p>	<p><u>Core 2</u></p> <p>Direct and indirect beneficiaries reached (male/female)</p>	<p>Enrollment surveys</p> <p>Spillover impact studies</p> <p>Household demographic surveys</p>	0	<p>1.2M+ direct beneficiaries</p> <p>(653,000+ females)</p>	<p>1.5M+ direct beneficiaries</p> <p>(777,000+ females)</p>	<p><u>Methodology:</u> The methodology to calculate direct and indirect beneficiaries is explained in more detail in the full proposal section D.1. (Impact Potential). In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion models (conservatively projected on the basis of ten years of historical expansion data, as well as data/estimations on the remaining addressable market and expected project penetration in target geographies) are used to determine the expected number of project farmers from 2025-29. • 1AF runs annual household demographic surveys to determine household numbers in target geographies. The three-year running average is used to provide a conservative estimation of future household numbers. Expected farmer enrollments are multiplied by household size to determine direct beneficiaries each year. • Rigorous spillover impact studies help 1AF to determine a conservative ratio of project (enrolled): spillover (non-enrolled) farmers. The definition of spillover farmer is explained in section D.1. This helps 1AF to determine the total number of indirect beneficiaries (i.e. spillover farmers and their household
				<p>649,000+ indirect beneficiaries</p> <p>(326,000+ females)</p>	<p>771,000+ indirect beneficiaries</p> <p>(388,000+ females)</p>	

⁸ In reality, distribution is not fully even: spacing is more dense in some areas, and less in cropland.

						members). <u>Externalities</u> : Climate-related hazards—such as flooding—do not occur at a level of scale and severity that would lead to widespread destruction of household assets and farmland. Note that crop yields are always at risk of depression in a poor weather year. This project assumes that there are not protracted disruptions in import policies and processes beyond standard delays. Exchange rate volatility and inflation can affect the provision of inputs to farmers, and therefore new enrollments. ⁹
ARA 1 Most vulnerable people and communities (This also acts as the indicator for Output 2 in the Theory of Change)	<u>Supplementary 2.1</u> Beneficiaries (female/male) adopting improved and/or new climate resilient livelihood options (number of individuals) (Also project Output 2)	Household climate-resilience practices surveys (gender-disaggregated)	0	165,000+ annual climate-smart farming adopters (67,000+ females)	196,000+ annual climate-smart farming adopters (80,000+ females)	<u>Methodology</u> : Once household surveys are completed, 1AF will measure its progress in this area by tracking and reporting the percentage of farmers who adopt 4+ 'climate resilience practices'. 1AF defines a smallholder 'climate resilience practice' as one that offers a protective 'layer' around household farm and livelihoods. These 'layers' offer a buffer and protection in climate change events - e.g. drought, flood, new pest emergence, and staple crop failure. The specific practices that will be counted in this measure include: <u>tree planting</u> (to support nitrogen-fixing, erosion control, and water management), <u>crop diversification</u> (defined as adopting non-staple crops including tubers, legumes, and horticulture), <u>organic composting</u> , <u>lime application</u> (to reduce soil acidity), <u>soil erosion control practices</u> (i.e. farmers adopting one or more of these practices), as well as two key practices aimed at improving crop yields with minimal application of mineral fertilizer - <u>correct plant spacing</u> and <u>fertilizer microdosing</u> . 1AF runs annual surveys to measure number of farmers adopting climate-resilience practices, including a Crop Mix and Tree Survey, across a representative sample of project farmers. The surveys tell 1AF the specific number (and percentage) of farmers that have applied each climate resilient practice each season (and therefore also the number/percentage that have applied 4+ practices). <i>Externalities the same as those detailed above (under Core 2).</i>

⁹ Mitigation measures against exchange rate volatility and inflation is discussed in more detail—together with a summary of key risks across the project implementation—in Annex 7: Risk Assessment.

2.2. GCF Outcome level: Enabling environment (IRMF core indicators 5-8 as applicable)

Select at least two relevant IRMF core (enabling environment) indicators to monitor and elaborate the baseline context and project/programme's targeted outcome against the respective indicators. Rate the current state (baseline) vis-à-vis the target scenario and select the geographical scope of the outcome to be assessed. Describe how the project/programme will contribute towards the target scenario. Refer to a case example in the accompanying guidance to complete this section.

IRMF Core Indicators (5-8) ¹⁰	Baseline context (Description)	Rating for current state (Baseline)	Target scenario (Description)	How the project will contribute	Coverage
<u>Choose an item.</u>		<u>Choose an item.</u>			<u>Choose an item.</u>
Core 7 (Markets)	<p>Rural smallholder farmers are generally perceived as risky to service providers. There is a lack of tested models that demonstrate a viable case for service mechanisms.</p> <p>There are a handful of programs/projects that offer limited services—for example, there are a small number of MFIs. However, these MFIs lack proximity to rural households, and the vast majority of farmers are unable to access their services as a result of their perceived lack of creditworthiness.</p>	Low	<p>Lower barriers to entry for new players in the financial and agricultural service sectors through tested blueprints that demonstrate demand from smallholders.</p> <p>New agricultural and financial service mechanisms, designed specifically for the smallholder context.</p> <p>A shift in market dynamics as farmers start to demand more services, and a new generation of market entrants emerge to deliver these dynamic, tailored services.</p>	<p>Proof-of-concept—through the provision of sustainable access to climate-resilience inputs—for potential new market entrants such as MFIs and agricultural extension service providers.</p> <p>1AF will help to shape policy and regulatory environment in Burundi, through government engagement and advocacy at a national level regarding key issues that affect farmers (such as importation of agricultural inputs).</p>	<u>National level</u>

¹⁰ The IRMF Indicators are set out in the [Integrated Results Management Framework](#)

Core 8 (Knowledge)	<p>There are only a small number of avenues and mechanisms to share lessons learned by successful initiatives and programs.</p> <p>The relatively small number of platforms and their often limited scope inhibits the development of peer-informed, improved methodologies and program strategies.</p>	Low	<p>New avenues and platforms developed for sharing best practices with a broad set of stakeholders in the financial and agricultural service sector in Burundi, including new extension and financing models that are responsive to the unique needs and contexts of smallholder farmers.</p>	<p>This project will share lessons and best practices with a wide set of stakeholders in the agricultural sector through the 1AF National Advisory Council (NAC),¹¹ and a one-time workshop at the end of the project with sector and public stakeholders.¹²</p> <p>Production and dissemination of best practices manuals on financing and agroforestry.</p> <p>Continued work with the government to embed a climate-resilience approach in the development of policies on rural agriculture.</p>	<u>National level</u>
-----------------------	---	-----	--	---	-----------------------

3. Project/programme specific indicators (project outcomes and outputs)						
Project/programme results (outcomes/ outputs)	Project/programme specific Indicator	Means of Verification (MoV)	Baseline	Target		Assumptions / Note
				Mid-term	Final	
		<i>Sources of information and methods used to collect and report data/information to measure progress against targets</i>	<i>The starting point or current value of the indicators before the implementation of the project</i>	<i>The estimated value of the indicator at the mid-point of the implementation</i>	<i>The estimated value of the indicator at the completion of the implementation</i>	<i>Externalities and factors outside project management's control that may impact on the Component. Data sources and methodologies applied for estimating baseline and targets</i>

¹¹ The National Advisory Council meets annually, and includes representatives from the Ministry of Environment Agriculture and Livestock, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and private sector.

¹² 1AF will work closely with GCF to identify other actors in Burundi that would benefit from knowledge exchange.

<p>Outcome 1: Increased household incomes of climate vulnerable smallholder farmers</p>	<p>Average annual \$ value of incremental income from climate-smart farming generated by each project farmer (compared to non-enrolled farmers)</p>	<p>Harvest measurement survey (<i>see Outcome 2</i>) Market price survey Crop mix survey (farmer-level)</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>\$100 in average annual incremental income per farmer</p>	<p>\$100 in average \$25.4M+ total annual incremental income per farmers</p>	<p><u>Methodology:</u> Local market price and crop mix surveys layered on to harvest measurements (see Outcome 2 methodology) to determine total revenues for a representative sample of enrolled versus non-enrolled farmers; while cost of production determined using farm input costs layered on to application rates. The same methodology applied non-project farmers, and the difference (incremental income) reported.</p> <p><i>Externalities the same as those detailed under Core 2 indicator in section 2.1.</i></p>
<p>Output 1.1: Increased availability and affordability of climate-resilience inputs in a sustainable, long-term model</p>	<p>Total annual number of agricultural input adopters</p>	<p>Farmer enrollment survey</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>255,000 annual input adopters (104,000+ females)</p>	<p>303,000 annual input adopters (123,000+ females)</p>	<p><u>Methodology:</u> 1AF will collect annual gender-disaggregated enrollment data to determine the total number of overall farmer enrollments in the project, together with the specific itemized breakdown and cost of inputs ordered per farmer.¹³</p>

¹³ These farmer enrollments will be tracked in 1AF's internal database system, in order to measure the scale of the project, as well as the geographic and demographic breakdown of enrolled individuals.

	Average annual percentage recovery rate through farmer contributions	Transaction sizes (total cost of inputs per farmer) Recovery database	0	98%+	98%+	Methodology: 1AF rigorously tracks inputs costs per farmer (transaction sizes)—at an individual farmer and project level—in order to measure the total rate of recoveries per season/year. <i>Externalities for both indicators under Output 1.1. are the same as those detailed under Core 2 indicator in section 2.1.</i>
Output 1.2: Enhanced ability of ag and financial sector service providers to respond to farmer needs	Cumulative number of workshops held—including annual NAC meetings—to share learnings and best practices	1AF will track the number of annual NAC meetings held (one expected per annum) and the final workshop.	0	3 workshops held (cumulative total)	6 workshops held (cumulative total)	Externalities: This assumes continued strong relationship and rapport with government.
Outcome 2: Climate-responsive improvements in farm productivity	Average annual percentage hybrid maize and bean yield improvements among enrolled farmers compared to non-enrolled farmers	Harvest measurement survey	0	27% maize yield improvement 15% bean yield improvement	27% maize yield improvement 15% bean yield improvement	Methodology: This includes physically weighing harvests in kg from a randomly selected portion of a farmer's fields and then extrapolating a per acre harvest estimate. This is done for a representative sample of project and non-project farmers. <i>Externalities the same as those detailed under Outcome 1</i>

<p>Output 3: Large-scale adoption of agroforestry practices</p>	<p>Total cumulative number of agroforestry trees planted by enrolled farmers as a result of project funding</p> <p>Total cumulative number of agroforestry trees planted by enrolled farmers—that survive to at least two years¹⁴—as a result of project funding</p>	<p>Agroforestry surveys (planting and survival rates)</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>8.2M+ cumulative trees planted</p> <p>2.7M+ cumulative surviving trees (2+ years)</p>	<p>15.6M+ cumulative trees planted</p> <p>5.2M+ cumulative surviving trees (2+ years)</p>	<p>Methodology: 1AF will conduct annual monitoring and evaluation to determine the survival rates of trees planted. This will include two rounds of in-person visits to farmers; the first immediately after planting (to measure the planting rate), and the second twelve months later (to measure survival rate), across a representative sample of 800-1900 randomly selected enrolled and comparison (non-1AF) farmers.</p> <p><i>Externalities the same as those detailed under Core 1 indicator (GHG emissions)</i></p>
<p>Project/programme co-benefit indicators</p>						
<p>Co-benefit 1: Increased total annual household income supports household graduation from poverty</p>	<p>Total percentage increase in total annual household income resulting from project activities</p>	<p>Impact study (1AF-internal study on new income generated by enrolled farmers)</p> <p>Annual household income study (external study)¹⁵</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>12% increase in total annual household income for 255,000 households</p>	<p>12% increase in total annual household income for 303,000 households</p>	<p>Methodology: 1AF used an external study of annual household income and internal 2023 program impact data to establish the 12% target. Within the project period, 1AF will conduct a one-time evaluation of total household income of members and nonmembers to ground proof the external study and apply annual impact data.</p>

¹⁴ Because the first two years are the sensitive period for trees, 1AF assumes that the vast majority of trees that survive for at least 2 years will reach maturity.

¹⁵ <https://housingfinanceafrica.org/app/uploads/2021/11/Burundi.pdf>

<p><u>Co-benefit 2</u>: Improved food security for targeted rural households</p>	<p>Beneficiaries (female/male) with improved food security (number of individuals)</p> <p>(Note that this is the same as Supplementary Indicator 2.2)</p>	<p>Household hunger survey (borrowing from FANTA—Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance under USAID—survey questions)¹⁶</p> <p>Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>324,000+ beneficiaries with improved food security</p> <p>(163,000+ females)</p>	<p>385,000+ beneficiaries with improved food security</p> <p>(194,000+ females)</p>	<p><u>Methodology</u>: 1AF uses one of the FANTA questions: “in the past [4 weeks/30 days], did you or any household member go to sleep at night hungry because there was not enough food?”, compare a representative sample of newly enrolled (<1 year in the program) to veteran farmers, control for location, and derive a percentage improvement score. To estimate the number of future beneficiaries with improved food security, the three-year historical average percentage improvement rate (2020-22) is applied to future years.</p> <p><u>Externalities</u>: Unforeseen improvements in agricultural productivity as a result of government, private sector or civil society projects—at scale—aimed at smallholder food security.</p>
--	---	--	----------	---	---	--

4. Project/programme activities and deliverables

All project activities should be listed here with a description and sub-activities. Significant deliverables should be also reflected in the project/programme Timetable (Annex 5). Add rows as needed.

Please number the activities as shown below to indicate association of activities to the related outputs provided above in section 5. Similarly, please number sub-activities as shown below to associate to the related activity.

Output	Activities	Description	Deliverables
<p>Please number each Output Output 1.1, Output 1.2)</p>	<p>List of the project activities below.</p>	<p>Provide a brief description of each of the activity listed in the previous column.</p>	

¹⁶ Six questions about hunger experienced in the past 30 days are used to determine an internationally vetted relative hunger score: <https://www.fantaproject.org/monitoring-and-evaluation/household-food-insecurity-access-scale-hfias>

<p><u>Output 1.1:</u> Increased availability and affordability of climate-resilience inputs in a sustainable, long-term model</p>	<p><u>Activity 1.1.1:</u> Awareness raising and farmer enrollment in the program</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Awareness raising:</i> 1AF will raise awareness about the project through its network of field officers. • Farmer enrollments: Then proactively enroll farmers into the project for the A season (September to March) and B season (February to June). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15,000+ farmer groups hear about the project through awareness raising efforts by year 5 (2029) • 303,000 new annual farmer enrollments by year 5 of the project (2029)
	<p><u>Activity 1.1.2:</u> Provision and delivery of farm inputs/products</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Input enrollments:</i> A suite of agricultural inputs will be offered to farmers. • <i>Delivery:</i> 1AF will provide 'last-mile' delivery of these inputs in hard-to-reach rural locations, within walking distance of all farmers served. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 47,000MT+ of total inputs purchased and distributed by the end of the project period.
	<p><u>Activity 1.1.3:</u> Recovery of input costs to re-purchase for next season</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Qualification:</i> Enrolled farmers will make a 'qualification contribution' (a % of the of the total value of inputs ordered.) • <i>Further installments:</i> And then further installments on their own schedule, and at any time throughout the season. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8%+ of the total costs of inputs recovered by the qualification deadline each year.
<p><u>Output 1.2:</u> Enhanced ability of ag and financial sector service providers to respond to farmer needs</p>	<p><u>Activity 1.2.1:</u> Best practice sharing and program calibration for subsequent seasons (these yearly discussions will also include lessons learned on component 2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>NAC meetings:</i> Best practices will be shared through annual NAC meetings (see footnote 13). • <i>One time workshop:</i> 1AF will also organize a one-time workshop at the end of the project that brings actors in the agricultural and financial service ecosystems together to share learnings/best practices on smallholder farmer extension provision and agroforestry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual NAC meetings held with government stakeholders to exchange key project lessons. • 1 workshop held to share best practices/key lessons with sector players at the end of the project period.

	<u>Activity 1.2.2:</u> Issuance of certificates for improved creditworthiness of farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Provision of certificates:</i> 1AF will offer certificates to detail the creditworthiness of farmers that successfully provide a contribution of 100% of the total value of inputs ordered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative total of 188,000+ certificates issued during the project period. • Cumulative total of 77,000+ certificates issued to female farmers.
<u>Output 2:</u> Enhanced farmers' capacities to adopt improved, climate smart practices	<u>Activity 2.1:</u> Refinement of climate-smart ag training materials in partnership with MINEAGRIE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ministry approval:</i> 1AF will work with MINEAGRIE to ensure that the climate smart agriculture trainings offered by 1AF conform to technical guidance approved by the Ministry and integrate lessons learned as well as best practices offered by the sector. • <i>Sector engagement:</i> 1AF will also regularly engage with the agriculture sector in order to gather additional best practices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 farmer climate-smart training manual - including ToT materials - created/continually updated for entire production cycle for staple (maize and beans) and supplementary non-staple crops (e.g. vegetables, other legumes), covering planting, all crop management stages, and harvests. • Soil health training materials created/continually updated.
	<u>Activity 2.2:</u> Provision of climate-smart ag training support for crops and soil health practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Farmer agricultural training:</i> 1AF will equip farmers to enhance their soil health and to grow a diverse range of crops — comprising grains, legumes, and vegetables — with a seed menu optimized for farmers' micro-climate, soil type, and other agroecological factors.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 242,000+ annual farmer-adopters of the fertilizer micro-dosing method by year 5 (2029) • 272,000+ annual farmer-adopters of compost application by year 5. • 24,000+ annual farmer-adopters of lime application by year 5. • 60,000+ annual farmers that attend the majority of annual trainings by year 5.

Output 3: Large-scale adoption of agroforestry practices	Activity 3.1: Cultivation and delivery of agroforestry seedlings to farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Seedling cultivation</i>: 1AF will cultivate seedlings centrally at its own facilities, or through 'decentralized nurseries' where community members are trained and equipped to run the nursery. • <i>Continual research and improvement</i>: Throughout the project period, 1AF will run ongoing research on the best species selection to offer to farmers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 600+ cumulative decentralized nurseries established for rural production of seedlings. • 600+ cumulative indirect jobs provided in rural communities (nursery managers) • 18M+ cumulative seedlings distributed by year 5 (2029)
	Activity 3.2: Training provision on agroforestry, including tree planting, care and maintenance	<p><i>Farmer agroforestry training</i>: 1AF will ensure that farmers receive training on the value of trees, as well as proper techniques for management, especially focused on tree survival.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 farmer climate-smart training manual - including ToT materials - created that covers the entire scope of species offered and agroforestry practices from planting to tree management (e.g. mulching, coppicing). • Meetings with MINEAGRIE will be held on an ongoing (annual) basis to validate agroforestry training materials.

5. Monitoring, reporting and evaluation arrangements (max. 300 words)

Besides the arrangements (e.g. annual performance reports) laid out in Accreditation Master Agreement (AMA), please give a summary of the project/programme specific arrangements for monitoring, reporting and evaluation including a description of the monitoring and reporting system that will be used to assess the climate results of the proposed project/programme. Please also summarize the types of interim and final evaluations. Describe Accredited Entity (AE) project reporting relationships, including to the National Designated Authority (NDA)/Focal Point and between AE and Executing Entity (EE) as relevant, identifying reporting obligations from the EE to the AE.

1AF will collect the data against the indicators mentioned in this Logical Framework by leveraging its in-house Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) team. MEL efforts for this project in Burundi will focus on measuring progress toward the annual targets. This will happen through a combination of checks on the farmer enrollment database system to track scale and geography of households served, household surveys to understand the average household size and makeup (used to determine the total project beneficiaries) as well as the additional surveys mentioned in this Logical Framework, such as crop harvest measurements to measure yield improvements across supported crops, and agroforestry surveys to determine annual tree planting and survival rates. A full list of the studies that the MEL team will conduct as part of this project is articulated in the Annex 2 from pages 70-71, and costs included in the budget (and summarized in the full proposal).

1AF proposes to share formal annual grant reports with GCF—with progress against annual targets—on March 15th annually (from 2026-2030). These dates align with 1AF's annual books closing (to provide final budget-vs-actual reports). Namely, internal MEL data and unaudited full year financials will be ready in early March, allowing 1AF to provide the full-

year report in mid-March. Given that a lot of the metrics are measured once per year, not every metric will be presented in every report. In the reports, 1AF will provide a narrative update on activities, outputs, outcomes, the quantified progress against mid-line and end-line targets, as well as a financial update. The financial update will include narrative explanations of any line item that deviated more than 10% from the proposed budget.

The reporting and evaluation schedule is explained below:

- **Inception report:** This will take place in Q2 2025, and include an MEL plan that outlines:
 - Roles and responsibilities on the MEL team (as part of the MRV process).
 - Budget allotted for MEL.
 - How knowledge sharing activities will be conducted - i.e. the annual National Advisory Council meetings, as well as a final workshop at the end of the project with stakeholders from the financial and agricultural sectors.
 - The iterative process that 1AF will undergo in order to leverage lessons derived from MEL/data collection to improve the project components (i.e. 'learning loops' in the comment).
 - Changes to targets articulated in Annex 2a (if any).
- **Annual APRs:** These will take place annually at the end of Q1 (by March 15th as mentioned above), and deep dive on progress on the targets articulated in Annex 2a (across all indicators and activity deliverables). This also includes the last APR (PCR - Project Completion Report) three months after the end of implementation (i.e. Q1 2030, as noted in the comments). Further topics covered in the annual APRs are covered in Annex 2, page 70.
- **Interim and final project evaluations:** The quarter after the 'mid-term' (i.e. half way point of the project), and six months after the end of implementation respectively. That is, Q2 2027 (for the interim evaluation) and Q2 2030 (for the final evaluation). These evaluations are budgeted.

Note that 1AF does not plan to conduct a dedicated baseline survey, as targets have been set on the basis of existing annual surveys (outlined in Annex 2 from pages 70-71)

1AF has held several consultative engagements with the National Designated Authority Diomedé Ndayirukiye of the Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock of Burundi. In these meetings, 1AF has provided project materials, included the submitted and approved Concept Note, and project Theory of Change. The NDA has expressed his strong support for this project, and its appropriateness to the Burundian context, including how it serves as part of the long-term partnership 1AF has with the government to serve Burundian farmers. This support will allow for results to be maintained well past the implementation of this project, as the sustainable 1AF model continues serving farmers, building on its track record of success since 2012.